like the private sector with contract bidding, saving taxpayers $80 billion.

These are commonsense and practical cuts, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the SAVE Act.

IN TRIBUTE TO DR. TRIFON LASKARIS

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

Mr. TONKO. I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable individual and prolific inventor whose pioneering research into medical imaging has helped to transform modern-day medicine.

Dr. Trifon Laskaris, a chief scientist at General Electric's Global Research Center, was recently awarded his 200th United States patent. It is a benchmark previously reached by only one other GE researcher—the inventor of the lightbulb and founder of the company's research center, Thomas Edison.

For the past four decades, Dr. Laskaris has worked at GE Global Research on technology to advance magnetic resonance imaging, or MRI. Without the work of Dr. Laskaris and his team, MRI would not be where it is today—a vital diagnostic tool used in hospitals around the world. There is no telling how many millions of people are leading healthier lives today because of the technology that Dr. Laskaris developed.

I congratulate Dr. Trifon Laskaris on this milestone achievement; and on behalf of this body and the citizens of the 20th Congressional District of New York, I thank him for his lifelong dedication to scientific research in the service of humanity.

OBAMACARE IS NOT ABOUT CARE

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

Mr. RADEL. Certainty and stability are really all that our businessowners are asking for from us here in the government so that they can grow and create jobs. Instead, we handed them ObamaCare—a nightmare for people who own businesses or who are trying to start up their own businesses. Worse, it is a nightmare for you and your family. It's not fair for you, for your kids, for your grandkids. ObamaCare will and is cutting your wages, your hours—it may even cost you your job—and it is weakening our social safety net.

In the big picture, ask yourself: When it comes to your health care, who knows how to care for you and your family most—you or some stranger here in Washington?

ObamaCare is bad for business, putting 3 million American jobs in jeopardy—and that is not speculation, Secretary Sebelius. It's plain and simple. The Affordable Care Act is not affordable. It's not about your health; it's not about care—and it is not fair. It's not fair to our seniors, our kids, our grandkids, or to you.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Over the last 50 years, women have broken barriers in business, science, education, and government. Today, they also account for half of the workers in the country, but still they earn less for equal work.

In Nevada, the average woman still makes only 85 cents for every dollar that men earn, amounting to a yearly gap of $6,300 between full-time working men and women. Collectively, Nevada women are losing some $2.3 billion each year due to this pay gap. The pay gap not only harms individual women, but it hurts their families and our communities. It is an economic drag, a social calamity, and a moral injustice.

In a country where we strive for equal opportunity, this is simply unacceptable. That's why it's so important that we pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. This critical piece of legislation would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act and help women fight wage discrimination.

The issue is simple: women should receive equal pay for equal work, and the Paycheck Fairness Act would provide the tools to reach that goal.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the consideration of H.R. 2217 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2217.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1245

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROE of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

It was 69 years ago this Thursday that more than 9,000 Allied soldiers were killed or wounded during the D-day invasion in Normandy, France. That courageous operation, as well as the sacrifice of so many brave individuals, serves as a sobering reminder that freedom and security are, in fact, not free.

It is with this solemn commitment to both freedom and security that I respectfully present to the people's House the fiscal year 2014 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. Similar to our subcommittee's work over the past 3 fiscal years, this bill demonstrates how we can fund vital security programs and enforce the law while also reducing discretionary spending overall. So this bill is about our security and fiscal priorities and getting them right.

The President's fiscal year 2014 budget proposal for DHS presents a harmful budget for our frontline homeland security agencies, diminishing their operational workforces and undermining mission capabilities. The end result of the President's budget proposal would, undoubtedly, be a less capable DHS. That's why our subcommittee, on a bipartisan basis, strove to significantly improve the flawed budget request through this bill before the House today.

First, this bill targets the very programs and systems displayed during and after the recent horrific attack at the Boston Marathon. It does this by a nearly 20 percent increase above the request for FEMA's first responder grants; substantial increases above the request and last year's level for CBP's targeting, TSA's Secure Flight, and ICE's visa enforcement programs, including the phase-in of 1,600 additional CBP officers; doubling the Department's Bombing Prevention program, substantially increasing counter-IED training and applying the lessons learned from our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; and a nearly 40 percent increase in the program If You See Something, Say Something.

In addition, the bill restores virtually all of the unjustified proposed cuts to DHS' operational programs, to include restoring the cuts to ICE's mandated 34,000 detention beds and vital investigative programs; restoring cuts to the Coast Guard's operational expenses, including aviation and flight hours, as well as restoring the President's truly harmful cuts to recapitalization and acquisitions of cutter and aviation assets; restoring the proposed cuts to CBP air and marine operating hours and procurement, as well as mission support functions; restoring the proposed long-term cuts to Secret

Service staffing and financial crime investigations; and providing these restorations while also strongly supporting the Department's disaster relief, cybersecurity and research programs, including the full-year construction increment for the National Agro-and Bio-Defense facility in Kansas.

□ 1250

This bill also considers our Nation's fiscal crisis by invoking real fiscal discipline and efficiency, including a more than $613 million—or more than 1.5 percent—reduction below fiscal year 2013 to the Department's annual budget; a 15 percent cut below the request to DHS headquarters staffing; a nearly 25 percent cut below the request to departmental administrative expenses and bureaucratic overhead; denial of the President's request to increase bureaucracy by creating three new headquarters offices; termination of funding for ineffectual offices and programs and substantial oversight requirements, ranging from withholding funds to statutory mandates to reporting requirements on everything from major acquisitions to ammunition inventories, purchases, and usage.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not represent a false choice between fiscal responsibility and security. Both are urgent priorities, and both are vigorously addressed by this bill.

I must note that DHS did a shameful job in complying with statutory requirements enacted into law FY13. Those failures are certainly addressed in this bill. We are serious about compelling the Department to both enforce the law and comply with the law, and we will not tolerate further failures in this regard, a point I think we make clear in this bill through 50 percent withholdings to the Department's executive offices and 50 percent reductions to offices that are delaying the review and submittal of needed, factual information requested by Congress.

On a final and regrettably sober note, my staff and I have been regularly talking with our dear friend and my classmate, TOM COLE, and doing all that we can to help the good people of his Oklahoma district get back on their feet from the devastating tornado that hit the town of Moore and surrounding communities.

So, in addition to the nearly $11 billion that is currently in FEMA coffers, this bill fully supports the known requirements of $6.2 billion for the disaster relief fund in FY14. These funds, combined with our continued oversight, will help ensure disaster assistance rapidly gets to those who've lost so much. Mr. Chairman, we send TOM and his constituents our sincere condolences and wish them a speedy recovery.

In closing, let me first thank Ranking Member PRICE for his statesmanship and partnership. I sincerely thank him and his dedicated professional staff for their input and notable contributions to this bill.

In addition, let me thank the thoughtful Members of this body. We received program submissions from 222 Members, and their input was critical to our oversight work over the past few months, as well as the production of this bill. I know that my staff and I made every effort to accommodate virtually every Member's submission we received, and that has only made this a stronger product.

Finally, I must thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the full committee, Chairman ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY. Their input and support for the bill is genuinely appreciated.

I sincerely believe this bill reflects our best effort to address our Nation's urgent needs: security, enforcement, and fiscal restraint.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY					
TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS					
Departmental Operations					
Office of the Secretary and Executive Management:					
Immediate Office of the Secretary	4,282	4,128	3,492	-790	-636
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	2,092	1,822	1,536	-556	-286
Office of the Chief of Staff	2,173	2,200	1,084	-1,089	-1,116
Executive Secretary	7,584	7,603	3,740	-3,844	-3,863
Office of Policy	43,706	27,815	29,998	-13,708	+2,183
Office of Public Affairs	5,470	8,661	9,326	+3,856	+665
Office of Legislative Affairs	5,794	5,498	4,625	-1,169	-873
Office of Intergovernmental Affairs	2,378	2,518	2,120	-258	-398
Office of General Counsel	21,137	21,000	17,691	-3,446	-3,309
Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties	21,618	21,678	18,272	-3,346	-3,406
Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman	5,644	5,344	4,501	-1,143	-843
Privacy Officer	7,992	8,143	6,861	-1,131	-1,282
Office of International Affairs	---	7,626	---	---	-7,626
Office of State and Local Law Enforcement	---	852	---	---	-852
Private Sector Office	---	1,666	---	---	-1,666
Subtotal	129,870	126,554	103,246	-26,624	-23,308
Office of the Under Secretary for Management:					
Immediate Office of the Under Secretary for Management	3,097	2,735	2,305	-792	-430
Office of the Chief Security Officer	68,931	66,025	55,799	-13,132	-10,226
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer	71,928	66,915	56,459	-15,469	-10,456
Subtotal	143,956	135,675	114,563	-29,393	-21,112
Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses	24,946	22,276	18,771	-6,175	-3,505
Human Resources Information Technology	9,670	9,213	7,815	-1,855	-1,398
Subtotal	34,616	31,489	26,586	-8,030	-4,903
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses	34,278	30,793	26,004	-8,274	-4,789
Nebraska Avenue Complex (NAC)	5,443	4,729	4,020	-1,423	-709
Subtotal	39,721	35,522	30,024	-9,697	-5,498
Subtotal, Office of the Under Secretary for Management	218,293	202,686	171,173	-47,120	-31,513
DHS Consolidated Headquarters Project	---	105,500	---	---	-105,500
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	51,449	48,779	41,242	-10,207	-7,537
Office of the Chief Information Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses	117,882	117,347	99,397	-18,485	-17,950
Information Technology Services	27,572	32,712	25,612	-1,960	-7,100
Infrastructure and Security Activities	55,944	100,063	45,863	-10,081	-54,200
Homeland Secure Data Network	42,090	77,132	39,863	-2,227	-37,269
Subtotal	243,488	327,254	210,735	-32,753	-116,519
Analysis and Operations	321,958	309,228	291,623	-30,335	-17,605
Total, Departmental Operations	965,058	1,120,001	818,019	-147,039	-301,982

