

Griffith	Lowey	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	Miller, George	Wamp
Johnson, Sam	Moore (WI)	Woolsey
Kilpatrick (MI)	Olver	Young (AK)
Kosmas	Rodriguez	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members, there are 2 minutes left in the vote.

□ 1728

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to prohibit any person from performing lobbying activities on behalf of a client which is determined by the Secretary of State to be a State sponsor of terrorism."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL ESIGN DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) expressing support for designation of June 30 as "National ESign Day".

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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 397, noes 15, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—397

Aderholt	Blackburn	Buyer
Adler (NJ)	Blumenauer	Calvert
Alexander	Blunt	Camp
Altmire	Boccieri	Cantor
Arcuri	Boehner	Cao
Austria	Bonner	Capps
Baca	Bono Mack	Capuano
Bachmann	Boozman	Cardoza
Bachus	Boren	Carnahan
Baird	Boswell	Carney
Baldwin	Boucher	Carson (IN)
Barrett (SC)	Boustany	Cassidy
Barrow	Boyd	Castle
Bartlett	Brady (PA)	Chandler
Barton (TX)	Brady (TX)	Childers
Bean	Braley (IA)	Chu
Becerra	Bright	Clarke
Berkley	Broun (GA)	Clay
Berry	Brown, Corrine	Clyburn
Biggert	Brown-Waite,	Coble
Bilbray	Ginny	Coffman (CO)
Bilirakis	Buchanan	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Burton (IN)	Cole
Bishop (NY)	Butterfield	Connolly (VA)

Cooper	Inslee	Nadler (NY)
Costa	Israel	Napolitano
Costello	Issa	Neal (MA)
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Courtnay	Jackson Lee	Nye
Critz	(TX)	Oberstar
Crowley	Jenkins	Obey
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Olson
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Oliver
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
Dahlkemper	Jones	Owens
Davis (AL)	Jordan (OH)	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kagen	Pascrell
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)
Davis (KY)	Kaptur	Paul
Davis (TN)	Kennedy	Paulsen
DeFazio	Kildee	Payne
DeGette	Kilpatrick (MI)	Perlmutter
DeLauro	Kilroy	Perriello
Dent	Kind	Peters
Deutch	King (NY)	Peterson
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Petri
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Pingree (ME)
Dicks	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pitts
Dingell	Kissell	Platts
Djou	Kline (MN)	Polis (CO)
Doggett	Kosmas	Pomeroy
Donnelly (IN)	Kratovil	Posey
Doyle	Kucinich	Price (GA)
Dreier	Lamborn	Price (NC)
Driehaus	Lance	Putnam
Edwards (MD)	Langevin	Quigley
Edwards (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Radanovich
Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Rahall
Ellison	Latham	Rangel
Ellsworth	LaTourette	Rehberg
Emerson	Lee (CA)	Reichert
Engel	Lee (NY)	Reyes
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Richardson
Etheridge	Lewis (GA)	Roe (TN)
Fallin	Linder	Rogers (AL)
Farr	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)
Fattah	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Filner	Loebbsack	Rohrabacher
Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe	Rooney
Forbes	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry	Lucas	Roskam
Foster	Luetkemeyer	Ross
Fox	Lujan	Rothman (NJ)
Fox	Lummis	Roybal-Allard
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Frank (AZ)	E.	Ruppersberger
Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Rush
Fudge	Mack	Ryan (OH)
Galegley	Maffei	Ryan (WI)
Garamendi	Maloney	Salazar
Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Sanchez, Linda
Gerlach	Markey (CO)	T.
Giffords	Markey (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gingrey (GA)	Marshall	Sarbanes
Gohmert	Matheson	Scalise
Gonzalez	Matsui	Schakowsky
Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)	Schauer
Gordon (TN)	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Granger	McCaul	Schmidt
Graves (GA)	McClintock	Schock
Graves (MO)	McCollum	Schrader
Grayson	McCotter	Schwartz
Green, Al	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Green, Gene	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Guthrie	McIntyre	Serrano
Gutierrez	McKeon	Sessions
Hall (NY)	McMorris	Sestak
Hall (TX)	Rodgers	Shea-Porter
Halvorson	McNerney	Sherman
Hare	Meek (FL)	Shimkus
Harman	Meeks (NY)	Shuler
Harper	Melancon	Shuster
Hastings (FL)	Mica	Simpson
Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Sires
Heinrich	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Heller	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)
Hergert	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Herse	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Herseth Sandlin	Minnick	Snyder
Higgins	Mitchell	Space
Hill	Mollohan	Speier
Himes	Moore (KS)	Spratt
Hinche	Moore (WI)	Stark
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Hirono	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Sullivan
Holden	Murphy (NY)	Sutton
Holt	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner
Honda	Murphy, Tim	Taylor
Hoyer	Myrick	Teague
Hunter		Terry
Inglis		

Thompson (CA)	Van Hollen	Welch
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Westmoreland
Thompson (PA)	Visclosky	Whitfield
Tiahrt	Walden	Wilson (OH)
Tiberi	Walz	Wilson (SC)
Tierney	Wasserman	Wittman
Titus	Schultz	Wolf
Tonko	Waters	Wu
Towns	Watson	Yarmuth
Tsongas	Watt	Young (FL)
Turner	Waxman	
Upton	Weiner	

## NOES—15

Akin	Chaffetz	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Neugebauer
Burgess	Kildee	Poe (TX)
Campbell	Flake	Shadegg
Carter	King (IA)	Thornberry

## NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman	Conyers	Pence
Andrews	Griffith	Rodriguez
Berman	Hoekstra	Slaughter
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Wamp
Capito	Klein (FL)	Woolsey
Castro (FL)	Levin	Young (AK)
Cleaver	McMahon	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 1 minute left in the vote.

□ 1738

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1740

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4899, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. McGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-522) on the resolution (H. Res. 1500) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 4899) making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief and summer jobs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4899, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1500 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 1500

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4899) making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief and summer jobs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a

motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the text with each of the five House amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour and 30 minutes as follows: 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; then 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representative Lee of California or her designee and an opponent; and then 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representative McGovern of Massachusetts or his designee and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except that the question of adoption of the motion shall be divided among the five House amendments. The first portion of the divided question shall be considered as adopted. If the remaining portions of the divided question fail of adoption, then the House shall be considered to have rejected the motion and to have made no disposition of the Senate amendment to the text.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of the motion specified in the first section of this resolution—

(a) the Clerk shall engross the action of the House under that section as a single amendment; and

(b) a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 3. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than July 3, 2010, such material as he may deem explanatory of the Senate amendments and the motion specified in the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 4. House Resolution 1493 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 5. Clause 10(a) of rule XXI is amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (b) and (c), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

“(A) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

“(B) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

“(2) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget relative to baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and consistent with sections 3(4), 3(8), and 4(c) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

“(3) For the purpose of this clause, the terms ‘budget year,’ ‘current year,’ and ‘direct spending’ have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term ‘direct spending’ shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4)(C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEINER). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gen-

tleman from California, my very good friend (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 4899 and makes in order a motion by the chair of the Appropriations Committee to concur in the Senate amendments with the five amendments printed in the Rules Committee report.

The rule waives all points of order against the motion except those arising under clause 10 of rule 21.

The rule provides that the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour and 30 minutes as follows: 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee; then 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representative LEE of California and an opponent; and then 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representative MCGOVERN of Massachusetts and an opponent. The rule provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except that the question of adoption of the motion shall be divided among the five House amendments, with the first portion of the divided question considered as adopted. If the remaining portions of the divided question fail of adoption, then the House shall be considered to have made no disposition of the Senate amendment to the text.

The chair of the Appropriations Committee may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than July 3, 2010, such material as he may deem explanatory of the Senate amendments and the motion specified in the first section of this resolution. The rule provides that House Resolution 1493 is hereby adopted.

Finally, the rule amends the time periods in clause 10 of rule XXI to align with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this rule. This is a difficult rule. It is a difficult rule because it deals with an extraordinarily important subject. This is an extraordinarily important rule. It is important to every Member of this House, on either side of this House, of whatever ideology they bring to this House. It is extraordinarily important to the American people.

It deals, as I said, with the lives and welfare of our young people. It deals

with the security of this Nation. It deals with the safety of our people. It deals with the objective of not only teaching our children, but in eliminating terrorists who would put them at risk.

I rise in support of this rule because I think that the very difficult line of trying to give every Member the opportunity to reflect their point of view, which, of course, in a body of 435 people is very difficult, but I think this rule attempts to do that.

We know that the fiscal course that we are on will ultimately lead to bankruptcy unless we act to change it. That is why this rule also projects fiscal discipline in the budget enforcement resolution that is included within the ambit of this rule.

Whenever you hear someone blame our debt on this Congress' so-called out-of-control spending, you can be sure they're more interested in pointing fingers and scoring political points than solving problems. That's especially true when you hear those complaints from those who presided over a lot of debt. Some of us voted for a lot of debt along with them, some of us did not.

In the long term, our structural deficit stems from the retirement of the baby boomers and spiraling entitlement costs. It is therefore in the budget resolution that we tip our hat in a favorable way to the commission that has been established by the President. It's said that we are hopeful that they will come up with substantive recommendations that will get us from where we are to where we need to be—a return to fiscal balance.

□ 1750

It also says that our committees ought to look carefully at the ways and means that we can save dollars, eliminate waste, and make more effective use of the tax dollars—indeed, save tax dollars. The American people want us to do that.

This budget enforcement resolution included in this rule will also say that we will honor statutory PAYGO, that we will pay for what we buy, that if this generation deems something an important priority for us to purchase that we will pay for it so that our children and our grandchildren will have the option of making their priorities and will not have their priorities made for them by us.

In addition to this bill, it provides for the consideration of domestic spending priorities, largely to save jobs. Particularly, we have teachers in this country who are subject to layoffs because of the severe recession that we have been involved in and because of the precipitous falling of revenues to States, therefore putting the education of our children at risk.

The administration asks for far more money than Mr. OBEY has been able to include. They also ask for it to be unpaid for, but if we are going to be honest about PAYGO, we need to pay for

things. This bill will pay for the increase in teacher assistants. Mr. OBEY scrubbed all of the appropriation accounts and has come up with sufficient dollars to do that. I think that is what the American public wanted us to do, and that is what Mr. OBEY has done. I congratulate him for that.

This bill will provide for additional border security on our southern border. We understand there is a crisis on the southern border. This President has responded to it. This bill responds to it.

In addition, we provide, obviously, for FEMA money. FEMA is running out of money. We have had a number of natural disasters around this country, and FEMA has responded. This bill provides for the dollars necessary for FEMA to have the resources to respond to those emergencies.

This rule provides for an amendment which will provide money for Haiti. It provides for other priorities of our country. Some will, perhaps, disagree with those priorities, and others will agree with them; but we will consider them on this floor.