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General:					
Operating Expenses	121,043	119,309	113,903	-7,140	-5,406
(by transfer from Disaster Relief)	(23,976)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24)	---
Total, Office of Inspector General	145,019	143,309	137,903	-7,116	-5,406
Total, title I, Departmental Management and Operations	1,086,101	1,239,310	931,922	-154,179	-307,388
(by transfer)	(23,976)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24)	---
TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS					
U.S. Customs and Border Protection					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Headquarters, Management, and Administration:					
Commissioner	17,398	---	25,288	+7,890	+25,288
Chief Counsel	43,035	---	45,022	+1,987	+45,022
Congressional Affairs	2,565	---	2,482	-83	+2,482
Internal Affairs	153,954	---	162,568	+8,614	+162,568
Public Affairs	12,550	---	12,920	+370	+12,920
Training and Development	77,643	---	76,512	-1,131	+76,512
Tech, Innovation, Acquisition	25,978	---	22,972	-3,006	+22,972
Intelligence/Investigative Liaison	68,088	---	61,105	-6,983	+61,105
Administration	414,259	---	293,091	-121,168	+293,091
Rent	564,306	407,898	407,898	-156,408	---
Management and Administration, Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation	---	620,656	---	---	-620,656
Management and Administration, Border Security and Control Between Ports of Entry	---	592,330	---	---	-592,330
Subtotal	1,379,776	1,620,884	1,109,858	-269,918	-511,026
Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation:					
Inspections, Trade, and Travel Facilitation at Ports of Entry	2,715,935	2,837,294	2,887,718	+171,783	+50,424
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection (trust fund)	3,271	3,274	3,274	+3	---
International Cargo Screening	71,416	72,260	71,961	+545	-299
Other International Programs	24,774	24,740	24,596	-178	-144
Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT)	43,026	40,183	41,960	-1,066	+1,777
Trusted Traveler Programs	10,800	6,311	6,311	-4,489	---
Inspection and Detection Technology Investments	117,447	112,526	112,504	-4,943	-22
Automated Targeting Systems	113,712	109,944	132,932	+19,220	+22,988
National Targeting Center	68,059	65,474	65,106	-2,953	-368
Training	34,811	47,651	40,703	+5,892	-6,948
Subtotal	3,203,251	3,319,657	3,387,065	+183,814	+67,408
Border Security and Control Between Ports of Entry:					
Border Security and Control	3,628,164	3,700,317	3,723,502	+95,338	+23,185
Training	73,865	55,928	55,558	-18,307	-370
Subtotal	3,702,029	3,756,245	3,779,060	+77,031	+22,815
Air and Marine Operations	---	286,769	---	---	-286,769
US-VISIT	---	253,533	---	---	-253,533
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	8,285,056	9,237,088	8,275,983	-9,073	-961,105
Appropriations	(8,281,785)	(9,123,814)	(8,272,709)	(-9,076)	(-851,105)
Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund	(3,271)	(3,274)	(3,274)	(+3)	---
COBRA FTA spending authority (Sec. 541a3)	---	(110,000)	---	---	(-110,000)

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Small Airport User Fee (permanent indefinite discretionary appropriation)	---	5,000	5,000	+5,000	---
Automation Modernization:					
Information Technology	393,946	---	367,860	-26,086	+367,860
Automated Commercial Environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS)	138,655	140,830	140,762	+2,107	-68
Current Operations Protection and Processing Support (COPPS)	186,545	199,275	199,275	+12,730	---
Subtotal	719,146	340,105	707,897	-11,249	+367,792
Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology (BSFIT):					
Development and Deployment	188,627	160,435	160,435	-28,192	---
Operations and Maintenance	135,148	191,019	191,019	+55,871	---
Subtotal	323,775	351,454	351,454	+27,679	---
Air and Marine Operations:					
Salaries and Expenses	283,286	---	292,791	+9,505	+292,791
Operations and Maintenance	397,002	353,751	392,000	-5,002	+38,249
Procurement	117,919	73,950	117,950	+31	+44,000
Subtotal	798,207	427,701	802,741	+4,534	+375,040
Construction and Facilities Management:					
Facilities Construction and Sustainment	176,038	385,398	385,398	+209,360	---
Program Oversight and Management	57,292	86,101	85,880	+28,588	-221
Subtotal	233,330	471,499	471,278	+237,948	-221
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection Direct Appropriations	10,359,514	10,832,847	10,614,353	+254,839	-218,494
Fee Accounts:					
Immigration Inspection User Fee	(568,790)	(764,267)	(764,267)	(+195,477)	---
Immigration Enforcement Fines	(1,093)	(773)	(773)	(-320)	---
Electronic System for Travel Authorization Fee	(46,318)	(55,168)	(55,168)	(+8,850)	---
Land Border Inspection Fee	(35,935)	(42,941)	(42,941)	(+7,006)	---
COBRA Passenger Inspection Fee	(419,352)	(694,627)	(694,627)	(+275,275)	---
APHIS Inspection Fee	(329,000)	(355,216)	(355,216)	(+26,216)	---
Global Entry User Fee	(13,743)	(34,835)	(34,835)	(+21,092)	---
Puerto Rico Collections	(96,367)	(98,602)	(98,602)	(+2,235)	---
Small Airport User Fee	(8,318)	---	---	(-8,318)	---
Virgin Island Fee	---	(11,302)	(11,302)	(+11,302)	---
Customs Unclaimed Goods	---	(5,992)	(5,992)	(+5,992)	---
Subtotal, Fee Accounts	(1,518,916)	(2,063,723)	(2,063,723)	(+544,807)	---
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection	11,878,430	12,896,570	12,678,076	+799,646	-218,494
Appropriations	(10,359,514)	(10,832,847)	(10,614,353)	(+254,839)	(-218,494)
Fee Accounts	(1,518,916)	(2,063,723)	(2,063,723)	(+544,807)	---
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Headquarters Management and Administration:					
Personnel Compensation and Benefits, Services and Other Costs	219,824	192,236	209,755	-10,069	+17,519
Headquarters Managed IT Investment	160,304	141,294	151,132	-9,172	+9,838
Subtotal	380,128	333,530	360,887	-19,241	+27,357
Legal Proceedings	206,834	204,651	205,921	-913	+1,270
Investigations:					
Domestic Investigations	1,685,172	1,599,972	1,710,172	+25,000	+110,200

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
International Investigations:					
International Operations	115,007	100,544	100,187	-14,820	-357
Visa Security Program	34,526	31,630	31,541	-2,985	-89
Subtotal	149,533	132,174	131,728	-17,805	-446
Subtotal, Investigations	1,834,705	1,732,146	1,841,900	+7,195	+109,754
Intelligence	78,374	75,448	74,908	-3,466	-540
Detention and Removal Operations:					
Custody Operations	2,022,991	1,844,802	2,038,239	+15,248	+193,437
Fugitive Operations	145,180	125,771	134,802	-10,378	+9,031
Criminal Alien Program	216,293	291,721	289,155	+72,862	-2,566
Alternatives to Detention	96,460	72,435	96,460	---	+24,025
(transfer out to Department of Justice)	---	---	---	---	---
Transportation and Removal Program	269,932	255,984	276,925	+6,993	+20,941
Subtotal	2,750,856	2,590,713	2,835,581	+84,725	+244,868
Secure Communities	138,111	20,334	25,264	-112,847	+4,930
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	5,389,008	4,956,822	5,344,461	-44,547	+387,639
Automation Modernization:					
IT Investment	---	---	8,400	+8,400	+8,400
TECS Modernization	22,977	34,900	23,000	+23	-11,900
Detention and Removals Modernization	6,993	---	---	-6,993	---
Electronic Health Records	3,497	---	3,500	+3	+3,500
Subtotal	33,467	34,900	34,900	+1,433	---
Construction	4,995	5,000	5,000	+5	---
Total, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Direct Appropriations	5,427,470	4,996,722	5,384,361	-43,109	+387,639
Fee Accounts:					
Immigration Inspection User Fee	(116,869)	(135,000)	(135,000)	(+18,131)	---
Breached Bond/Detention Fund	(75,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)	(-10,000)	---
Student Exchange and Visitor Fee	(120,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	(+25,000)	---
Subtotal	311,869	345,000	345,000	+33,131	---
Total, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement	5,739,339	5,341,722	5,729,361	-9,978	+387,639
Appropriations	(5,427,470)	(4,996,722)	(5,384,361)	(-43,109)	(+387,639)
Fee Accounts	(311,869)	(345,000)	(345,000)	(+33,131)	---
Transportation Security Administration					
Aviation Security:					
Screening Operations:					
Screener Workforce:					
Privatized Screening	147,542	153,190	163,190	+15,648	+10,000
Screener Personnel, Compensation, and Benefits	3,075,630	3,033,526	2,972,715	-102,915	-60,811
Subtotal	3,223,172	3,186,716	3,135,905	-87,267	-50,811
Screener Training and Other	224,759	226,936	203,057	-21,702	-23,879
Checkpoint Support	115,089	103,377	103,309	-11,780	-68
EDS/ETD Systems:					
EDS Procurement and Installation	99,830	83,987	83,845	-15,985	-142
Screening Technology Maintenance, Utilities	308,691	298,509	298,509	-10,182	---
Subtotal	408,521	382,496	382,354	-26,167	-142
Subtotal, Screening Operations	3,971,541	3,899,525	3,824,625	-146,916	-74,900

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Aviation Security Direction and Enforcement:					
Aviation Regulation and Other Enforcement	367,887	354,650	358,187	-9,700	+3,537
Airport Management and Support	561,787	590,871	555,242	-6,545	-35,629
Federal Flight Deck Officer and Flight Crew Training	24,705	---	12,353	-12,352	+12,353
Air Cargo	121,647	122,990	122,332	+685	-658
Subtotal	1,076,026	1,068,511	1,048,114	-27,912	-20,397
Aviation Security Capital Fund (mandatory)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Total, Aviation Security (gross)	5,047,567	4,968,036	4,872,739	-174,828	-95,297
Aviation Security Fees (offsetting collections)	-2,070,000	-2,120,000	-2,120,000	-50,000	---
Additional Offsetting Collections (leg. proposal)	---	-105,000	---	---	+105,000
Total, Aviation Security (net, discretionary)	2,977,567	2,743,036	2,752,739	-224,828	+9,703
Surface Transportation Security:					
Staffing and Operations	36,317	35,433	35,262	-1,055	-171
Surface Transportation Security Inspectors and Canines	87,977	73,898	73,356	-14,621	-542
Subtotal	124,294	109,331	108,618	-15,676	-713
Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing:					
Secure Flight	106,828	106,198	108,198	+1,370	+2,000
Crew and Other Vetting Programs	85,404	74,419	74,419	-10,985	---
TWIC Fees	(47,300)	(36,700)	(36,700)	(-10,600)	---
Hazardous Materials Fees	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	---	---
Alien Flight School Fees (by transfer from DOJ)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Air Cargo/Certified Cargo Screening Program	(7,200)	(5,400)	(5,400)	(-1,800)	---
Commercial Aviation and Airports/Secure Identification Display Area Checks	(8,000)	(6,500)	(6,500)	(-1,500)	---
Other Security Threat Assessments	(120)	(50)	(50)	(-70)	---
General Aviation at DCA	(100)	(350)	(350)	(+250)	---
Subtotal	271,952	246,617	248,617	-23,335	+2,000
Direct Appropriations	(192,232)	(180,617)	(182,617)	(-9,615)	(+2,000)
Fee Funded Programs	(79,720)	(66,000)	(66,000)	(-13,720)	---
Transportation Security Support:					
Headquarters Administration	275,846	284,942	265,712	-10,134	-19,230
Information Technology	416,779	455,484	389,750	-27,029	-65,734
Human Capital Services	215,613	212,554	201,643	-13,970	-10,911
Intelligence	45,085	44,809	44,561	-524	-248
Subtotal	953,323	997,789	901,666	-51,657	-96,123
Federal Air Marshals:					
Management and Administration	792,992	714,669	709,254	-83,738	-5,415
Travel and Training	113,857	111,853	111,853	-2,004	---
Subtotal	906,849	826,522	821,107	-85,742	-5,415
Total, Transportation Security Administration	7,553,985	7,398,295	7,202,747	-351,238	-195,548
Offsetting Collections	(-2,070,000)	(-2,225,000)	(-2,120,000)	(-50,000)	(+105,000)
Aviation Security Capital Fund (mandatory)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Fee Funded Programs	(79,720)	(66,000)	(66,000)	(-13,720)	---
Total, Transportation Security Administration (net)	5,154,265	4,857,295	4,766,747	-387,518	-90,548

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Coast Guard					
Operating Expenses:					
Military Pay and Allowances	3,411,766	3,425,306	3,440,053	+28,287	+14,747
Civilian Pay and Benefits	785,793	784,097	779,011	-6,782	-5,086
Training and Recruiting	213,969	181,617	216,588	+2,619	+34,971
Operating Funds and Unit Level Maintenance	1,092,799	1,061,567	1,065,083	-27,716	+3,516
Centrally Managed Accounts	350,721	318,856	319,307	-31,414	+451
Intermediate and Depot Level Maintenance	958,913	983,940	1,019,374	+60,461	+35,434
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism	254,000	---	---	-254,000	---
Subtotal	7,067,961	6,755,383	6,839,416	-228,545	+84,033
(Defense)	(593,660)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(-253,660)	---
(Nondefense)	(6,474,301)	(6,415,383)	(6,499,416)	(+25,115)	(+84,033)
Environmental Compliance and Restoration	13,138	13,187	13,164	+26	-23
Reserve Training	132,395	109,543	112,991	-19,404	+3,448
Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements:					
Vessels:					
Survey and Design-vessel and Boats	2,498	1,000	1,000	-1,498	---
Response Boat-medium	7,992	---	---	-7,992	---
In-service Vessel Sustainment	---	21,000	21,000	+21,000	---
National Security Cutter	678,621	616,000	603,553	-75,068	-12,447
Offshore Patrol Cutter	29,970	25,000	25,000	-4,970	---
Fast Response Cutter	334,665	75,000	205,000	-129,665	+130,000
Cutter Small Boats	3,996	3,000	3,000	-996	---
Medium Endurance Cutter Sustainment	15,984	---	---	-15,984	---
Polar Ice Breaking Vessel	7,992	2,000	2,000	-5,992	---
Subtotal	1,081,718	743,000	860,553	-221,165	+117,553
Aircraft:					
Airframe Replacement (CGNR 6017)	13,986	---	30,000	+16,014	+30,000
Maritime Patrol Aircraft	54,945	---	---	-54,945	---
Long Range Surveillance Aircraft	89,910	16,000	107,710	+17,800	+91,710
HH-65 Conversion/Sustainment Projects	31,469	12,000	12,000	-19,469	---
Subtotal	190,310	28,000	149,710	-40,600	+121,710
Other Acquisition Programs:					
Program Oversight and Management	14,985	10,000	10,000	-4,985	---
Systems Engineering and Integration	---	204	204	+204	---
C4ISR	40,460	35,226	50,226	+9,766	+15,000
CG-Logistics Information Management System	2,498	1,500	1,500	-998	---
Nationwide Automatic Identification System	5,994	13,000	13,000	+7,006	---
Subtotal	63,937	59,930	74,930	+10,993	+15,000
Shore Facilities and Aids to Navigation:					
Major Construction; Housing; ATON; and Survey and Design	29,970	2,000	2,000	-27,970	---
Major Acquisition Systems Infrastructure	49,362	---	---	-49,362	---
Minor Shore	4,995	3,000	3,000	-1,995	---
Subtotal	84,327	5,000	5,000	-79,327	---
Military Housing	9,990	---	18,000	+8,010	+18,000
Personnel and Related Support:					
Direct Personnel Costs	112,969	114,747	114,080	+1,111	-667
Core Acquisition Costs	599	439	439	-160	---
Subtotal	113,568	115,186	114,519	+951	-667
Subtotal, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements	1,543,850	951,116	1,222,712	-321,138	+271,596
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	19,671	19,856	9,928	-9,743	-9,928

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Health Care Fund Contribution (permanent indefinite discretionary appropriation)	202,797	201,000	201,000	-1,797	---
Retired Pay (mandatory)	1,423,000	1,460,000	1,460,000	+37,000	---
Total, Coast Guard	10,402,812	9,510,085	9,859,211	-543,601	+349,126
Appropriations	(10,148,812)	(9,510,085)	(9,859,211)	(-289,601)	(+349,126)
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism	(254,000)	---	---	(-254,000)	---
(mandatory)	(1,423,000)	(1,460,000)	(1,460,000)	(+37,000)	---
(discretionary)	(8,979,812)	(8,050,085)	(8,399,211)	(-580,601)	(+349,126)
United States Secret Service					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Protection:					
Protection of Persons and Facilities	854,381	841,078	848,263	-6,118	+7,185
Protective Intelligence Activities	68,057	67,782	67,165	-892	-617
National Special Security Event Fund	4,496	4,500	4,500	+4	---
Presidential Candidate Nominee Protection	57,902	---	---	-57,902	---
Subtotal	984,836	913,360	919,928	-64,908	+6,568
Investigations:					
Domestic Field Operations	299,390	316,433	330,391	+31,001	+13,958
International Field Office Administration, Operations and Training	30,940	30,958	30,811	-129	-147
Support for Missing and Exploited Children	8,358	---	8,358	---	+8,358
Subtotal	338,688	347,391	369,560	+30,872	+22,169
Headquarters, Management and Administration	174,160	177,282	188,964	+14,804	+11,682
Rowley Training Center	55,542	55,552	55,118	-424	-434
Information Integration and Technology Transformation	1,132	1,029	1,019	-113	-10
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	1,554,358	1,494,614	1,534,589	-19,769	+39,975
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses:					
Facilities	4,426	5,380	5,380	+954	---
Information Integration and Technology Transformation	52,268	46,395	46,395	-5,873	---
Subtotal	56,694	51,775	51,775	-4,919	---
Total, United States Secret Service	1,611,052	1,546,389	1,586,364	-24,688	+39,975
Total, title II, Security, Enforcement, and Investigations	32,955,113	31,743,338	32,211,036	-744,077	+467,698
Appropriations	(32,701,113)	(31,743,338)	(32,211,036)	(-490,077)	(+467,698)
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism	(254,000)	---	---	(-254,000)	---
(Fee Accounts)	(1,910,505)	(2,474,723)	(2,474,723)	(+564,218)	---
TITLE III - PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY					
National Protection and Programs Directorate					
Management and Administration:					
Administrative Activities	50,170	64,725	50,522	+352	-14,203