I say to my friends that this rule provides for three options, as Mr. MCGOVERN, I think, will explain further, so I will not go deeply into them.

There will be, perhaps, those who will say we ought not to fund the effort in Afghanistan at all. They will have that option. There will then be an option that says, no, we will appropriate this money, but we need to limit it to extricating ourselves—drawing down our forces from Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. OBEY have another alternative which will provide for the administration's providing us with information both in a National Intelligence Estimate and in a plan for withdrawal. They will expand upon that; but that gives, I think, almost everyone in this House the opportunity to express their views as to what ought to be done.

I urge my colleagues at this hour, on this, perhaps, last day of our session before the July 4 break to approve this rule, which, I believe, gives Members the options that they can be comfortable with in voting "yes" or "no." I will urge a "yes" vote on the rule and certainly a "yes" vote on a number of pieces of this legislation. I will not vote for every one of these amendments, but they ought to be made in order.

I appreciate the work that Mr. MCGOVERN has done. I appreciate the work that Mr. DREIER has done. I want to thank them both. They may have different views, but it is my understanding that this was brought to the floor in a reasonable and considered way.

In closing, I want to thank DAVID OBEY. No one in this House works harder. No one, frankly, is under more pressure than Mr. OBEY. Everybody in every State, every locality, every city and every person who wants a road, a bridge or a public facility talks to Mr. OBEY on a regular basis. I know that

Mr. BOEHNER and I, as the leaders, have a lot of people talking to us when we come on this floor, but nobody talks to anybody more than they talk to Mr. OBEY. Mr. OBEY has focused on this, has worked on this, and has brought to the floor, I think, a bill that we can be proud of, that we think will move America forward, a bill that will help stop the loss of jobs, particularly in our educational community. So I thank Mr. OBEY for the leadership that he has shown and for the commitment that he has made.

Now, I want to tell my friends on our side of the aisle that the administration is not happy with some of the pay-fors which we are committed to. The administration and our side of the aisle overwhelmingly were for statutory PAYGO, saying that we would pay for what we bought. The administration, understandably, has some reservations about some of the offsets. However, nobody is ever happy with all of the tough decisions that have to be made. So I would urge my colleagues to pass this bill and to pass the amendment that Mr. OBEY will offer on domestic discretionary spending. I would ask us to send this bill to the Senate.

I regret that the Senate has gone home. I am sorry that the Senate has gone home. I am sorry the Senate is not available tonight or tomorrow to consider this legislation. I understand that we have lost a great Senator and a dear friend in Robert C. Byrd. I will be going tomorrow to the memorial service for Senator Byrd, and then I will return here. I would have returned ready for business, as I think we should complete this piece of legislation, and I would have hoped that that might have been the case.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding. I urge my colleagues to let us move forward on this important piece of legislation, not only for the safety and security of our troops, not only for the effort to ensure that terrorists are hunted down and defeated, but also to ensure that, here at home, we take care of the people and that we pay for those who we take care of here at home. We are not going to pay for the emergency that exists overseas, but this is a good rule. The options are clear for all, and the effort that we make here is important for our country and for our people.

I urge adoption of the rule. I urge adoption of the Obey amendment. I urge the careful consideration of the other three amendments that will be offered as well.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to my good friend from Worcester, my Rules Committee colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my friend's, the gentleman from Mary-

land's, outline of this rule, but the fact of the matter is this is one of the most convoluted rules that we have seen in a long, long period of time.

I say that because, while my friend tried to make it sound as if this rule were fashioned to ensure that every single Member of this institution would have the opportunity to have a say, to play a role and to ensure that the House is working its will, the fact of the matter is it is a rule which is designed, I believe, in many ways to deny what a majority of this House would like to do.

We all decry the fact that we still have men and women in Afghanistan and in Iraq. We wish very much that the wars could come to an end and that we could bring our troops home, and we all enthusiastically look forward to doing that just as expeditiously as possible. Yet we know that a request was made for \$33.5 billion—this is a request that the President made—to ensure that our men and women in uniform have exactly what they need. The Secretary of Defense and other leaders in our military have indicated that it is essential that they have this before the 4th of July. When is the 4th of July? It is this coming Sunday.

Now, last May 27, more than a month ago, the Senate took its action. By a vote of 67–28, they voted in favor of this \$33.5 billion in order to ensure that our men and women in uniform have exactly what they need.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in any way an advocate of our being a rubber stamp or of our doing exactly what our friends in the other body propose. That is why I wished very much, in the month before last, in late May, that we had begun the process so that we would not be here on the eve of the date at which time the Secretary of Defense had indicated we must have this money.

With the action that this institution might consider taking, we are jeopardizing the ability of our men and women in uniform to have exactly what they need now. There is nothing that any of us does in our jobs that is more painful than talking to the family members of those who have lost their lives in Iraq, Afghanistan or in any place in the world.

My friend from Worcester just talked about two of his constituents who died in Afghanistan recently.

□ 1800

We can on a regular basis, Mr. Speaker, talk about these challenges. We want to ensure that we never again have to call and talk to those family members. That is why, as Mr. HOYER said very eloquently in his opening remarks, we want to ensure that we diminish the kind of threat that exists for the United States of America and for our interests around the world. That is the reason that we are there.

Now, the distinguished chair of the Committee on Rules just a little while ago upstairs talked about the fact or

implied in some way that we were imposing democracy on the people of Afghanistan and it is something that they are not really interested in.

Well, the fact of the matter is, our colleague Mr. PRICE and I, along with 18 other Members, have a commission which has expended time, energy, resources and effort in 15 new and re-emerging democracies around the world, working to build their parliaments.

Mr. Speaker, one of our partner nations for the House Democracy Partnership happens to be Afghanistan. And while there have been real difficulties with democracy there, there have been difficulties and a real struggle as they begin to plant the seeds of democracy, we have been working closely with their parliament, and they are enthusiastic about the process of moving ahead and, interestingly enough, modeling themselves after much of what we have here in the House of Representatives. So as we look at where it is that we are headed, we have to ensure that those resources are there. We don't like the fact that we have to do this, but it is essential.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at this rule, the rule is one which is, as I said, very convoluted. We have dealt with war supplementals in the past. My colleague Ms. FOXX upstairs in the Rules Committee talked about the fact that consistently President Obama when he was a candidate indicated that he would not be asking for any war supplementals.

But I will say that when we have considered war supplementals in the past, under the chairmanship of JERRY LEWIS and in the work that we had in the Rules Committee, every single war supplemental that we brought forward came under an open amendment process. That is the way to allow the House to work its will.

Now, we are where we are. We are where we are on the eve of Independence Day and the time when the Secretary of Defense and other military leaders have said it is essential for us to have the resources that are necessary.

So what is it we should be doing? We should defeat this rule. We should defeat this rule, go right back upstairs to the Rules Committee, and come down here with a rule that will allow us to let the House work its will and have an up-or-down vote, an up-or-down vote on whether or not we accept this \$33.5 billion request, along with a few other items that are included in this measure, including funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which, as Mr. HOYER said, is desperately needed. That is included in the measure that came over from the Senate. And we should have an up-or-down vote and see what this House will do.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I believe fully that if we were to have that up-or-down vote, that a bipartisan majority, a bipartisan majority in this

House would in fact vote to complete the work, ensure that our men and women in uniform have all the resources that they need to proceed, and then we will have done our job.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote no on this rule for numerous reasons, the most important of which at this moment is to ensure that our men and women in uniform get what they need as soon as possible.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the \$37 billion in this bill for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. I oppose this war funding, and I believe that our presence in Afghanistan is not strengthening our national security. Instead of spending this money on a war that doesn't make us any safer, I believe we should be reducing the deficit and investing here at home.

After the events of 9/11, the United States went to Afghanistan to capture or kill Osama bin Laden and dismantle al Qaeda, not to occupy the country or to build the Afghan government, a government that has proven time and time again to be one of the most corrupt in the world.

June was the deadliest month for our U.S. military personnel since the war began in 2002. And while the loss of one American servicemember is tragic, the loss of over 1,000 brave Americans for a cause that doesn't make America any safer is something we cannot tolerate.

Military and intelligence officials have said there are now only 50 to 100 al Qaeda operatives in Afghanistan, which begs the question, why do we need over 100,000 troops over there? Does the United States really need 1,000 troops and \$1 billion a year to fight each single member of al Qaeda?

We are pursuing a failed strategy in that country and have somehow confused nation building with fighting the war on terror. We have watched too many times as our colleagues here on the other side of the aisle and in the Senate vote not to extend unemployment benefits or pass funding that would help keep firefighters and teachers on the job because they said we can't afford it. Isn't it time to start asking whether we can really afford a war that costs \$7 billion a month? It is time we really need to support our troops and deploy them from Afghanistan.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to strip out the wasteful and unnecessary funding in this bill. The American people and our brave servicemembers deserve to know our intentions in Afghanistan. That is why we need the administration to develop a timetable for withdrawal immediately.

The American people want us to end this war, and it is time for us to bring our men and women in uniform safely home.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to my friend from Janesville, Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a rule, not a budget, really not a budget enforcement system. We have a rule that will deem to the Appropriations Committee \$1.1 trillion to spend on discretionary spending. This really is an unprecedented occurrence here on the House floor, because what is happening is we are marking a moment for the first time since the budget system was created in 1974 that dictated how Congress does budgets.

For the first time since the 1974 Budget Act, the modern budgeting system in Congress, the House isn't going to do a budget. The House is not going to do a budget. They will call this rule budget enforcement, but all it really is is giving up \$1 trillion to the Appropriations Committee to spend. No budget, no priorities, no restraints, just turn the spending system on.

Now, the majority talks about PAYGO as their budget enforcement. With all due respect, I think PAYGO is a sham, and whenever it is not circumvented, whenever it is actually applied, it is usually used to raise taxes on the American people.

Another problem, Mr. Speaker, is what they are talking about in this rule is that the President's Fiscal Commission will assemble and bring a recommendation in December, and that will serve as our budget this year, or something to that effect. I am a member of the Fiscal Commission. I hope that we actually do come up with some concrete answers and some fiscal steps in the right direction.

But what is the Fiscal Commission? It is a commission appointed by Executive order by the President of the United States. So in effect are we saying that we are going to delegate the legislative branch's authority and responsibility to budget the power of the purse to an executive branch commission? Are we now simply saying that the President will appoint people and they will write the budget? Whatever happened to protecting the separation of powers? Whatever happened to Congress actually doing its job? Whatever happened to actually passing a budget?

So, what we have here is we have a very tough election year, I suppose, and people don't want to do a budget. But they want to spend. So, for the first time, for the first time since the 1974 Budget Act was in place, the House isn't even doing a budget. We are going to spend the money, but we are not going to account for it. We are not going to prioritize.