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Infrastructure Protection and Information Security:					
Infrastructure Protection:					
Infrastructure Analysis and Planning	58,910	57,975	66,144	+7,234	+8,169
Sector Management and Governance	66,994	60,477	60,335	-6,659	-142
Regional Field Operations	56,362	56,708	56,550	+188	-158
Infrastructure Security Compliance	77,867	85,790	77,104	-763	-8,686
Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection	260,133	260,950	260,133	---	-817
Cybersecurity and Communications:					
Cybersecurity:					
Cybersecurity Coordination	3,982	4,338	4,320	+338	-18
US Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) Operations	92,834	102,636	102,486	+9,652	-150
Federal Network Security	235,756	199,769	199,725	-36,031	-44
Network Security Deployment	328,680	406,441	382,367	+53,687	-24,074
Global Cybersecurity Management	25,929	19,057	19,037	-6,892	-20
Critical Infrastructure Cyber Protection and Awareness	62,685	73,043	73,013	+10,328	-30
Business Operations	6,205	5,125	5,089	-1,116	-36
Subtotal, Cybersecurity	756,071	810,409	786,037	+29,966	-24,372
Communications:					
Office of Emergency Communications	38,615	36,516	36,446	-2,169	-70
Priority Telecommunications Services	53,212	53,412	53,372	+160	-40
Next Generation Networks	24,475	21,160	21,158	-3,317	-2
Programs to Study and Enhance Telecommunications	12,917	10,102	10,074	-2,843	-28
Critical Infrastructure Protection Programs	10,949	9,445	9,409	-1,540	-36
Subtotal, Communications	140,168	130,635	130,459	-9,709	-176
Subtotal, Cybersecurity and Communications	896,239	941,044	916,496	+20,257	-24,548
Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security	1,156,372	1,201,994	1,176,629	+20,257	-25,365
Federal Protective Service:					
Basic Security	271,540	271,540	271,540	---	---
Building-specific Security	509,056	509,056	509,056	---	---
Reimbursable Security Fees (Contract Guard Services)	521,228	521,228	521,228	---	---
Subtotal, Federal Protective Service	1,301,824	1,301,824	1,301,824	---	---
Offsetting Collections	-1,301,824	-1,301,824	-1,301,824	---	---
Office of Biometric Identity Management	232,190	---	232,190	---	+232,190
Total, National Protection and Programs Directorate (gross)	2,740,556	2,568,543	2,761,165	+20,609	+192,622
Offsetting Collections	(-1,301,824)	(-1,301,824)	(-1,301,824)	---	---
Total, National Protection and Programs Directorate (net)	1,438,732	1,266,719	1,459,341	+20,609	+192,622
Office of Health Affairs					
BioWatch	85,305	90,609	79,534	-5,771	-11,075
National Biosurveillance Integration Center	12,987	8,000	13,000	+13	+5,000
Chemical Defense Program	1,998	824	824	-1,174	---
Planning and Coordination	5,402	4,995	4,995	-407	---
Salaries and Expenses	26,675	27,369	25,072	-1,603	-2,297
Total, Office of Health Affairs	132,367	131,797	123,425	-8,942	-8,372

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Administrative and Regional Offices	257,152	240,735	229,213	-27,939	-11,522
Office of National Capital Region Coordination	(4,289)	---	---	(-4,289)	---
Preparedness and Protection	178,868	293,684	174,766	-4,102	-118,918
Response	179,249	171,665	170,837	-8,412	-828
Urban Search and Rescue Response System	(35,145)	---	---	(-35,145)	---
Recovery	55,244	55,530	55,121	-123	-409
Mitigation	29,784	25,882	25,808	-3,976	-74
Mission Support	157,376	144,580	148,744	-8,632	+4,164
Centrally Managed Accounts	114,472	110,306	110,306	-4,166	---
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	972,145	1,042,382	914,795	-57,350	-127,587
(Defense)	(57,942)	(77,000)	(67,000)	(+9,058)	(-10,000)
(Nondefense)	(914,203)	(965,382)	(847,795)	(-66,408)	(-117,587)
Grants and Training:					
State and Local Programs:					
Discretionary State and Local Grants	188,743	---	1,264,826	+1,076,083	+1,264,826
State Homeland Security Grant Program	346,253	---	---	-346,253	---
Operation Stonegarden	(46,553)	---	---	(-46,553)	---
Urban Area Security Initiative	499,876	---	---	-499,876	---
Nonprofit Security Grants	(9,990)	---	---	(-9,990)	---
Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance	97,403	---	---	-97,403	---
Amtrak Security	(9,990)	---	---	(-9,990)	---
Port Security Grants	97,403	---	---	-97,403	---
Subtotal, Discretionary Grants	1,229,678	---	1,264,826	+35,148	+1,264,826
Education, Training, and Exercises:					
Emergency Management Institute	17,787	---	17,805	+18	+17,805
Center for Domestic Preparedness	64,926	---	64,991	+65	+64,991
National Domestic Preparedness Consortium	92,907	---	93,000	+93	+93,000
National Exercise Program	32,346	---	32,378	+32	+32,378
Continuing Training	26,973	---	27,000	+27	+27,000
Subtotal	234,939	---	235,174	+235	+235,174
National Preparedness Grant Program	---	1,043,200	---	---	-1,043,200
First Responder Assistance Program:					
Emergency Management Performance Grants	---	350,000	---	---	-350,000
Fire Grants	---	335,000	---	---	-335,000
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act Grants	---	335,000	---	---	-335,000
Training Partnership Grants	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Subtotal, First Responder Assistance Program	---	1,080,000	---	---	-1,080,000
Subtotal, State and Local Programs	1,464,617	2,123,200	1,500,000	+35,383	-623,200
(Defense)	(46,553)	---	---	(-46,553)	---
(Nondefense)	(1,418,064)	(2,123,200)	(1,500,000)	(+81,936)	(-623,200)
Subtotal, State and Local Programs (net)	1,464,617	2,123,200	1,500,000	+35,383	-623,200
Firefighter Assistance Grants:					
Fire Grants	337,163	---	337,500	+337	+337,500
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act Grants	337,163	---	337,500	+337	+337,500
Subtotal	674,326	---	675,000	+674	+675,000

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency Management Performance Grants	349,650	---	350,000	+350	+350,000
Subtotal, Grants and Training	2,488,593	2,123,200	2,525,000	+36,407	+401,800
Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program	-1,443	-1,272	-1,272	+171	---
United States Fire Administration	43,956	41,306	42,162	-1,794	+856
Disaster Relief Fund:					
Base Disaster Relief	607,318	594,522	594,522	-12,796	---
Disaster Relief Category	6,400,000	5,626,386	5,626,386	-773,614	---
Subtotal, Disaster Relief Fund	7,007,318	6,220,908	6,220,908	-786,410	---
(transfer out to Inspector General)	(-23,976)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24)	---
Subtotal, Disaster Relief Fund (net)	6,983,342	6,196,908	6,196,908	-786,434	---
Flood Hazard Mapping and Risk Analysis Program	95,234	84,361	95,202	-32	+10,841
National Flood Insurance Fund:					
Salaries and Expenses	21,978	22,000	22,000	+22	---
Flood Plain Management and Mapping	148,851	154,300	154,300	+5,449	---
Subtotal	170,829	176,300	176,300	+5,471	---
Offsetting Fee Collections	-170,829	-176,300	-176,300	-5,471	---
National Predisaster Mitigation Fund	24,975	---	22,500	-2,475	+22,500
Emergency Food and Shelter	119,880	100,000	120,000	+120	+20,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	10,750,658	9,610,885	9,939,295	-811,363	+328,410
(Appropriations)	(4,350,658)	(3,984,499)	(4,312,909)	(-37,749)	(+328,410)
(Disaster Relief Category)	(6,400,000)	(5,626,386)	(5,626,386)	(-773,614)	---
(Transfer out)	(-23,976)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24)	---
Total, title III, Protection, Preparedness, Response and Recovery Directorate	12,321,757	11,009,401	11,522,061	-799,696	+512,660
Appropriations	(5,921,757)	(5,383,015)	(5,895,675)	(-26,082)	(+512,660)
Disaster Relief Category	(6,400,000)	(5,626,386)	(5,626,386)	(-773,614)	---
(Transfer out)	(-23,976)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24)	---
TITLE IV - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES					
United States Citizenship and Immigration Services					
Appropriations:					
E-Verify Program	111,812	114,213	114,213	+2,401	---
Immigrant Integration Programs	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Subtotal	111,812	124,213	114,213	+2,401	-10,000
Fee Accounts:					
Adjudication Services:					
District Operations	(1,313,702)	(1,510,836)	(1,536,880)	(+223,178)	(+26,044)
(Immigrant Integration Grants)	(7,500)	---	---	(-7,500)	---
Service Center Operations	(524,788)	(550,653)	(578,393)	(+53,605)	(+27,740)
Asylum, Refugee and International Operations	(196,584)	(236,494)	(236,710)	(+40,126)	(+216)
Records Operations	(86,774)	(94,039)	(94,039)	(+7,265)	---
Business Transformation	(269,216)	(183,464)	(183,464)	(-85,752)	---
(Digitization Program)	(29,000)	---	---	(-29,000)	---
Subtotal	2,391,064	2,575,486	2,629,486	+238,422	+54,000
Information and Customer Services:					
Operating Expenses	(89,011)	(96,409)	(96,409)	(+7,398)	---
Administration:					
Operating Expenses	(382,334)	(339,421)	(339,421)	(-42,913)	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE)	(20,048)	(29,937)	(29,937)	(+9,889)	---
Subtotal, Fee Accounts	2,882,457	3,041,253	3,095,253	+212,796	+54,000
H1-B Visa Fee Account:					
Adjudication Services:					
Service Center Operations	---	(13,000)	---	---	(-13,000)
H1-B and L Fraud Prevention Fee Account:					
Adjudication Services:					
District Operations	---	(26,044)	---	---	(-26,044)
Asylum and Refugee Operating Expenses	---	(216)	---	---	(-216)
Service Center Operations	---	(14,740)	---	---	(-14,740)
Subtotal	---	41,000	---	---	-41,000
Total, Fee Accounts	2,882,457	3,095,253	3,095,253	+212,796	---
Total, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services	(2,994,269)	(3,219,466)	(3,209,466)	(+215,197)	(-10,000)
Appropriations	(111,812)	(124,213)	(114,213)	(+2,401)	(-10,000)
Fee Accounts	(2,882,457)	(3,095,253)	(3,095,253)	(+212,796)	---
(Immigration Examination Fee Account)	(2,834,907)	(3,041,253)	(3,041,253)	(+206,346)	---
(H1-B Visa Fee Account)	(12,550)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(+450)	---
(H1-B and L Fraud Prevention Fee Account)	(35,000)	(41,000)	(41,000)	(+6,000)	---
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Law Enforcement Training	197,806	210,818	198,317	+511	-12,501
Management and Administration	29,134	28,420	28,228	-906	-192
Accreditation	1,299	1,306	1,300	+1	-6
Subtotal	228,239	240,544	227,845	-394	-12,699
Acquisitions, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses	28,357	30,885	30,885	+2,528	---
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	256,596	271,429	258,730	+2,134	-12,699
Science and Technology					
Management and Administration	131,868	129,608	129,000	-2,868	-608
Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations:					
Research, Development, and Innovation	450,104	467,000	---	-450,104	-467,000
Apex R&D	---	---	15,013	+15,013	+15,013
Border Security	---	---	31,580	+31,580	+31,580
Chem/Bio/Radiological/Nuclear/Explosives Defense	---	---	194,294	+194,294	+194,294
Counterterrorist R&D	---	---	24,561	+24,561	+24,561
Cyber Security	---	---	70,829	+70,829	+70,829
Disaster Resilience	---	---	130,723	+130,723	+130,723
Subtotal, Research, Development and Innovation	450,104	467,000	467,000	+16,896	---
Laboratory Facilities	164,767	857,785	547,785	+383,018	-310,000
Acquisition and Operations Support	47,936	41,703	41,703	-6,233	---
University Programs	39,960	31,000	40,000	+40	+9,000
Subtotal	702,767	1,397,488	1,096,488	+393,721	-301,000
Total, Science and Technology	834,635	1,527,096	1,225,488	+390,853	-301,608
Domestic Nuclear Detection Office					
Management and Administration	39,610	37,510	37,353	-2,257	-157

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research, Development, and Operations:					
Systems Engineering and Architecture	29,970	21,222	21,222	-8,748	---
Systems Development	27,972	21,243	21,243	-6,729	---
Transformational Research and Development	74,691	75,291	75,291	+600	---
Assessments	32,967	39,918	39,918	+6,951	---
Operations Support	35,465	30,835	30,835	-4,630	---
National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center	25,538	22,701	22,701	-2,837	---
Subtotal	226,603	211,210	211,210	-15,393	---
Systems Acquisition:					
Radiation Portal Monitor Program	1,354	7,000	7,000	+5,646	---
Securing the Cities	21,978	22,000	22,000	+22	---
Human Portable Radiation Detection Systems	28,072	13,600	13,600	-14,472	---
Subtotal	51,404	42,600	42,600	-8,804	---
Total, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office	317,617	291,320	291,163	-26,454	-157
Total, title IV, Research and Development, Training, and Services	1,520,660	2,214,058	1,889,594	+368,934	-324,464
(Fee Accounts)	(2,882,457)	(3,095,253)	(3,095,253)	(+212,796)	---
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
USCIS Immigrant Integration Grants	2,498	---	---	-2,498	---
NSSE Reimbursement Fund	4,995	---	---	-4,995	---
Data Center Migration	54,945	---	34,200	-20,745	+34,200
DHS Consolidated Headquarters Project	28,971	---	---	-28,971	---
Community Disaster Loans	12,987	---	---	-12,987	---
Rescission of NPPD IPIS Unobligated Balances	-1,683	---	---	+1,683	---
Working Capital Fund (rescission)(defense)	---	---	-9,000	-9,000	-9,000
Working Capital Fund (rescission)(nondefense)	---	---	-241,000	-241,000	-241,000
Visa Lottery Fee	---	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000	---
Analysis and Operations (rescission)	-1,800	---	---	+1,800	---
CBP BSFIT (rescission)	-73,232	---	---	+73,232	---
ICE Construction (rescission)	-9,516	---	---	+9,516	---
TSA Surface Transportation (rescission)	-21,667	---	---	+21,667	---
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)(P.L. 111-83)	---	-14,500	-14,500	-14,500	---
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)(P.L. 112-10)	---	-9,000	-21,612	-21,612	-12,612
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)(P.L. 112-74)	---	-18,500	-41,000	-41,000	-22,500
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)(P.L. 113-6)	---	---	-32,479	-32,479	-32,479
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)	-154,500	---	---	+154,500	---
Treasury Asset Forfeiture Fund (rescission)	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
Predisaster Mitigation Fund (rescission)	-12,000	---	---	+12,000	---
Rescission of Legacy Funds	-7,680	---	---	+7,680	---
Rescission of Unobligated Balances	-24,922	---	---	+24,922	---
Total, title V, General Provisions	-202,604	-92,000	-475,391	-272,787	-383,391
Appropriations	(104,396)	(-50,000)	(-15,800)	(-120,196)	(+34,200)
Rescissions	(-307,000)	(-42,000)	(-459,591)	(-152,591)	(-417,591)
TITLE ___ - OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2).					
Customs and Border Protection					
Salaries and Expenses (emergency)	1,667	---	---	-1,667	---
Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Salaries and Expenses (emergency)	855	---	---	-855	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Coast Guard					
Acquisitions, Construction and Improvements (emerg.)..	274,233	---	---	-274,233	---
United States Secret Service					
Salaries and Expenses (emergency).....	300	---	---	-300	---
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Disaster Relief Fund (disaster relief category).....	5,379,000	---	---	-5,379,000	---
Disaster Relief Fund (emergency).....	6,108,735	---	---	-6,108,735	---
Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account:					
Direct Loan Subsidy (emergency).....	296,000	---	---	-296,000	---
Administrative Expenses (emergency).....	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Science and Technology					
Research, Development, Acquisition and Operations (emergency).....	3,249	---	---	-3,249	---
Domestic Nuclear Detention Office					
Systems Acquisition (emergency).....	3,869	---	---	-3,869	---
Total, title __ - Other Appropriations.....	12,071,908	---	---	-12,071,908	---
Grand Total.....	59,752,935	46,114,107	46,079,222	-13,673,713	-34,885
Appropriations.....	(41,334,027)	(40,529,721)	(40,912,427)	(-421,600)	(+382,706)
Rescissions.....	(-307,000)	(-42,000)	(-459,591)	(-152,591)	(-417,591)
Emergency appropriations.....	(6,692,908)	---	---	(-6,692,908)	---
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.....	(254,000)	---	---	(-254,000)	---
Disaster Relief Category.....	(11,779,000)	(5,626,386)	(5,626,386)	(-6,152,614)	---
(Fee Funded Programs).....	(4,792,962)	(5,569,976)	(5,569,976)	(+777,014)	---
(by transfer).....	(23,976)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24)	---
(transfer out).....	(-23,976)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24)	---

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2014 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill and am pleased that we're bringing this bill to the House floor under an open rule. I want to commend Chairman CARTER for the open, collaborative, and bipartisan process he has led this spring. There's a long history of bipartisan cooperation on this subcommittee that's critical for allowing us to focus on the Nation's domestic security needs.

The funding allocation provided to the subcommittee hews closely to the overall spending figure requested by the President for the Department of Homeland Security, but I don't believe either number is fully adequate to provide DHS with the resources it needs to help keep the Nation safe. We have been able to fill a number of significant holes in the President's budget request, but that has necessitated creating some shortfalls in other areas.

I want to make clear, however, that my support of Chairman CARTER's efforts are in no way an endorsement of the overall discretionary spending caps adopted by the majority in the House budget resolution. Sequestration was intended to be a mechanism to force the parties to come together to address our long-term fiscal challenges. It was never meant, in itself, to be a tool for deficit reduction, and it certainly was never meant to be the basis for a discretionary spending cap on a budget resolution.

While not quite sufficient, our allocation is still better than most of the other domestic appropriations bills, which will struggle to appropriately fund critical priorities, such as medical and energy research, law enforcement and the justice system, and investments in education and infrastructure. Our Homeland Security bill is not the only bill that deals with our country's strength and security, and the allocations provided to these other subcommittees by the Ryan budget will put that strength and security at grave risk.

That being said, and given the low 302(b) allocation this subcommittee had to work with, I applaud the chairman and the staff for addressing a number of Democratic priorities, including first responder and antiterrorism grants, as well as providing increases above the request for frontline DHS employees so that they can continue to conduct critical operations along our borders, protect our Nation's airports, seaports, and land ports of entry, and respond to natural disasters across the country.

Right before last year's markup, we were reminded of the threats facing our Nation when the intelligence community thwarted an attempt to place a nonmetallic improvised explosive device on an aircraft bound for the United States.

This year, following the terrorist attacks in Boston, we're forced to confront the tragic reality that these threats remain constant, that terrorists remain determined to attack the homeland and they will devise more and more perverse ways to kill and harm innocent people. This requires DHS and the intelligence community and local first responders to remain vigilant and to strive continually to optimize their scarce resources. That's why I'm pleased this bill increases funding for critical grant programs, while once again rejecting the administration's insufficiently articulated proposal to reengineer the grant structure, a proposal that has not been authorized.

Specifically, the bill includes $1.5 billion for FEMA State and local grants, an increase of $35 million over the FY13 appropriated level, and it keeps both fire grants and emergency performance grants level with FY13. The bill also doubles the requested funding for the Office of Bombing Prevention to accelerate planning, training, and awareness programs to help detect and respond to IEDs and other explosive devices.

Equally important, the bill provides a $16.9 million increase in funding for research and development efforts at the Science and Technology Directorate. When you combine this funding with what was included in the final FY13 bill, we've made significant progress since FY12, providing funding for high-priority research efforts and some new projects, as well.

The bill also provides substantial funding—$404 million—for construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, a laboratory that's essential to our ability to help prevent and respond to animal disease threats.

The bill also increases funding for critical Coast Guard and CBP air and marine acquisitions to recapitalize aging assets while also bringing the latest aviation and vessel technologies online to ensure our frontline personnel can operate more effectively, improving on the administration's request on each of those fronts.