So when you take a look at the budget we are living under, the one that

passed last year, the first Obama budget, that is the budget that is the incumbent budget. What does that budget do? It doubles our debt in 5 years and triples our debt in 10 years.

Our debt just hit the \$13 trillion mark. We are watching Europe in the throes of a debt crisis because they borrowed too much money, they taxed too much, they slowed down their economies, and now they are in crisis mode. Well, that is exactly what is going to happen here if we don't get our fiscal house in order. That is exactly what the credit markets are going to do to us if we don't show that we are serious about our fiscal responsibilities.

So what is the primary responsibility of the legislative branch of government? Budgeting. And what is this majority doing? They are not budgeting. We are deeming. We are deeming \$1.1 trillion so we can start spending. Not budgeting; spending. No restraints, no priorities. Spending.

Mr. Speaker, I really worry about this. I worry a lot about this, because I worry we are sending all the signals—the wrong signals; the wrong signals to the economy, to businesses, to the credit markets, to entrepreneurs, that the Americans don't have their fiscal house in order, that our government isn't functioning because it is not budgeting. That is a shame.

We should reject this and get on to the business of actually budgeting.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me say when the Democrats were in the minority, we as a party submitted a budget every single year. The Republicans, to my knowledge, have not done that. Mr. RYAN, my colleague and friend on the Budget Committee, did submit a budget under his name, and perhaps if he wants to make that budget in order, I am sure our leadership would love to have a debate on a budget that turns Medicare and Social Security into a voucher system.

But the budget document that the Democrats have put forward would cap discretionary spending at \$1.2 trillion, which is \$7 trillion less than what President Obama proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I rise today in support of the rule and in support of the Lee amendment to responsibly end the war in Afghanistan. There is a real terrorist threat to our country, but that threat does not emanate from Afghanistan. It emanates from al Qaeda, a stateless menace, a menace that will organize and set up wherever we are not.

The ongoing and indefinite occupation in Afghanistan is not a constructive step towards the battle against a terrorist threat to this country. In fact, through the civilian casualties, we only increase the pool of potential terrorists every day that we continue this occupation.

I strongly support this concept of allowing our funds only to be used for the orderly withdrawal of American troops from the country of Afghanistan.

The mission, the challenge we have put before our men and women, is nearly a difficult and impossible challenge: To try to build a cohesive nation state out of a tribal nation, out of dealing with people in our own employ who are of dubious moral character and continue to engage in the opium and drug trade to finance their related activities.

There is a difference between the ongoing battles and insurgency in Afghanistan and the terrorist threat to this Nation. We should spare no expense in going after terrorists wherever they are, engaging in aggressive intelligence-gathering operations and taking out the ability of terrorists to train. But the ongoing occupation of Afghanistan is not a constructive step to that end.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1½ minutes.

Mr. POLIS. I rise today in support of the rule and in opposition to the Obey amendment.

Funding for teachers and for education is my top priority here as a Member of Congress. I am a cosponsor of a bill to provide \$23 billion in funding for teachers.

□ 1815

It breaks my heart that we're only talking about \$10 billion today. But what is critical to achieve success—to find \$10 billion, to find \$23 billion—is keeping those who advocate resources on the same page as those who advocate reform. Resources and reform. That is the promise of the Obama administration. That is the platform that I ran on. That is what will transform millions of American lives to help break the vicious cycle of poverty that holds too many families as slaves and replace it with the virtuous cycle of opportunity and hope. Programs like Race to the Top, programs like funding innovative new charter schools, programs like innovative ways to fund teacher salaries. These are the programs that are being cut by this proposed amendment.

I hope that the Secretary continues to work with us here in Congress to find ways to pay for teachers' salaries, but we need to do so in a way that doesn't have the threat of a Presidential veto and can garner strong support in this body.

Funding teacher salaries is my top priority, and I would vote for anything to do that. I don't feel that going after the reform aspects of the President's education budget is a constructive way to build a majority to be able to fund teacher salaries. So I hope that we will continue that important work. And I personally will be voting against the Obey amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Santa Clarita, California (Mr. McKEON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Rules Committee ranking member, Mr. DREIER, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader pointed out that all of us are going to have a chance to express our views. Some different views have been expressed here this morning. But the way our system works after all of our views are expressed, we have a Commander in Chief. The Commander in Chief last year took 90 days to thoroughly study the effort in Afghanistan. He made a decision. The decision was that we carry a counterinsurgency war to make our security safe so that al Qaeda and the Taliban cannot have a safe haven from which they could continue to launch attacks on us. In carrying out that strategy, he placed General McChrystal in charge of the troops and he approved 30,000 additional troops for the area. He also requested that we send an additional \$33 billion to support those troops.

Now we know about the tragedy with General McChrystal. We know that his resignation was accepted. We know that the President nominated General Petraeus to take his place. General Petraeus appeared before the Senate last week and again reiterated the need for this money, as Secretary Gates had the week before. He said that if we didn't get this money, we had to start doing stupid things. General Petraeus was unanimously confirmed by the Senate. He is on his way right now to Kabul to take over this command. And we're here debating a rule that will delay further the money that those troops need over there.

Sunday is the Fourth of July. George Washington on the 9th of July in 1776 was so impressed by that Declaration of Independence that he had all of the Continental Army come to ranks and have that document read to them. We're going to be reminded again of that Sunday, and how important it is for us to follow our Commander in Chief and to give our troops the things they need.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. McKEON. The letters that General Washington wrote to the Congress, I wish we could have him here now and see the letter that he would probably send us, accusing us of dithering while the troops are out there putting their lives on the line.

I ask that we defeat this rule. It doesn't have to be that complicated. We can defeat this rule and this afternoon turn it right around, pass the bill that the Senate already passed, and

have the money on the way to the troops next week. I ask my colleagues to please join me in defeating this rule and moving forward in that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and pursuant to it will vote in strong support of the domestic funding portion of the supplemental appropriation, but in reluctant acceptance of the war funding, which appropriates some \$37 billion to our efforts in Afghanistan, most of it going to the troop surge that President Obama announced in December of last year.

Concern about the well-being of our troops makes it difficult to vote against supplemental war funding once the troops that funding is meant to support have already been deployed. While a "no" vote on the war supplemental has some appeal as a way of forcing reevaluation of our current strategy, denying those funds could jeopardize the safety of our troops. For me, that leaves little real choice in the matter.

However, that does not mean I am ready to acquiesce in a policy that appears increasingly open-ended, while its cost in lives and resources continues to mount. I am highly skeptical that an extra year and 30,000 additional troops will bring stability and effective governance in a country that for 30 years has seen nothing but conflict and for centuries has been known as the graveyard of empires. It is hard to imagine that the Karzai government will rid itself of corruption and become a reliable partner or that the Afghan forces will acquire a sustainable level of competency any time soon. The elusive "turning point" our policy seeks to achieve seems ever farther away.

Through it all, wear and tear on our troops has been unrelenting. More than a thousand Americans have lost their lives in Afghanistan and 6,500 have been wounded in action. The toll of multiple tours and unconventional combat has placed terrible stress on our soldiers, resulting in a near epidemic of suicides among returning veterans. When the burdens on our troops is this heavy, our policymakers must bear a commensurate burden of proof to show that the sacrifice is in our national interest and that the mission is meeting with success. In my view, this burden of proof is not being met. For that reason, I believe we should stick to the plan of bringing our troops home and beginning that withdrawal no later than July of 2011.

That is why I will support the McGovern-Obey amendment that reaffirms the President's timeline for withdrawal. The McGovern-Obey amendment requires the President to submit a detailed plan for the safe, orderly, and expeditious redeployment of U.S. troops from Afghanistan, including a timeline for completion of that redeployment.

I am determined to fight terrorism. I wish I were confident that our current strategy in Afghanistan was having the net effect of advancing that goal. But I am not. I worry instead that as this 9-year war drags on and on, it is bogging us down, sapping our strength, and distracting us from other, more effective strategies for combating the terrorist threat in that region and elsewhere in the world.

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I will support our troops in this supplemental but I will also continue to press for their withdrawal from Afghanistan and for a meaningful discussion of exactly how that can be accomplished in accordance with the timeline originally set by the President.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from West Chester, Ohio, the very distinguished Republican Leader, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. I want to thank my colleague for yielding and say to my colleagues that the President, on February 1, sent up a supplemental spending request to fund our activities for our troops and the State Department in Afghanistan. For 5 months, this Chamber has wallowed around trying to find a way to bring this bill to the floor. And look how we've done it.

We have a rule that provides for the consideration of the supplemental that self-executes a lot of wasteful spending here in Washington right into the rule itself. But if that isn't bad enough, there are four amendments made in order. If any of those amendments were to fail, it's as if the House has not even considered the bill. It's as though this debate that we're having right now had never even happened.

How could such a rule providing for the consideration of an important supplemental spending bill have in there this escape clause that if we don't get our way on all of these amendments, then this really didn't happen? This is supposed to be the greatest legislative body in the history of the world and we're treating it like a bunch of kids in a sandbox. I, frankly, think it's disgraceful.

Beyond what the rule does in terms of the consideration of the bill, it also deems the appropriation process to begin. And it outlines a number. We've tried for several months to pass a budget here in the House. But the budget resolution never reached the floor. There was never a debate and never an effort to actually come to grips with a fiscal crisis that's facing our country. And yet what are we going to do? We're going to authorize over a trillion dollars worth of new spending. No debate how to save money, no debate about the crisis that we're facing. We're just going to keep the spending spree alive.

This scheme-and-deem process that's included in this rule should be another

reason that Members ought to think twice before they vote for this budget and vote for this rule. But I've got to tell you the worst thing that's going on here is that the Secretary of Defense has asked for this money prior to July 4th because our troops in Afghanistan need the resources in order to succeed in their mission. Not only are we trying to pile all of this new spending on the backs of our troops, the fact is that if this rule were to pass, it guarantees that this bill will not get to the President before July 4th. If this rule passes, which self-executes all of this extra spending into it, it will automatically have to go to the United States Senate, where how long it will be there, who knows. But all I can say is that the troops that are out there fighting for the defense of our country, trying to preserve the security for our country for today and tomorrow, are going to be left wanting because of the political chicanery that's going on here in this House. I think this is disgraceful. I really do.

I promised the President 2 months ago that if they brought a clean supplemental spending bill to the floor of the House, I and my Republican colleagues would be there to help the President pass it. He heard me loud and clear. He looked at the Senate Republican leader and said, Well, what do you think about this? He said, I'm with BOEHNER.

We promised the President we would help pass this bill. But, no, there was never any reaching out, never any working together to try to make sure that our troops had what they needed in a timely fashion. No, the only way we can bring this bill up was to load it up with tens of billions of dollars of new spending—just more stimulus spending that hasn't worked over the last year and a half, and this additional spending is just going to be thrown on the backs of our kids and grandkids.