□ 1300

I am also pleased that the bill provides funding for an additional 1,600 Customs and Border Protection officers requested by the administration and for substantially strengthened cybersecurity protective efforts. These efforts are absolutely necessary to monitor and detect intrusions to our Federal networks and protect them from foreign espionage and cyber attacks.

Finally, I commend Chairman CARTER for providing the requested amount, $6.22 billion, for the Disaster Relief Fund, which will ensure that there are sufficient disaster relief resources moving into the coming fiscal year. And I echo the chairman's pledge of support for Representative TOM COLE, for his constituents and the other people of Oklahoma to fully address their needs.

I also want to remind my colleagues, however, that should emergency disaster relief funding become necessary beyond what we have budgeted, Congress must respond immediately and effectively, without distracting fights over budget policy.

I do have some concerns with the bill, notably, some of the immigration provisions. The bill once again sets an arbitrary minimum of 34,000 ICE detention beds, denying ICE the flexibility it needs to manage its enforcement and removal resources in response to changing circumstances and to use cheaper, alternative forms of supervision when appropriate.

The bill also unnecessarily and wastefully continues the 287(g) program, which was designed to secure local law enforcement participation in immigration enforcement. In addition to being seriously flawed, this program has become obsolete with the full implementation of the Secure Communities program.

I also must note my concern with some of the withholdings in the bill. I understand the need to give incentives to the Department to respect reporting deadlines established by the committee, but I hope we can temper some of these withholdings as we move through the process, as they have the potential to seriously undermine the Department's management functions.

The bill also provides no funding for the new DHS headquarters, despite $105 million in the request. We have been told repeatedly by the administration that deferring these investments will greatly increase the project's costs and eventually it's bound to affect frontline operations, and I believe they're correct on both counts.

I also want to note my strong objection to three general provisions related to abortion services for detainees that were added to the bill in full committee. While they have no impact on ICE policies, they unnecessarily interject a divisive issue into the bill, distracting us from what should be our focus and straying far outside the lines of the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

So while I support the bill as reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee and believe it represents an improvement over the budget request, it still falls short of the bill I believe we would want to craft were we operating under a more adequate allocation.

Let me also express the hope, going into this debate, that this year we can avoid loading the bill up here on the floor with controversial and unnecessary policy riders. There will be a time and place to debate immigration reform, and the Homeland Security appropriations bill should not be caught up in that process.

In closing, I, too, want to express my appreciation for the hardworking and dedicated staff on both sides of the aisle. In the course of just 2 months, they have diligently wrapped up the fiscal 2013 bill, digested and analyzed the President's fiscal 2014 request, and

crafted the bipartisan measure before us. Thanks to Ben Nicholson, Kris Mallard, Corenell Teague, Valerie Baldwin, Pam Williams, and Hilary May on the majority side, and of course, Darek Newby and Justin Wein on our side of the aisle.

With that, I urge approval of the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is the former founding chairman of this subcommittee and a former great prosecutor from the State of Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

First, I'd like to thank our colleagues for their careful consideration yesterday of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, which, as you know, passed overwhelmingly in the House. There were only four Members who voted against that bill, and I'd like to ask all of the supporters of that bill to continue on this bill today. It's a very conscientious piece of legislation that I believe can and should pass this body on a bipartisan basis.

The bill before you, as the chairman and the ranking member have said, provides $38.9 billion for the Department of Homeland Security. In such austere budget times, this bill rightly prioritizes spending on programs that save American lives. Frontline protection, terrorism prevention and response, disaster recovery, and a strong and secure border, all of these are paramount to the safety and security of our homeland.

Mr. Chairman, we are constantly reminded that we can't let our frontline security efforts lapse. The terrible attack at the Boston Marathon underscored the need to support key readiness programs, provide heroic first responders with the funding and equipment they deserve, and improve intelligence and threat-targeting activities so we can help avoid terrible attacks like Boston in the future.

With this bill, we are tightening security at our borders with funding increases for Customs and Border Protection and ICE that preserve the highest totals of Border Patrol agents and CBP officers and the highest detention bed capacity in history. We've targeted funding to combat human trafficking, child exploitation, cyber crime, and drug smuggling. And we're protecting our shores and access points with adequate funding for the Coast Guard and TSA.

This bill also fully supports the known requirements from the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund, which provides assistance to localities overwhelmed by catastrophic natural disasters like the recent tornadoes in the Midwest. Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the victims of those disasters that have ravaged our Nation, like Oklahoma.

To that end, this bill provides an additional $6.2 billion for that Disaster Relief Fund. That's for fiscal 2014. Right now, though, as the chairman has said, combined with the approximately $11 billion kitty that FEMA has on hand, there is sufficient funding for the immediate response needs in Oklahoma and other affected areas.

Our committee stands at the ready to reassess any further needs as a fuller picture of the damage becomes clear. It's our duty as Members of Congress to provide this critical assistance to communities that are suffering from such unexpected and devastating natural disasters.

Mr. Chairman, strong national security comes at a price. And as we all know, tax dollars for these programs are in limited supply these days, so we can't let any of the funding that we appropriate to the Department of Homeland Security go to unproven or wasteful programs. Across the Department, we've made careful reductions that bring total funding in this bill to $617 million less than the fiscal year 2013 enacted level. We've enforced strict reporting requirements and other oversight tools to guarantee that DHS is spending its dollars wisely, and we've prevented funding from being used on risky or controversial efforts like transferring detainees from Guantanamo Bay or another Fast and Furious-type program.

Before I conclude, let me extend my appreciation to Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE, former chairman of the subcommittee, for their hard work in crafting this bill. As has been said by both sides, this is a nonpartisan bill. It always has been that way.

□ 1310

We've attempted to work from the very beginning of this subcommittee's existence to work across the aisle, to be sure that the homeland is adequately protected. That takes cooperation across the middle aisle, and it's happened over the years, and it's happened this year. And I want to thank these two gentlemen, especially, for working together, as they have.

This is JOHN CARTER's first bill as a cardinal. He's making his maiden voyage, and I think the ship is sailing through. He says he hopes so.

And we want to thank, of course, the staff of the subcommittee for their tireless hours dedicated towards crafting this bill of great importance to our national security.

So I'm proud to say, Mr. Chairman, that I stand before you in 100 percent support of this bill. It represents all that makes our country great and the security that will keep our country great. And I urge our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to share the very gracious remarks on the part of the chair of the full committee, the chair of the subcommittee, the outstanding ranking member, and all the staff for the important work you did on this bill.

Over the past year, we have experienced the devastation of Hurricane Sandy, heartbreak in Moore, Oklahoma, tragic acts of terror in Boston. Disasters, natural or manmade, pose risks to our communities, which must be matched with the resources of the Federal Government and, in particular, the Department of Homeland Security.

The bill before us, which is approximately $35 million below the administration's request, does a good job of meeting these tasks, yet inadequately funds other programs such as operational accounts, which face cuts so severe that they cannot realistically be implemented.

I do thank the chairman and ranking member for including several priorities, providing $1.5 billion for FEMA State and local grants which were underfunded in the request, prioritizing high-risk areas in our grant programs, continuing the Securing the Cities program to prevent radiological or nuclear attacks, making needed investments in cybersecurity, and including language to help stem sexual assault in the Coast Guard, which has become a significant and outrageous problem in the military.

However, the bill before us ignores the dangerous impact of sequestration, putting off difficult choices that must be made if we are to enact responsible spending bills for FY14.

With the majority's unworkable 302(a) allocation, which is $92 billion below the President's request, and less than the amounts agreed to under the Budget Control Act, this is one of the few bills that will have sufficient funding to garner bipartisan support.

The budget resolution and appropriations process under way harm our ability to invest in education, medical research, transportation infrastructure, energy development, all of which we need to grow our economy and build a competitive workforce for the future.

I was very proud to serve on the Homeland Security Subcommittee and appreciate, again, the chairman and ranking member's efforts, as well as the professional staff, in writing this bill. This subcommittee has a history of working across the aisle; and if we avoid poison pill riders during this debate, we will likely pass a bipartisan bill to provide responsible funding levels for the agencies tasked with vital security functions.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from the great State of Texas, (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the full Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my dear friend and colleague

from Texas, the great State, Judge CARTER, and commend him for a fine job on this legislation.

The recent Boston attacks serve as a stark reminder that the terrorist threat to America remains constant. Despite the President's dangerous narrative downplaying the radical jihadist threat to America, al Qaeda and its affiliates and those they inspire have not given up their quest to attack us.

In today's challenging fiscal climate, it is more important than ever that every dollar spent on national security be linked to results. Our safety depends on the strategic funding of programs and technologies that provide us with valuable defenses and measurable outcomes. This bill demands that those criteria be met.

As chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I'm pleased to see that this bill provides appropriate funding for our frontline efforts, reins in wasteful spending, and ensures that tax dollars are accounted for by enacting important reporting requirements for the Department.

I will soon introduce a cybersecurity bill defining the Department's role in ensuring the real-time flow of information to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure, data, intelligence, and financial systems. This bill provides the necessary funding needed for DHS to fulfill its important cybersecurity mission.

I recently introduced H.R. 1417, the Border Security Results Act, requiring DHS to implement a strategy to gain operational control of our borders. The appropriations bill presented here today supports a strong commitment to secure our borders by providing over $350 million to the Border Technology account and supports the refinement and adaptation of proven technology needed to monitor the border and support our boots on the ground.

The bill provides for an additional 800 CBP officers, $387 million for ICE operations, and funding for ICE's 34,000 detention beds, despite the administration's plan to reduce that number and release hundreds of dangerous criminals into our communities.

It also restores cuts to our Coast Guard, which will strengthen our interdiction efforts in the Western Hemisphere.

And, finally, the bill applies lessons learned from the recent Boston attacks. For example, the bill rejects the President's proposed 39 percent cut to Bombing Prevention programs, and increases funding for visa security and overstay enforcement programs by $10 million.