Mr. Speaker, I think our colleagues tonight should do the right thing. I think they should stand up and say "no" to this rule. Let's say "yes" to a fairer process and to a process that will get our troops the funds that they need in a timely fashion, which is now. If we defeat this rule, you can bet that the supplemental spending bill, without all these other add-ons, will be on the floor of this house. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I and my Republican colleagues will gladly vote for a clean supplemental to support our troops.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, since the distinguished minority leader raised the issue of our commitment to our troops, I should point out for the record that when we debated and voted on the defense authorization bill only a few weeks ago, only nine Republicans voted for that bill. Because they thought the issue of gays in the military was more important than supporting our troops and their families.

At this point I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.



Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the base text of funding the war originated in the Senate and that article I, section 7 of the Constitution says: all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

Now, one of General McChrystal's top aides was quoted as saying, "If Americans started paying attention to this war, it would become even less popular." The question is, when will Congress finally begin paying attention to this war, which is being waged with our consent; when will Congress realize that we've lost more than 1,200 troops too many; that we've spent \$300 billion too much; that the deaths of our brave soldiers cannot be justified, that their service is sacred but the mission is not; that the death of every innocent Afghan citizen is a blot on our national conscience.

When will Congress cut off funding? When will the requirements of our failing domestic economy of unemployment, factory closings, business failures, foreclosures, loss of savings, bankruptcies, failing infrastructure, and failing energy policy cause us to look homeward?

□ 1830

Or should we cut social and economic programs to balance the budget to pay for the war?

We went to war in Iraq based on lies. More than 1 million innocent Iraqis have died. We've lost more than 4,000 of our troops. The long-term cost will be close to \$3 trillion.

Our presence in Afghanistan is an unmitigated disaster. The war is a cesspool of corruption. Billions in U.S. taxpayer dollars are being stuffed into suitcases and flown out of Kabul. The counterinsurgency strategy is a failure. U.S. tax dollars are going to support warlords who end up shooting at our troops. Security contractors bribe insurgents to shoot at our troops to demonstrate the U.S. needs more security services. Professional killers from Blackwater are now contracted to guard our embassy in Afghanistan. Drug production has skyrocketed during the U.S. occupation. U.S. tax dollars are going to build villas in Dubai, and our country is falling apart with a failing economy.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 15 minutes left, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 17 minutes left.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, with that, I am happy to yield 3½ minutes to my very good friend from Urbana, Illinois (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I stand in opposition to this rule and in sincere but deep opposition to this \$63 billion massive spending bill, and particularly the war spending component of the bill.

I speak, I believe, on the behalf of the hundreds of thousands of brave men

and women who serve America in the Middle East with neither a defined objective nor the ability to assess victory or defeat; and on behalf of families of our military personnel around the world who have lost their fathers or their mothers or their sons or their daughters in a valiant but shortsighted effort and battle that can never be won; and on behalf of the American taxpayers who have seen more than \$1 trillion poured into an attempt to fight terror, where there is not even a remote relationship to the welfare of the American people; and really, also, on behalf of the innocent children who have had the misfortune to simply be in the ever-changing line of fire and the vicinity of terrorists who move effortlessly from Iraq to Somalia to Yemen to Paraguay to Afghanistan like the Whack-a-Mole at the county fair in the form of unconventional and ill-defined tribal warfare that 2,000 years have taught us we simply cannot fight.

I think it was November of 1952, when I was about 6 years old, that Charles Schultz and his Peanuts comic strip came out with the annual saga where, every year, Charlie Brown comes up to the football, and Lucy tells Charlie Brown year after year, "Just one more time we'll let you kick ball." And each year, she pulled the football out, only to find Charlie Brown on his rear end.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in this somewhat stretched analogy, that a series of Commanders-in-Chief are Lucy, and we're Charlie Brown, and the football is the illusive promise of a goal that we simply cannot reach. We cannot force a culture to accept our values, and we cannot impose Western democracy on a people who don't understand or accept it and whose leadership is corrupt and antidemocratic beyond repair. And we cannot continue to spend the billions and, arguably, trillions of dollars of the hardworking men and women in this country in a venture that has no objective, no end game, and no proximate connection to the well-being of our Nation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we cannot afford economically, we cannot afford militarily, and we cannot afford as a people to pass this bill. This President who, frankly, won an election based on his strong antiwar message, like many of his predecessors, asked us one more time to spend a few more billion dollars—in this case \$38 billion—a few thousand more men and women in an effort to kick the football just one more time. It simply isn't doable.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this rule underlies a bill that the vast majority, I believe, of the American people don't want. I represent a district in central Illinois, and I think I speak in many ways for middle America. I voted for the authorization of force in Iraq and, frankly, Afghanistan; and I believe, like many of us, I may have questioned

my vote. But I believe that we're the greatest nation on Earth, thanks in large part to the generations of fighting men and women who have given their lives to this great cause and democracy and this great Nation of ours.

As we prepare to celebrate our independence in a few days, I think I speak on behalf of the average American citizen who says, For what? What is this money being expended for? Why are we doing it? And what's the end game? And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there is no end game, and I would respectfully ask that this rule and the underlying bill be defeated.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will have an opportunity to do something we have not been able to do, and that is to debate the Afghan war and the direction that this war is taking and the impact on our men and women on the front lines. I particularly want to say to the families how much we appreciate the sacrifice that you've made as these men and women stand on the front lines of Afghanistan. But I think we're long overdue for a major debate that has to do with that direction.

I support this underlying rule for the purpose of allowing us to have this debate, but also that it provides, on the domestic spending, crucial issues.

Pell Grants will be provided for in \$4.95 billion; border security that impacts the northern and southern border so that we can stand as we do comprehensive immigration reform and assure the American people that we will secure our boarders.

In the most catastrophic oil spill from the region that I come, the tsunami of oil spills, we are taking care of the people by providing \$304 million for the gulf coast oil spill, including monies for unemployment assistance.

Then, coming from the region I belong to, as well, we had a tragedy at Fort Hood, and we are now rebuilding the Fort Hood processing center that saw a terrible loss of life because of terrorism.

FEMA disaster. This is the most vigorous season that you could have ever imagined that is to be expected in hurricanes, and we know, among other disasters, we'll have the money here.

But we're also going to say to the youth of America when we vote on this, we're providing money for summer youth jobs, \$1 billion in youth jobs that we in the Congressional Black Caucus—and many Members joined us—are fighting for. This is a crucial step forward. We're providing for black farmers who have been discriminated against over the years.

And then, as I have indicated, we will have an opportunity to question not the men and women in Afghanistan or Iraq, but to question whether or not it is wise to focus on insurgents versus terrorists so that we send men and

women into harm's way without a discerning goal.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

I will tell you, ladies and gentlemen, when you begin to fight those who are classified as your neighbors—and I don't use that term loosely. The Taliban live in Afghanistan. And whenever you determine to fight those individuals, it makes it very difficult to win this war.

Mr. CULBERSON. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. The gentleman has his own time. I appreciate it. I am concluding.

And finally, let me say that I offered an amendment to maintain NASA human space exploration and the funding as it was. I look forward to working with this Congress and the Democrats to make sure that happens.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Houston wouldn't yield; so I will yield 30 seconds to my other friend from Houston, Mr. CULBERSON.

Mr. CULBERSON. And with my 30 seconds, I invite Ms. JACKSON LEE to refer to page 14 of this bill. She may not be aware that this legislation gives control over Texas' education funding to the Federal Government and, in fact, will force tax increases and spending increases in Texas, and that this has never been done before for any State in the Union. And I want to make sure that she is aware of this provision that says that Texas cannot spend any less money on education than we are spending in the fiscal year 2011, which is going to include some stimulus money and result in tax increases for Texas, giving the Federal Government control over Texas' education spending. Was she aware of that?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

And let me publicly apologize to the gentleman. I was rushing. I wanted to make sure I mentioned NASA. But let me say that, yes, I am aware, and I am enthusiastic about that language. And I thank the leadership for it because, in fact, it is celebrated and supported by 40-plus school districts in Texas to prevent the Governor of the State of Texas from misusing education dollars, as they have been misused before. This is money that will be effectively used for the schoolchildren of the State of Texas. And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to yield an additional 15 seconds to my friend from Houston if she might yield to our other friend from Houston, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Is my colleague from Texas aware that this provision strips the Texas Legislature and the people of Texas of the power to make decisions at the State level?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, what I'm aware of is that this language is supported by at least 40 school districts that support the money being able to come directly to them or not being used if it is not used for education. Additionally, this language only includes education funding not stimulus dollars. So it will not artificially increase any costs to the taxpayers. The school districts will benefit from the Governor having to use federal education dollars for education.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me remind my friends that we are in the midst of a debate on the war supplemental.

At this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Howard, Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

We are supposed to be dealing with emergency spending. So I ask, what is the emergency in section 4172? That section strips my district of an Appalachian Development Highway System designation. I found out about this 24 hours ago. This designation is a connection between Philipsburg, Pennsylvania, and Interstate 80 in Clearville, Pennsylvania. This highway stretch has been codified in law for over 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is hardly an emergency situation. The situation with my district and this mysterious section 4172 is a clear indication of what is wrong with this rule and the breakdown in the process here in this House. It appears that "emergency" now just translates to a "backroom deal."

I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9¾ minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 14 minutes.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of the rule. A lot of people have put in a lot of work to organize this supplemental in ways that many of us would have the opportunity to support.

I am focused on several aspects, but I am particularly focused on the amendment that will be brought before us by BARBARA LEE. BARBARA LEE has an amendment that basically would strip the funding that is dedicated to the war in Afghanistan and redirect those funds so that we can safely withdraw from an Army that has less and less support of the American people.

And while I will not get into details about my support for that amendment

at this time—I will be speaking on it later—I wish to congratulate the leadership and our Rules Committee members for the hard work that they have put in in organizing the rule on the supplemental. It has not been easy. There are a lot of concerns. There are a lot of demands. We have a lot of needs that need to be addressed.

So while we are wrestling with addressing the needs of our domestic community and our domestic concerns, we still have to be concerned about the direction that the war is taking and what that means for the future of this country. While we are bogged down in a serious deficit, the moneys that we are spending on this war must be reconsidered in ways that will eventually wind this war down and give us an opportunity to focus on our domestic needs.

□ 1845

So I would ask my colleagues to support the rule on this supplemental.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), a tireless worker on the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, President Obama promised over and over during his Presidential campaign that he would end the practice of funding the wars with supplemental funding, as we are about to do today.

Then in February of 2009, during his first address to Congress, he said, "For 7 years we have been a Nation at war. No longer will we hide its price."

In other words, no more supplemental war funding bills.

Okay, fair enough.

Then in April 2009 President Obama requested \$83 billion in additional funding for the wars, saying, "This is the last planned war supplemental," in a letter to House Speaker PELOSI. He called for "an honest, more accurate and fiscally responsible estimate of Federal spending" after years of "budget gimmicks and wasteful spending."

Now his administration is requesting a \$33 billion war funding supplemental bill and calling its passage essential.

What gives? Is this a budget gimmick, or is it essential spending?

Mr. Speaker, this administration can't have it both ways. We need to provide funding for our troops, and we need to do it expeditiously and without billions of pork.

Unfortunately, because of the hypocrisy of this administration on this issue, we're faced today with a supplemental funding bill that is stuffed with unrelated spending that breaks another of the President's promises.

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

I actually agree with the gentlelady in my disappointment that the President has decided to submit a supplemental bill to fund this war in Afghanistan. But I think it is not—it is a little bit, well, unfair for her to criticize President Obama when President Bush



did this routinely. And we have spent over \$1 trillion, \$1 trillion on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. And the vast majority of that money is not paid for. It's all borrowed. We're not paying for it. Our kids will pay for it and our grandkids and our great grandkids.

And, you know, so I find it also a little bit puzzling that we're having this, we had this debate earlier today over the extension of unemployment benefits for the millions of people who are unemployed in this country due to this terrible economy. And my friends on the other side of the aisle said, well, we can't afford it. We can't afford to pay for it so we're going to deny these citizens who have fallen on hard times the ability to get unemployment compensation.

Yet, when it comes to funneling money to the corrupt Karzai regime, we're a bottomless pit. So I think all of us, Republicans and Democrats, need to come together and figure out how to get this right.

And I hope that the gentlelady will join with me and my colleague, DAVE OBEY, in supporting our amendment asking for the President to develop a plan consistent with his statement that we will begin the withdrawal of our forces in July of 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule so that we can get on to discussing an extremely important matter, not only the domestic issues that will be included in this piece of legislation which are absolutely essential. We do need to educate our kids. We do need to provide for critical domestic policies.

I also want to get to the issue of the war, particularly the war in Afghanistan, of which there will be some \$30 billion allocated for that war. I strongly oppose that appropriation.

The Lee amendments, the McGovern amendments, the Obey amendments all come to grips with that and, in various ways, will cause us to get out of that war.

We have to focus laser beam-like on al Qaeda, but that doesn't mean that we have to engage in a counterinsurgency program in Afghanistan.

\$30 billion. The Pentagon estimates that it's \$875,000 per soldier in Afghanistan. Roughly \$87,000 is enough for a well-paid teacher in America. That translates to 300,000 teachers. If we took that \$30 billion and used it in America, we could employ 300,000 teachers.

We have to have a strong economy. We know that economy is in desperate need of a well-educated workforce. Better to spend the money here at home. Better to focus laser beam-like on al Qaeda wherever it may be in this world, whether it's in Aden, whether it is in Saudi Arabia or whether Sudan or Afghanistan and Pakistan, but not engage in a terribly expensive counterinsurgency program in Afghanistan.

Some of us were around for the Vietnam War. And what this sounds like is another Vietnam, a quagmire in which we will ultimately extract ourselves with extraordinary loss of life and treasure. It's time to stop it right now. So I ask for an "aye" vote on the rule and support for the two amendments that we'll be dealing with.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Lake Jackson, Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. It's been described rather vividly on this side of the aisle how messy this process is, so I strongly oppose this.

Of course, I also strongly oppose the funding, especially for the funding for the war. This is a war that I've objected to for a very long time. This war is going badly. It's not a declared war. We don't have a precise enemy. The Taliban is the spoken enemy, and yet the Taliban are individuals who have never committed terrorism outside their homeland. The Taliban is an outgrowth of the mujahadin, who we were at one time allies with, along with Osama bin Laden. So it isn't a very neat little war.

Here we are, we are the most powerful Nation in the world, the most powerful army ever organized in the history of the world. And yet we are fighting a war that essentially is not a war. We're fighting a war against individuals that have no tanks, no planes, no ships, no modern technology; and we're not doing well. There's something wrong. If it were truly a war, a declared war and we knew who the enemy was, the war would be over.

The fact that the war is not over after 9 years, it's draining us, it's draining us of life and limb, it's draining us of funding. The wars in the Middle East have drained trillions of dollars, and we are suffering from a severe problem, a financial crisis here at home. So it's time that we start looking abroad and looking at what we're trying to maintain. We're in over 130 countries, 900 bases. It's unsustainable.

It was brought to attention this past week that we were having problems. If we were doing well in Afghanistan, we wouldn't be firing our generals. We want to put the blame on the generals. If we change the generals, everything is going to be okay.

But our generals are trained to fight wars. They're not trained to be nation builders and social workers and policemen. So this is a war that I see is going to be very difficult, if not impossible, to win until we change our policy.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Houston, Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), a hardworking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the bedrock principles upon which

this government was created was to provide for the common defense. Yet this Democrat majority was asked 5 months ago by the President to provide funding for the war.

It's been 35 days since the United States Senate passed a straightforward, simple funding bill for the war, which all of us on the Republican side would have voted for without objection to support our men and women in the field. Yet today we've only got 90 minutes of debate for it.

The United States, the public, the American people have only seen this bill since 11 this morning.

I serve on the Appropriations Committee, none of the Republican members of this committee, none of the Republican staff members were included in the drafting of this bill. The United States of America, particularly our troops in the field, deserve far better than this.

Is it any wonder that the public does not trust the government? Is it any wonder a tsunami is building that will sweep out this liberal majority in November and elect a constitutional conservative majority committed to fiscal responsibility, committed to preservation of our Constitution, committed to preservation of the States' rights to control something as fundamental as education spending?

On Page 14 of this bill, which no one saw until 11 today, the State of Texas is stripped of its sovereign authority to control education spending. It's given—for the first time in this Nation's history, control over education spending in a sovereign State of the Union is given to the Federal Government by an amendment no one saw until 11 today, that the liberal majority is prepared to vote for, which will result in the destruction of the 10th Amendment sovereign power of the people of Texas, in big tax increases and spending increases, because this language says we can't spend any less than was spent in 2011, an artificially high number that will include "spendulus" money, leading to property tax increases, statewide tax increases in Texas.

Why aren't we simply funding our troops in the field?

This is why you'll lose the majority in November.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues here that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, with the exception of only nine, voted against the Defense authorization bill just a few weeks ago, a bill that provided a great deal of support for our troops and their families. Why did they vote against it? They voted against it because they were preoccupied with the social issue of gay marriage. Where were they then when it came to supporting our troops and supporting their families?

My friend talks about all of the great crises that we're facing, but much of the crises that we're facing are as a result of some of the actions that my

friends on the other side of the aisle took: two wars on borrowed money; on top of that, tax cuts for the rich on borrowed money.

And now we have an economy that the President has inherited that we're trying to dig ourselves out of, and we're going to do that. But I think it's important to keep some of this in perspective.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we all hate the fact that we have to deal with this war on terror. September 11, 2001, changed the lives of every single one of us. And it is painful and, as I said earlier, the most difficult part of our job is to call the families of loved ones who've paid the price in Afghanistan, Iraq or any other spot in the world. And we all hope and pray that we never, ever have to do it again.

We also recognize that we have to come together and ensure that our men and women in uniform who are on the front line in this battle against radical extremism have what they need.

Now, the American people are sick and tired of wasteful Federal spending. But the American people also understand, Mr. Speaker, that the five most important words in the middle of the preamble of the United States Constitution are, in fact, "provide for the common defense."

Virtually everything else that we do, other than our Nation's security, can be handled by individuals, by families, by churches and synagogues and mosques, by counties, by cities, by States. But our national security can only be handled by the Federal Government.

Now, the President of the United States has just issued what we refer to by the acronym a SAP around here. It's a Statement of Administration Policy. And while we sit here having a debate, which I think is very important for us to have, the President has said that if we don't provide him a clean bill that is independent of all these other extraneous matters—and by the way, if they all don't pass, this bill just dies and we have to start over again—he will veto it.

And so it is fascinating. We, as Republicans, and many thoughtful Democrats, have stepped up to the plate and said that we will join with the President to ensure that that \$33.5 billion that is needed is there for our men and women in uniform.

□ 1900

We've heard from the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, who talked about the fact that just this week General David Petraeus, Secretary Gates, and others have said we must have this funding by July 4. This is Thursday evening, July 1. The request was made in February. The Senate passed, by a 67–28 vote on May 27, this bill, and here we are just 3 days before this time by which the

Secretary has said they need these resources.

And what is it we're doing? We're adding spending, we're shifting some 10-mile stretch in Pennsylvania from one district to another. What does that have to do with an emergency supplemental? And we're increasing spending when the American people have said we need to bring about responsible spending cuts.

We can do better, Mr. Speaker. We can do better. We can immediately, after defeating this rule, go upstairs and bring down a rule that will allow us to let Members of Congress who are opposed to providing that \$33.5 billion the opportunity to vote "no," and those of us who want to provide those resources for the troops to vote "yes."

And so, Mr. Speaker, let's vote "no" on this rule. Let's move ahead right now. Let's do what we can to bring this war to an end so that our men and women can come home just as quickly as possible. And the best way to do that is to ensure that they have what it takes so that they can be successful.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very, very strong support of this rule, and I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this rule. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this rule makes in order an amendment offered by myself, Mr. OBEY and Mr. JONES of North Carolina to require a meaningful exit strategy from Afghanistan.

As we are being asked to consider tens of billions of dollars in supplemental funding for the war, I believe that now is the time for us to ask tough questions and demand straight answers. Of all the problems that President Obama inherited from the Bush administration, Afghanistan is the one that keeps getting more and more complicated.

In just the past few weeks, two brave young soldiers from Fall River, Massachusetts, in my district, lost their lives in Afghanistan. So this is a big deal, and we need to get it right.

Last December, President Obama told the American people that we would begin to withdraw our forces next July. The American people deserve to know if that plan is still in place and how we're going to get there.

Much has been made about General Stanley McChrystal's comments in *Rolling Stone* magazine about the Nation's civilian leadership. But there are other parts of that article that I find to be much more disturbing. General McChrystal's chief of operations said that Afghanistan, and I quote, "is not going to look like a win, smell like a win, or taste like a win. This is going to end in an argument."

A senior adviser to General McChrystal said, and I quote again, "If Americans pulled back and started paying attention to this war, it would become even less popular." A senior military official said this, and I quote again, "There's a possibility we could

ask for another surge of U.S. forces next summer if we see success here."