This bill reflects the right priorities and insists on accountability from DHS. It will help to ensure that America is safe, secure, and protected; and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I'm now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), an outstanding member of our subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their bipartisan efforts in the drafting of this bill.

Unfortunately, with the refusal of the House leadership to go to conference on the budget, this year's appropriations process will be at the expense of essential funding for critical programs such as education, research, transportation, and infrastructure.

Nonetheless, this bill will help make our Nation stronger and more secure. It robustly funds grants to provide our first responders with the resources they need to protect the public when disaster strikes.

The bill also funds the highly effective Alternatives to Detention program at $24 million above the President's request. While I believe ATD should be significantly expanded, I was pleased to see the increased allocation for this proven program.

In addition, the bill provides a $16.9 million increase in funding for the Science and Technology Directorate, which will enable DHS to develop new tools to detect and deter terrorists before they attack.

However, there are still aspects of the bill that are of concern. For example, the bill continues to mandate that every night ICE maintain 34,000 detention beds, even when they are not needed. This needless quota restricts ICE's flexibility in using the smartest, most cost-effective means of enforcing our immigration laws by limiting ICE's ability to base detention decisions on whether or not an individual poses a threat to our country.

□ 1320

The bill also increases funding for the ineffective and unnecessary 287(g) program, which encourages racial profiling and undermines confidence in law enforcement in our minority and immigrant communities. These scarce resources could be better spent addressing serious threats like cyber warfare and cyber crime. Instead, the bill underfunds this critical national priority by more than $24 million below the President's request.

In spite of these weaknesses and given the limited resources allocated to the subcommittee, I do believe Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE have done their best to enable DHS to protect the American people in an increasingly dangerous world. For that reason, I support the bill in its current form. However, I understand some Members will try to pass anti-immigrant amendments, which would make it impossible for me to support this bill. These efforts are contrary to the bipartisan spirit in which this bill was written and the bipartisan spirit in which this House has always approached issues of national security. If introduced, I urge my colleagues to reject these irresponsible amendments.

Again, I thank Chairman CARTER, Ranking Member PRICE, and the subcommittee's hardworking staff for putting together this bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), a former chairman of this subcommittee and currently chairman of the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I rise today also in support of the FY 2014 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. I want to commend Chairman CARTER and also Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work in making sure that they set up the right priorities during a very difficult budget time here in this Nation.

The bill provides the resources that are needed to meet our most essential obligations, while at the same time maintaining fiscal responsibility and also greater oversight. It is $617 million below last year's spending level. As has been mentioned, the bill rejects the administration's proposed reductions to CBP operations and the Coast Guard and increases funding for critical programs such as the TSA Secure Flight Program and the FEMA first responder grants.

The bill maintains the needed number of beds for ICE detention. It also includes a substantial amount of funding for NBAF. This important asset provides our Nation with critical capabilities to conduct research and develop vaccines and other countermeasures in a time when we would most need it.

Again, I want to congratulate Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work on this bill. I would urge my colleagues that this is a good bill and a measure that should have their support.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to another outstanding subcommittee member, Mr. CUELLAR of Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. I rise in support of this appropriations bill, which includes the hiring of 1,600 new CBP officers. Those are the men and women in blue that man our ports of entry. These 1,600 CBP officers will be a huge and historic step in addressing the congested ports of entries. And I thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their leadership and a bipartisan approach to this very important issue.

In FY 2012, CBP processed more than 350 million travelers and facilitated $2.3 trillion worth of trade at ports of entry. America's ports of entry are vital hubs of economic activity. As high volumes of goods and persons move through our ports of entry, port security is an urgent priority. Therefore, this new increase of CBP officers will achieve the goal of facilitating trade and travel and boost economic development.

The southern border is one of the fastest-growing regions in North America. In fact, every day there's $1.2 billion of trade between the U.S. and Mexico. My hometown of Laredo handles about 45 percent of all the trade between the U.S. and Mexico. In fact,

every day about 12,000 commercial trucks cross the bridges in Laredo. These 1,000 men and women in blue will help facilitate trade and travel at our ports of entry and will help our economy. Again, I want to thank both the chairman and ranking member for this effort.

We also have to do some enhancements to infrastructure at our critical ports. That's also very necessary. If we limit the Federal funding at our ports of entry, we need to be innovative and think outside the box. In fact, it's essential that the Federal Government explore the use of public-private partnerships, which allows the Federal agencies to partner up with local governments and private stakeholders to help fund the land port, seaport, or airport infrastructure projects. These innovative financing mechanisms, with the proper safeguards that we will add, will adequately staff, supply, construct, and rehab our ports of entry and, in turn, will make our ports more secure and more efficient.

I've been working with my colleagues, both the Democrats and Republicans, to encourage the use of public-private partnerships. In fact, I reached out to our colleague in the Senate from the Homeland Security Subcommittee, the chairwoman, MARY LANDRIEU, and she supports this particular concept. I look forward to working with my good friend, the judge from Texas. Both he and I agree that these are not Federal handouts but they actually allow the local government to partner up with the Federal Government and allow us to make our ports more efficient, more effective. I look forward to working with you, Chairman CARTER, and with Ranking Member PRICE and the staff as we address this conference committee.

I ask you to support this bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I rise in support of the 2014 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill being debated this afternoon. I certainly want to applaud the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ROGERS, and certainly the chair of the subcommittee, Mr. CARTER, as well as Ranking Member PRICE and the ranking member of the full committee, Mrs. LOWEY, for carefully piecing together a bill that appropriately addresses the evolving threats that face our Nation. This bill strikes a proper balance of fiscal responsibility while fulfilling the mission of vital security programs and providing the resources to enforce current law.

Regarding fiscal restraint, we're considering a bill today that provides for a reduction in the Department's annual budget by $613 million, eliminating ineffectual programs. Yet the legislation was crafted in such a way that agencies and programs will receive the resources and flexibility they need to meet the security needs facing communities across the country day in and day out.

For example, in the wake of the Boston bombings this spring, the bill before us restores DHS' Bombing Prevention program and increases counter-IED training. The Disaster Relief Fund, or the DRF, is robustly funded and will meet the disaster needs of Oklahoma, as well as those who were affected by the hurricanes in the Northeast, such as Hurricane Sandy.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DENT. The FEMA first responder grants, including fire grants, will receive a 20 percent increase. Further, these SAFER grants will continue to provide additional flexibility to allow communities to use grants to retain or rehire firefighters facing layoffs. As an aside, I want to thank again Ranking Member PRICE as well as Chairman ROGERS for working with me on this critical issue once again.

The bottom line is this is a smart, responsible bill that practices fiscal restraint while addressing our most pressing needs in securing our homeland. I urge support of the underlying bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. At this time I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. At this time I yield 2 minutes to a very distinguished member of our subcommittee from the great of State of Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal 2014 Homeland Security appropriations bill.

First, I would like to thank Chairman CARTER and the subcommittee staff for all the work that they have done in preparation for this legislation.

□ 1330

This bill is a perfect example of what happens when real time and thought is put into how taxpayer dollars will be spent.

As I have often said, budgeting is about prioritization, and this is exactly what this bill does. The legislation before us today exercises fiscal discipline. As a whole, we will reduce discretionary spending, while ensuring that programs vital to our national security are properly supported.

This bill also recalibrates the President's pernicious budget proposals for the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that we are getting the most out of every taxpayer dollar. We must ensure the protection of Americans by strengthening security at and within our borders.

By streamlining select programs within DHS and implementing stringent oversight, Chairman CARTER and committee staff, with help from Ranking Member PRICE, have produced a bill that adequately funds our highest security priorities and eliminates waste, fraud, and abuse.

Again, I thank the subcommittee for their diligence in crafting this legislation that pays equal heed to the protections of our taxpayer dollars and the security of our citizens.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who is the chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Subcommittee of the full committee.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, it is my pleasure to rise today in very strong support of H.R. 2217.

Earlier this year, the President released a fiscal year 2014 budget that would cut funding for the Coast Guard by nearly 10 percent below current levels. This is the second year in a row that this President has asked the Coast Guard to sacrifice mission readiness and success to pay for his questionable spending at other agencies.

The President's budget would slash the service's acquisitions budget by 42 percent below current levels and would severely undermine efforts to recapitalize the service's aging and failing legacy assets, increase acquisition costs for taxpayers, and seriously degrade mission effectiveness. The President's proposed budget points to a future in which a downsized Coast Guard would fail to be able to accomplish even its most basic missions, and the cost could be measured in lives. Fortunately, the bill Chairman CARTER has put before us totally rejects the massive cuts proposed by the President and ensures the Coast Guard is provided with the resources needed to carry out its very critical missions.

I want to thank Chairman CARTER, Ranking Member PRICE, and staff for their tremendous efforts and for their commitment to the men and women of the Coast Guard and the safety of the maritime community.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Ranking Member PRICE.

First, let me commend both Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE on a strong, bipartisan bill. But let me especially recognize their leadership for adding language to this legislation to protect our most vulnerable constituents—our children.

This language that I refer to will effectively fence off $20 million in funds for child exploitation investigations

and forensics within Immigration and Customs Enforcement's Child Exploitation Investigations Unit at the Department of Homeland Security.

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

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

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

Since the 1970s, before we even had a Federal child pornography statute, ICE—which was then called the U.S. Customs Service—was a leader in the fight to protect our children. That is still true today. Last year, there were more than 1,600 criminal arrests relating to child exploitation, and 2,600 worldwide investigations were launched, setting new records for Homeland Security investigations. Already this year, there have been 1,382 criminal arrests relating to child exploitation. Their efforts are second to none, and I know they will continue to put these resources to good use.