Mr. Speaker, I voted in 2001 to go to war in Afghanistan, to hunt down al Qaeda, and to eliminate their threat. And I would cast that same vote today in a heartbeat. But what we are doing in Afghanistan today is far beyond that original authorization. We are engaged in extensive, expensive nation building in Afghanistan. And frankly, given the level of unemployment and the severe economic situation we face in the United States, I would rather do a little bit more nation building here at home.

Some in this body have refused to support extending unemployment benefits for out-of-work Americans because they say we cannot afford it. We are told we can't afford to help States avoid laying off teachers. We're told we can't afford to improve our roads and our bridges or help more families afford a college education. We are told we can't afford to prevent foreclosures or to improve child nutrition, and now we are being asked to borrow another \$33 billion for nation building in Afghanistan?

We don't have the money to help American working families. But when it comes to supporting a corrupt and incompetent Karzai government, we are supposed to be a bottomless pit. You know, we talk a lot about the deficit around here. We have borrowed \$350 billion, added to the debt, not paid for, for the war in Afghanistan. How are we supposed to address the deficit if we don't know how many more billions of dollars we are going to be spending in Afghanistan?

My colleagues, we all have a responsibility here. It's not just the President's war. It's our war, too, like it or not. We voted to send our sons and daughters to war. We voted repeatedly to send money to support this war. We have a responsibility to ask the tough questions and to do the right thing. So I urge all my colleagues to think long and hard today about this critical issue. It is time for Congress to step up to the plate and do its duty.

I hope my colleagues will support the Lee amendment. I hope they will support the McGovern-Obey-Jones amendment. And I hope they will support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the budget enforcement resolution for fiscal year 2011, contained in this rule. This resolution sets an overall limit of \$1.121 trillion on discretionary spending in next year's appropriations bills. This limit is well below the comparable request made by the President for FY 2011 and \$3 billion below the resolution approved by the Senate Budget Committee.

One of the chief functions of a budget resolution is to cap the level of discretionary spending for the forthcoming fiscal year. This resolution serves that purpose, and permits the Appropriations Committee to move forward with appropriation bills for fiscal year 2011.

The "Pay-As-You-Go" rule, PAYGO, passed previously, bars increases in mandatory

spending and decreases in revenues, unless offset, so that they do not add to the budget deficit. The current PAYGO system requires that the authorizing committees meet the deficit-neutrality test for four time periods: two for the House PAYGO rule and two for statutory PAYGO. This resolution would align these time windows so that the requirements for complying with House PAYGO and statutory PAYGO would be the same, and makes other synchronizing changes—thus facilitating the consideration of deficit-neutral bills.

While this resolution does not project the budget out over five years, it does look to the future by assuring that the House will have an opportunity to vote this year on longer-term budget proposals made by the President's Fiscal Commission and approved by the Senate. This resolution also sets an out-year goal for the budget: a budget in primary balance (excluding net interest costs) in 2015.

The budget enforcement resolution reinforces the Commission's goal of lowering the deficit to sustainable levels, and as mentioned, reaffirms the House leadership's commitment to bring to a vote any of the Commission's recommendations passed by the Senate.

In addition, this resolution—  
instructs House committee chairs to submit recommendations for eliminating wasteful spending in their committee jurisdiction; and  
accommodates additional program integrity funds of \$538 million in 2010 to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse in the federal budget.

When all of these elements are brought together, they form a complete substitute, the functional equivalent of a budget resolution.

The budget enforcement resolution limits discretionary spending, while the PAYGO rules limit mandatory spending and revenue reductions. These are disciplines for the short run, while the Fiscal Commission works out recommendations for the longer run.

The budget enforcement resolution is another of many steps Democrats in the 111th Congress have taken to enforce fiscal responsibility, such as enacting statutory PAYGO; reforming defense acquisition; and insisting, successfully, that health care reform not add to the deficit.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come before you today in support of H. Res. 1500, a rule providing for H.R. 4899, the "Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2010"—a bill that will help create jobs for Americans and provide assistance in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Haiti.

I want to thank Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS for their leadership on this timely legislation. Clearly, this is an important bill and must be only amended with items that are essential to provide the necessary assistance this country so greatly needs.

H.R. 4899 will provide funding for the needs of the American people, from national security, housing, employment, health, to education. I fully support these efforts and want to stress that we must continue to provide policies and funding that ensure that the United States remains a global leader in science and technology, including space exploration, which not only results in knowledge-building, but also in hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout the nation.

Mr. Speaker, this supplemental appropriation is quite different from any other supplemental appropriation that members of this body will ever consider. This supplemental ap-

propriations bill provides over \$37.47 billion to support our troops, over \$24 billion to keep teachers, firefighters and law enforcement personnel on the job while states continue to recover from the recession; over \$13 billion for Vietnam veterans and survivors exposed to Agent Orange; \$5.7 billion for PELL; \$2.8 billion for Haiti; \$677 million border security; \$275 million for the Gulf Coast oil spill including unemployment benefits program and unemployment assistance related to the oil spill and an oil spill relief employment program that are underway for the self-employed businessman and women who were greatly impacted by the Gulf Coast oil spill.

No price is too great to pay, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to doing what is necessary to aid our country. This bill must only be amended with key items that are critical to adequately address this nation's needs. I am therefore, offering several amendments to H.R. 4899.

#### GULF OIL SPILL AMENDMENT

I am offering an amendment that would require the President to appoint a research and development team to review and recommend new technologies to prevent oil spills.

The response to the Deepwater Horizon explosion and spill highlights an unfortunate deficiency in our national infrastructure. Many people have criticized the administration's response, and seeming willingness to put those responsible for the mess in charge of the cleanup. However, the sad fact is that the administration and Coast Guard had to let the oil industry take a larger role in leading the cleanup than any of us would like.

The problem is that the government does not have the tools necessary to take full charge in a disaster like this. The oil industry does. It is industry that has the equipment necessary to drill deep, deep below the surface of the ocean. The Federal government has the best in technology in many areas, but not in this one.

But as the events of the past two months have shown, the Federal government needs those tools. Where the industry cannot or will not do what is necessary to react quickly to incidents of their own creation, the government must. And where the government has responsibility, it must have the tools and technology to act effectively.

#### GULF OIL SPILL AMENDMENT

I am offering an additional amendment, for a team of experts. Leaders from academia, research, government agencies, and even the oil industry can review and recommend new technology that the government can use to prevent and clean up spills, particularly in deep water, to prevent them from doing nearly irreparable harm to our economy and our environment.

My amendment would require the President to appoint an emergency oil spill coordination team to respond to oil spills in this country.

One of the most disturbing questions raised in the public's mind as they watched the disaster in the Gulf of Mexico unfold is "Who is in charge?" For weeks it seemed as if there was no clear answer. For too long, it seemed that BP, the entity responsible for the explosion and oil slick, was in charge of the cleanup. This did nothing but diminish public confidence in the response.

Now, of course, we know who is in charge, and Admiral Allen is doing an admirable job. But it is extremely important that we establish,

ahead of time, a clear and definite answer to the question of who is in charge. My Amendment will require the President to appoint an emergency oil spill coordination team in case a tragedy like this ever occurs again. The team shall consist of the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Interior, and chief of the Army Corps of Engineers, the leaders of the agencies most involved in tasks of this nature. The President shall also establish a clear chain of command and decision making from this team.

We hope that an incident like this, a man made disaster of this magnitude, will never, ever happen again. But in the event that it does, we need to know who is in charge of the response, with no period of unnecessary uncertainty.

#### BORDER SECURITY

"To provide \$100 million to hire special agents and investigators at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to help investigate and track illegal firearms and help prevent the flow of weapons across Border States."

My amendment will provide \$100 million to hire special agents and investigators at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to help investigate and track illegal firearms and help prevent the flow of weapons across Border States.

The United States continues to fight the battle against the powerful drug trafficking organizations that have plagued our sister cities just across the border with violence. We have been fortunate thus far that for the most part the violence has not spilled over into the United States, but we cannot depend on being insulated forever. Instability abroad is a danger to stability at home, and we have a vested interest in helping our neighbors to the south wrest power away from the criminal organizations that have threatened the safety of their citizens, and brought drugs into our country.

One of the ways we can help them is by stemming the illegal flow of weapons across our Border States and into Mexico. I fully support the Second Amendment enshrined in our Constitution, but I do not believe we can continue to allow criminals to buy semiautomatic and assault weapons and other arms in the United States, only to use them to kill, maim, corrupt and wreak havoc on the safety and security of our Mexican neighbors. It hurts them and it hurts us. We must do everything we can to stop this illegal arms traffic.

Fortunately, in stopping this illegal traffic we can also strengthen our own safety and security in the United States. State and local law enforcement officials and experts in academia have suggested that a much needed increase in resources to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives will increase our ability to monitor and track arms sales within the United States, helping us to prevent the illegal flow of weapons south of the border into Mexico.

By increasing the investigative capacity and manpower of this agency, we can better identify the straw buyers drug trafficking organizations are increasingly utilizing to acquire weapons here legally, which they then illegally transfer and transport into Mexico. Over 87 percent of all traceable arms recovered by Mexican authorities have been traced to the United States. We have here an enormous opportunity to help reduce the power of the drug

trafficking organizations. While stemming the illegal flow of weapons south is no panacea for reducing violence across our border, it is a very important component of that process.

Strengthening the ATF will also help us to more effectively monitor the approximately 6,700 federal firearm licensees, FFL, that exist along the southern border. By monitoring these licensed sellers and their gun sale records, it will be much simpler to track and trace suspicious purchase patterns and buyers, weakening the drug trafficking organizations' ability to acquire weapons in the United States. This is of particular importance when many of the guns favored by the cartels are those capable of loading armor piercing rounds destined for killing Mexican law enforcement officials.

The appropriations in this amendment are only a small part of what must be a larger strategy to increase security at the border and combat the drug trafficking organizations. Many challenges remain unanswered, including the ease with which individuals can illicitly acquire assault weapons that present an enormous challenge to law enforcement and even military officers in Mexico, and that weaken security in border cities in Mexico. Nonetheless, increasing strategically targeted funding for investigators and special ATF agents is a promising start to getting our border under greater control and stopping the flow of weapons into the hands of drug trafficking organizations.

#### BORDER SECURITY

To offer \$500 million in grant assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies to Border States within 100 miles of the Border States and to cover salaries and expenses associated with border enforcement for State and local officials.

I also offer an amendment of \$500 million in grant assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies to Border States within 100 miles of the Border States to purchase interoperable communications, hire additional investigators, detectives and other law enforcement personnel, and to cover salaries and expenses associated with border enforcement for State and local officials.

Our Border States are frustrated and in need of targeted assistance. In recent months I have attended a number of different hearings, briefings and press conferences on immigration, combating the drug trade, and improving the border, and in almost all instances I have heard the same comment: Border States are frustrated. The deeply misguided Arizona Law, SB1070 for example, is an expression of that very frustration. Unless we want to see more of a backlash, we in the federal government need to do more to help our Border States, vital to securing our nation and upholding our immigration laws, do their job right.

First of all, we need to do more than just provide "boots on the ground" to help secure our borders. While deterrence is essential to improving security, several members of the law enforcement community have stressed the importance of providing more resources for investigators and detectives, who can help to ferret out and dismantle the criminal activities taking place on our borders.

Moreover, while federal agencies have improved their coordination, communication within local and state authorities continues to be problematic. Communication in disperse rural areas presents a particular challenge. At a

hearing on the Merida Initiative, I heard the moving testimony of a rancher from rural Arizona, Mr. Bill McDonald. He pointed out how a lack of resources and a rapid turnover rate make communication extremely important, but extremely lacking. These rural areas, and the people who live there, are in many cases the most vulnerable to human traffickers and drug traffickers.

This Amendment will provide Border States with the much needed support that they need in order to more effectively secure our borders from threats, and ensure a safe and stable environment for our border residents. The \$500 million in grant assistance will provide for additional personnel, particularly investigators and detectives crucial to loosening the grip that criminal organizations have slowly tightened on our borders. More robust, well funded, and well resourced law enforcement systems are exactly what our Border States and residents demand.

Moreover, this Amendment will provide funds specifically for interoperable communications equipment that will improve security on our borders. Along with a more robust and effective local law enforcement effort, improved communications equipment and strategies will aid in providing more effective coverage of our more vulnerable rural areas, and ensure more effective protection of our vulnerable border residents.

Finally, this Amendment is an important piece of what must be a broader continued and tireless effort to secure our nation against ever changing threats, and provide federal leadership on an issue that continues to frustrate Border State residents and constituents nation-wide. These appropriations to improve law enforcement efforts at the border are only a small part of more comprehensive reforms to our immigration system, reforms that the American people are crying out for and that I sincerely hope my fellow members will stand behind. Thank you Madame Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### DEFENSE AMENDMENT

To establish portability between states of individualized education programs, and disability and therapeutic benefits of a dependent of a member of the armed forces upon transfer of the member.

I offer an Amendment that will establish portability between states of individualized education programs, and disability and therapeutic benefits of a dependent of a member of the armed forces upon transfer of the member.

Our armed forces and their family members are among the most valued members of our society, custodians of our freedom and protectors of our democracy. We must re-commit ourselves to serving them with the honor, dignity and respect with which they serve their country.

An important part of anyone's quality of life is their family and dependents. One of the ways in which we can serve the members of the armed forces who sacrifice so much for our safety and our liberty is to ensure that their families are taken care of, and to eliminate the bureaucratic red tape involved in moving from one place to another. Members of the armed forces often find themselves moving, and uprooting their families and their lives. Again, my Amendment aims to facilitate a fair and equitable process.

My Amendment would make the educational, disability and therapeutic benefits of

a child or dependent of a member of the armed forces transferrable from one state to another. This will greatly facilitate and simplify what is already a difficult, complicated and often painful process for the men and women who put their lives on the line for our country, and their families. Let us serve them, as they have served us.

#### NASA AMENDMENT

My Amendment would ensure: All managed funding for the National Aeronautics Space Administration (NASA) NASA Constellation programs will be maintained through fiscal year 2015 with the assumption that the Constellation program will continue: (2) U.S. human space flight systems shall be lead by the U.S. government to ensure crew safety and to ensure skill, capabilities and institutional knowledge attributable to NASA and ISS can be retained by the U.S. for the appropriate time; (3) strengthen partnerships between universities and NASA centers; and (4) ensure a protocol for commercial human space flight utilization shall be established.

The President's proposed FY 2011 budget eliminates funding for a portion of the Constellation Program which includes the Orion Crew Capsule, the Altair Lunar Lander, and the Ares I and Ares V rockets.

Earlier this year, I introduced H. Res. 1150, "Designating the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as a national security Interest and Asset," and stating findings that the elimination of funding for the NASA Constellation program in the President's proposed FY 2011 budget presents national security concerns.

It is critical that managed funding for the NASA Constellation programs is maintained through fiscal year 2015 as:

1. Elimination of the Constellation programs will present Homeland security implications for cyberspace, critical infrastructure, and Intelligence community of the United States;

2. Elimination of the Constellation programs will compromise the effectiveness of the International Space Station as it relates to the strategic importance of space station research, and intelligence; and

3. Continuation of NASA's Constellation program is crucial to maintaining thousands of American jobs and the U.S.'s leadership role and technological edge as well as securing valuable knowledge that improves national security, climate, and research in science and medicine.

Eliminating the Constellation upon retirement of the Space Shuttle will diminish the Nation's international leadership role and efforts to advance scientific research in space. The United States will for the first time, since its space program began, be without a human space flight program.

Additionally, transferring funds from the Constellation program to the development of commercial space programs to carry humans and crew into space is taking a chance on an unproven quantity and is an unnecessary and unreasonable risk this country must not take at this time. It is more prudent to establish a protocol for commercial human space flight utilization at this time.

It will take years for the commercial spaceflight industry to get up to speed to reach the level of competence that exists at NASA today. Our government has already invested literally years and billions of dollars into this program. We should build upon these investments and not abandon them. Our country

can support the commercial spaceflight industry, but not at the expense of our human spaceflight program, which for years has inspired future generations and driven technology that enhances our quality of life.

The retirement of the Space Shuttles this year will leave the United States vulnerable and dependent upon Russia to put U.S. astronauts in orbit without the Constellation program.

In May of last year when it became clear the U.S. had no one else to turn to, Russia raised its prices from \$48 to \$51 million per launch for each astronaut.

In addition, it is important for us to remember that the Constellation program is not just about going to the moon, as the U.S. has a commitment to the International Space Station (ISS). With the Space Shuttles being retired this September, the Constellation is the only system under development that will give NASA the future capability to launch crews to and retrieve them from the ISS. Decreasing the use of the International Space Station would impact the ability to sustain its systems and physical infrastructure.

The Congress should recognize the policy outlined in section 501(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Authorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16761(a)), that the United States shall maintain an uninterrupted capability for human space flight and operations in low-Earth orbit, and beyond, as an essential element of national security and the ability to ensure continued United States participation and leadership in the exploration of space.

The human space flight program should be funded to continue use of the International Space Station to support the agency and other federal, commercial, and academic research and technology testing needs. NASA conducts aeronautics research to address aviation safety, air traffic control, noise and, emissions reductions and fuel efficiency.

NASA's contribution to our knowledge of air and water supports has improved decision making for natural resource management and emergency response, thus enabling us to better respond to future homeland security threats.

Knowledge of Earth's water cycle is a critical first step in protecting our water supply; water flows over the Earth's surface in oceans, lakes, and streams, and is particularly vulnerable to attack.

NASA sensors provide a wealth of information about the water cycle, and contribute to improving our ability to monitor water resources and water quality from space. We must also protect the quality and safety of the air we breathe; airborne contaminants can pose danger to human health; and chemical, nuclear, radiological, and biological attacks are plausible threats against which we can better protect the United States through NASA's research.

Elimination of the Constellation program will present homeland security implications for cyberspace, critical infrastructure, and the intelligence community of the United States. Elimination of the Constellation program will also compromise the effectiveness of the International Space Station as it relates to the strategic importance of space station research, and intelligence.

Continuation of NASA's human space flight program is crucial to improving national security, studying climate change and its effects, and research in science and medicine.

For the above reasons, it is my hope that my Colleagues will join me in supporting efforts to maintain NASA's Constellation Program. It is through balanced policies that promote economic growth that we will continue to maintain our international leadership and technological competitive edge, and gain valuable knowledge relating to the national security of our nation.

#### SUMMER JOBS AMENDMENT

Making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief and summer jobs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010 and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Senate has proposed to strike out a portion of the Act that is vital to supporting the career development of our nation's youth. My amendment would reinstate the section of the bill pertaining to "Employment and Training Administration," which appropriates \$600 million dollars in grants to states to support summer employment programs for youth.

The recent recession has affected various sectors, and unemployment has been borne by many sectors of the economy, particularly in the housing and banking sectors. The suffering that comes with a major economic downturn has been felt not only by the adult population, but by our youth as well, and they have been hindered in their efforts to acquire summer employment as I speak. Statistics also demonstrate that youth minority groups have been more affected than other groups of young individuals. Data assembled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that in July 2009, 51.4 percent of young persons between the ages of 16 and 24 were involved in some form of summer employment. This was the lowest recorded rate since 1964. The youth unemployment rate, at 18.5 percent, was also a record low since the onset of the Bureau's statistical studies almost forty years ago. In comparison to a 4 percent rise in unemployment for white youth, 7 percent more African Americans and 10 percent more Hispanics became unemployed between 2006 and 2009. These numbers are troubling, and indicate a need for intervention on our part.

It is important that in our efforts to aid in the economic recovery effort, we do not forget our young Americans. Their career development is crucial to ensuring that whatever economic strides we make today will be sustainable tomorrow. As such, we must ensure that we do not neglect the hardships that have been inflicted upon them as a result of the economic downturn. These funds will promote the intellectual development of our youth, which, in turn, will promote a healthy and innovative economy. Studies have also shown that such an initiative could work to decrease the likelihood of criminal activity by young individuals, who are less likely to engage in such activity when they are involved in productive use of their time.

This amendment will provide an indispensable source of support for our states to help them develop our youth. For these reasons, I urge my Colleagues to support my amendment on summer youth jobs.

#### HAITI AMENDMENT

An amendment to require the Department of State to report on contracting procurement in Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment to increase oversight over the contracting process in Haiti. This amendment requires that the Department

of State prepare a report that describes how offers received in response to solicitations for contracts to be carried out are evaluated.

As Haiti's neighbor, it is the responsibility of the U.S. to help Haiti recover, and to build the capacity to militate against future disasters. Yet, it must be done in a way that is transparent and accountable.

Last month, I held a town hall meeting to link USAID and contractors seeking to secure contracts to rebuild Haiti following the devastating earthquake. Similar to contractors operating in Pakistan, these groups were concerned that they were not able to access the contracts in a transparent manner.

There are vast untapped human resources and potential in the United States, and the people of Haiti are in need of our help. During these economic times, it only makes sense to ensure that the hard working men and women of the United States have an opportunity to contribute to helping the people of Haiti rebuild their nation. USAID and the American Red Cross will help open the door for our local businesses including small, minority and women-owned and disadvantaged businesses to participate in something great, at the same time strengthening our own damaged economy.

Mr. Speaker, transparency is at the heart of an effective assistance program. Again, I ask my Colleagues to allow this amendment to move forward.

#### PAKISTAN AMENDMENT

Amendments to require the Department of State to report on contracting procurement in Pakistan.

An amendment to increase oversight over the contracting process in Pakistan. This amendment requires that the Department of State prepare a report that describes how offers received in response to solicitations for contracts to be carried out are evaluated.

A major focus of the President's policy review was the importance of Pakistan to our efforts in Afghanistan, to regional stability, and to our national security and foreign policy interests. There remains mistrust between our two countries, but we see a critical window of opportunity created by the recent transition to democratic, civilian rule and the broad, sustained political support across Pakistan for military operations against extremists. We seek to lead the international community in helping Pakistan overcome the political, economic, and security challenges that threaten its stability, and in turn undermine regional stability. And we seek to build a long-term partnership with Pakistan based on common interests, including recognition that we cannot tolerate a safe haven for terrorists whose location is known and whose intentions are clear.

As co-Chair of the Pakistan Caucus, I have met with dozens of groups concerned about the future of Pakistan. Every single group has told me that they are unable to access information about the contracting process in Pakistan as it relates to the \$1.5 billion authorized by the Kerry-Lugar-Berman bill. This lack of transparency threatens to undermine the tremendous progress we have made in Pakistan gaining the trust of the people and the government. It is therefore crucial that my Colleagues support an amendment that will work to alleviate those fears and implement transparency measures as the cornerstone to our assistance programs.

I thank you for consideration of H.R. 4899 for the Fiscal Year 2010 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule allowing for consideration of House amendments to H.R. 4899, the Supplemental Appropriations Act.

I believe that it is irresponsible of Congress to leave for the Fourth of July recess without sending the Senate-passed supplemental appropriations bill to the President's desk for signature. Insisting on inclusion of additional spending above the Senate-passed supplemental levels, with absolutely no assurances that the Senate is willing or even able to pass this additional spending will do nothing but delay vitally important emergency funding.

Swift approval of the supplemental is needed not only for the war effort but also for areas of the United States, like North Dakota, who have been hit hard by disasters and desperately need Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) disaster relief funding owed them. While I do not take issue with the additional offset spending that is being discussed, the current push to add it will result in Congress failing to enact a supplemental for several weeks, with the strong possibility of ending up right back where we began.

I am submitting, as a part of my statement, a copy of an editorial that recently ran in the Bismarck Tribune titled "Congress needs to meet its responsibilities". Congress' inability to complete even its most basic business has the American people's patience running thin. The delay in passing a supplemental appropriations bill endangers our soldiers fighting overseas and is preventing critical aid from reaching those who have been hit with disasters here at home. We must act today to pass the Senate version of this bill and avoid further delays.

[June 30, 2010]

#### CONGRESS NEEDS TO MEET ITS RESPONSIBILITIES

Mor-Gran-Sou Electric, crippled by the Good Friday snowstorm, qualified for financial disaster relief from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The damage to Mor-Gran-Sou poles and lines was extensive and pricey, upwards of \$30 million.

The feds agreed to pick up 75 percent of the cost. That's what disaster relief programs are all about—financial help when a natural disaster levels an area.

Except, the check isn't in the mail.

When the feds, when anyone, says they are going to do a thing, they ought to do it—and do it in a timely fashion.

There's no excuse for FEMA, and really Congress, holding up Mor-Gran-Sou.

And the phrase "holding up" isn't just a metaphor. While waiting for FEMA, Mor-Gran-Sou has had to get a \$30 million line of credit, which even at 2.5 percent interest could cost the co-op and its electric customers \$1 million in interest over a year.

The FEMA disaster funding was placed in the bill funding the war in Afghanistan and Iraq.

One has nothing to do with the other. Lumping these funding efforts together is just another political tool—like the "Christmas tree" building bills in the North Dakota Legislature—for forcing lawmakers to vote in favor of something they do not want in exchange for something they need.

A congressman might not want to fund the war in Afghanistan or Iraq, but if that congressman wants disaster relief, well . . .

Congress has intentionally become a beast of complexity and burden, in this case.

Legislation, rather than being a clean, well-written policy or law with a single given purpose, has become incomprehensible in language, sheer volume and related programming, regulating and funding.

Yes, we live in a complex world and over simplification can be dangerous, but that's not justification for the present level of congressional chaos.

Congress has legislated FEMA's obligation in a natural disaster. FEMA has deemed Mor-Gran-Sou's situation as qualified for help.

Now Congress must follow through and provide funding to do what it said FEMA would do.

In Washington, a million dollars in interest might not amount to much, but on the far end of a power line in western North Dakota, with 11,000 downed poles and 550 miles of tangled line, it's a very big deal.

In people, follow-through of this kind, speaks to character. The same goes for Congress and its members.

Our delegation needs to push hard to break this log jam. Will it?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 4899—"Supplemental Appropriations Act 2010." H.R. 4899 will provide funding for the needs of the American people, from national security, housing, employment, health, to education. I fully support these efforts and want to stress that we must continue to provide policies and funding that ensure that the United States remains a global leader in science and technology, including space exploration, which not only results in knowledge-building but also in hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout the nation.

My amendment would ensure: all managed funding for the National Aeronautics Space Administration (NASA) NASA Constellation programs will be maintained through fiscal year 2015 with the assumption that the Constellation program will continue: (2) U.S. human space flight systems shall be lead by the U.S. government to ensure crew safety and to ensure skill, capabilities and institutional knowledge attributable to NASA and ISS can be retained by the U.S. for the appropriate time; (3) strengthen partnerships between universities and NASA centers; and (4) ensure a protocol for commercial human space flight utilization shall be established.

The President's proposed FY2011 budget eliminates funding for a portion of the Constellation Program which includes the Orion Crew Capsule, the Altair Lunar Lander, and the Ares I and Ares V rockets.

Earlier this year, I introduced H. Res. 1150, "Designating the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as a national security interest and Asset," and stating findings that the elimination of funding for the NASA Constellation program in the President's proposed FY 2011 budget presents national security concerns.

It is critical that managed funding for the NASA Constellation programs is maintained through fiscal year 2015 as:

1. Elimination of the Constellation programs will present Homeland Security implications for Cyberspace, critical infrastructure, and Intelligence community of the United States;

2. Elimination of the Constellation programs will compromise the effectiveness of the International Space Station as it relates to the strategic importance of space station research, and intelligence; and

3. Continuation of NASA's Constellation program is crucial to maintaining thousands of

American jobs and the U.S.'s leadership role and technological edge as well as securing valuable knowledge that improves national security, climate, and research in science and medicine.

#### INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TECHNOLOGICAL COMPETITIVE EDGE

Eliminating the Constellation upon retirement of the Space Shuttle will diminish the nation's international leadership role and efforts to advance scientific research in space. The United States will for the first time, since its space program began, be without a human space flight program.

Additionally, transferring funds from the Constellation program to the development of commercial space programs to carry a human crew into space is taking a chance on an unproven quantity and is an unnecessary and unreasonable risk this country must not take at this time. It is more prudent to establish a protocol for commercial human space flight utilization at this time.

It will take years for the commercial spaceflight industry to get up to speed to reach the level of competence that exists at NASA today. Our government has already invested literally years and billions of dollars into this program. We should build upon these investments and not abandon them. Our country can support the commercial spaceflight industry, but not at the expense of our human spaceflight program, which for years has inspired future generations and driven technology that enhances our quality of life.

The retirement of the Space Shuttles this year will leave the United States vulnerable and dependent upon Russia to put U.S. astronauts in orbit without the Constellation program. In May of last year when it became clear the U.S. had no one else to turn to, Russia raised its prices from \$48 to \$51 million per launch for each astronaut.

In addition, it is important for us to remember that the Constellation program is not just about going to the moon, as the U.S. has a commitment to the International Space Station (ISS). With the Space Shuttles being retired this September, the Constellation is the only system under development that will give NASA the future capability to launch crews to and retrieve them from the ISS. Decreasing the use of the International Space Station would impact the ability to sustain its systems and physical infrastructure.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY AND HOMELAND SECURITY

The Congress should recognize the policy outlined in section 501(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Authorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16761(a)), that the United States shall maintain an uninterrupted capability for human space flight and operations in low-earth orbit, and beyond, as an essential element of national security and the ability to ensure continued United States participation and leadership in the exploration of space.

The human space flight program should be funded to continue use of the International Space Station to support the agency and other Federal, commercial, and academic research and technology testing needs. NASA conducts aeronautics research to address aviation safety, air traffic control, noise and, emissions reductions and fuel efficiency.

NASA's contribution to our knowledge of air and water supports has improved decision making for natural resource management and



emergency response, thus enabling us to better respond to future homeland security threats.

Knowledge of Earth's water cycle is a critical first step in protecting our water supply; water flows over the Earth's surface in oceans, lakes, and streams, and is particularly vulnerable to attack.

NASA sensors provide a wealth of information about the water cycle, and contribute to improving our ability to monitor water resources and water quality from space. We must also protect the quality and safety of the air we breathe; airborne contaminants can pose danger to human health; and chemical, nuclear, radiological, and biological attacks are plausible threats against which we can better protect the United States through NASA's research.

Elimination of the Constellation program will present homeland security implications for cyberspace, critical infrastructure, and the intelligence community of the United States. Elimination of the Constellation program will also compromise the effectiveness of the International Space Station as it relates to the strategic importance of space station research, and intelligence.

Continuation of NASA's human space flight program is crucial to improving national security, studying climate change and its effects, and research in science and medicine.

#### CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is my hope that this committee will join me in supporting efforts to maintain NASA's Constellation Program. It is through balanced policies that promote economic growth that we will continue to maintain our international leadership and technological competitive edge, and gain valuable knowledge relating to the national security of our nation. I look forward to working with all of you to ensure that we preserve a robust human space flight program in the United States.

#### AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4899

OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT CONTINUATION.

The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall ensure that—

(1) all planned funding for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Constellation programs will be maintained through fiscal year 2015 with the assumption that the Constellation programs will continue;

(2) the Federal Government will lead United States human space flight systems—

(A) to ensure crew safety; and

(B) to ensure that skills, capabilities, and institutional knowledge attributable to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the International Space Station are retained by the Federal Government for the appropriate time;

(3) partnerships between universities and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's centers are strengthened; and

(4) a protocol for commercial human space flight utilization is established.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 7(b) of rule XX, the Chair confers recognition for that purpose.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 427]

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Adler (NJ)  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Bocieri  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bright  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castle

Castor (FL)  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Childers  
Chu  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Djou  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Driehaus  
Duncan  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen

Kirk  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kissell  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Kosmas  
Kratovil  
Kucinich  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NY)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMahon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minnick  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)

Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (NY)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Myrick  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olson  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmuter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky

Schauer  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradner  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Teague  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

□ 1937

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 419 Members have recorded their presence.

A quorum is present.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4899, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 1500, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.