But for every child rescued, hundreds more remain trapped in a current of abuse, the horrors of which none of us can truly imagine. We need the absolute best personnel going into the fight to rescue these children. That's why it's my hope that some of these funds will be used to employ our wounded warriors, in addition to the experienced agents already fighting these battles. And I thank the chairman and ranking member for adding report language in the bill to encourage the hiring of these valued veterans.

Our armed services have already protected us abroad, so naturally our veterans are a perfect choice to protect our most precious resources at home. In fact, retired Army Master Sergeant Rich Robertson is already fighting child exploitation at the ICE field office in Tennessee. In his words, ''Who better to hunt child predators than someone who's already hunted men?''

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

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

Mr. Chair, let me be clear: with the inclusion of this language, we are putting predators on notice. Their reign of terror is coming to an end—you can bet on it.

I thank my colleagues on the committee for committing to fight until every American child can live free from terror and exploitation.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA). He is the chairman of the committee that authorizes FEMA.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Chairman CARTER for putting together a bill that supports communities' ability to prepare for natural disasters in this very difficult fiscal environment.

As chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over FEMA, I want to thank them for including all three of my committee recommendations in the bill:

Thank you for continuing the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program, which saves money in future disaster assistance;

Thank you for preserving the FEMA administrator's authority for directing Federal disaster response by limiting the role of the principal Federal official;

Finally, thank you for funding the Emergency Management Performance Grants, or EMPG. With a 50 percent match requirement, EMPG grants leverage twice as many preparedness dollars as any other Federal program. For 60 years, EMPG has been focused on building local and State emergency management capability. There are plenty of programs that buy equipment and other things, but they won't do much good in a major disaster without qualified local emergency managers.

We have all seen the photos of evacuation buses flooded and useless in New Orleans because they didn't have a good hurricane evacuation plan. Emergency managers develop the plans to get people out of harm's way and to bring help from outside to the disaster area. The EMPG program helps buy that capability, and FEMA needs to keep the EMPG grant guidance focused on building local government emergency management capacity.

Again, let me thank Chairman ROGERS and Chairman CARTER for a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of very important report language included in the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, which will sustain inland Border Patrol stations in states along our nation's southern border.

In 2012, the U.S. Border Patrol proposed to close nine interior Border Patrol stations as part of a cost-savings proposal. Six of the nine proposed closures are located in Texas, including one located in my district in the city of Amarillo. The U.S. Border Patrol made this announcement without first ensuring that local law enforcement agencies will have the necessary resources to deal with the serious illegal immigration problems in our area. The inland stations proposed for closure apprehend hundreds of illegal aliens every year. If these closures are allowed, several hundred illegal aliens would have to be let go due to the lack of federal presence.

Since the proposal was unveiled last year, I have repeatedly heard from numerous local law enforcement officials who have serious concerns about the detrimental effect this would have on our local communities. They also believe this impact could reverberate throughout the country.

You do not have to be on—or even near—the border to see and feel the effects of illegal immigration on our local communities, and that is something we want to make sure the folks in Washington understand. Enforcement of our immigration laws does not stop at the border. Interior enforcement is essential as well. The Supreme Court has confirmed that it is the federal government's job to enforce these laws.

The Border Patrol cited ''cost-saving measures'' as a reason for this proposal, but it is simply penny-wise and pound-foolish. Although the agency anticipates closing these nine stations could save $1.3 million, they admit it will cost $2.47 million to transfer all the agents to other stations.

When I first brought these concerns to the U.S. Border Patrol, I was told time and time again that the agency was working with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to develop a transition plan to ensure that someone from the federal government will be there to pick up the phone when local law enforcement needs their help. To date, I have seen no evidence of a viable plan. There appears to be no draft plan or even an outline of a plan. There are simply too many unanswered questions to allow these inland border patrol station closures to proceed.

Any country must be able to control who and what comes across its borders. A government that cannot or will not do so fails in one of its most basic responsibilities.

I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee and Subcommittee Chairman CARTER for including this important language. I look forward to continuing to work together to ensure that our country is not left with a gaping hole in the enforcement of our immigration laws.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my disappointment that the DHS Appropriations bill provides $68 million in funding for 287(g)—a redundant, controversial immigration enforcement program.

I will be offering an amendment later today to cut $10 million from this unnecessary program and use those funds to increase CBP staffing at our nation's airports.

I would like to express my frustration that the legislation we are considering today, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, provides $68 million for the 287(g)—a superfluous and controversial program that allows local police to act like federal agents.

It does not make any sense to waste $68 million on a program that will not help us fix our immigration system nor secure our country.

Because of this, today, I will be proposing an amendment that will cut $10 million from this program and use that money to increase the number of customs agents in our airports.

This would reduce long lines and unacceptable delays, promoting commerce and tourism and furthering our economic recovery.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this bill, though not in support of the process that brought it to the House floor.

I am pleased that the overall committee process that produced this bill was bipartisan. For the first time in several years, this bill actually provides slightly more money for the State and Local Grant program, which funds such critical community grant programs like SAFER, AFG, and the Nonprofit Security Grant Program. Specifically, the bill provides $1.5 billion for State and Local Grants, which is $456.8 million above the request and $35.4 million above the FY2013 enacted level. This is still far less than what our firefighters, EMS and other first responders need to replace aging equipment and hire needed additional personnel, but it is nonetheless movement in the right direction.

Unfortunately, that positive development is offset by the failure of this bill to reverse the effects of sequester. TSA is addressing its sequestration-related funding shortfalls in part with a reduction in overtime and a freeze on hiring of new transportation security officers, which will lead to longer checkpoint lines at airports during peak summer travel season. CBP reduced overtime for CBP Officers, leading to significant increases in wait times at air, land, and sea ports of entry for citizens and international commerce. Coast Guard drug and migrant interdiction efforts have been reduced substantially, increasing the flow of narcotics into the United States. Sequestration cut $928 million from FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund (DRF), threatening to reduce funds available to help future victims of hurricanes, tornadoes, and other natural disasters recover and rebuild. This is no way to run a government, and I again urge the House majority to bring a bill to the floor that permanently overturns sequester. The American people want it, they need it, and we should do it today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, before us is H.R. 2217, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for FY 2014. Although this legislation is far from perfect, I rise in reluctant support of the bill because ensuring that our first responders and those who work on the frontline protecting our borders have adequate resources to protect our homeland and keep our citizens safe.

I strongly disapprove of the method employed by the House Republican to discharge the House's fundamental responsibility to reach a budget agreement with the Senate establishing the framework governing the appropriations process. The Republican majority brought to the floor and passed a rule that ''deems'' adopted the draconian spending limits imposed by the Ryan Budget resolution rather than a resolution that realistic and responsible limits that is to be negotiated and agreed to by House and Senate budget conferees.

Indeed, the Republican House leadership has refused for months to appoint conferees empowered to reach a budget agreement that is fair, balanced and would end sequestration.

I agree with President Obama that prior to consideration of appropriations bills the House and Senate should first reach agreement on an appropriate framework for all appropriations bills and one does not harm our economy or require draconian cuts to middle-class priorities.

Without such an agreement, House Republican appropriation bills will result in: hundreds of thousands of low-income children losing access to Head Start programs, tens of thousands of children with disabilities losing federal funding for their special education teachers and aides, thousands of federal agents who will not be able to secure the border, enforce drug laws, combat violent crime or apprehend fugitives; and thousands of scientists without medical grants to conduct research to find new treatments and cures for diseases like breast cancer and Alzheimer's.

The Ryan Budget that the House majority deemed adopted and incorporated in the rule governing consideration of this legislation assumes that the draconian funding levels established under sequestration will remain in place for the next several years.

Sequestration has been an unmitigated disaster for the American people, especially for Texas and the people I represent in Houston. Let me identify just a few of the ways my constituents are being adversely affected by sequestration:

Teachers and Schools: Texas will lose approximately $67.8 million for primary and secondary education, putting around 930 teacher and aide jobs at risk. In addition about 172,000 fewer students would be served and approximately 280 fewer schools would receive funding.

Education for Children with Disabilities: Texas will lose approximately $51 million for about 620 teachers, aides, and staff who help children with disabilities.

Head Start: Head Start and Early Head Start services would be eliminated for approximately 4,800 children in Texas, reducing access to critical early education.

Military Readiness: In Texas, approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees would be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around $274.8 million in total.

Law Enforcement and Public Safety Funds: Texas will lose about $1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

Job Search Assistance: Around 83,750 fewer Texans will get the help and skills they need to find employment as Texas will lose about $2,263,000 for job search assistance, referral, and placement, meaning.

Child Care: Up to 2,300 disadvantaged and vulnerable children could lose access to child care, which is also essential for working parents to hold down a job.

Vaccines for Children: In Texas around 9,730 fewer children will receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and Hepatitis B due to reduced funding for vaccinations.

Violence Against Women Grants: Texas could lose up to $543,000 to provide services to victims of domestic violence, resulting in up to 2,100 fewer victims being served.

Public Health: Texas will lose approximately $2,402,000 to help upgrade its ability to respond to public health threats including infectious diseases, natural disasters, and biological, chemical, nuclear, and radiological events. In addition, Texas will lose about $6,750,000 in grants to help prevent and treat substance abuse, resulting in around 2,800 fewer admissions to substance abuse programs. And the Texas State Department of Public Health will lose about $1,146,000 resulting in around 28,600 fewer HIV tests.

Regarding the merits of the legislation before us, let me say that there is much in the bill that should command bipartisan support. For example, the bill includes $1.5 billion for FEMA State and Local Grants, which is $35.4 million above the FY 2013 enacted level. These grants fund critical programs such as the Homeland Security Grant Program, which primarily fund first responders, and the Urban Area Security Initiative.

The bill also provides $10.6 billion for Customs and Border Protection and includes funding for the additional 1,600 Customs and Border Protection Officers requested by the President.

The bill also makes needed investments in cybersecurity, providing $786 million to help protect federal networks from foreign espionage and cyber attacks. The bill also provides a total of $6.2 billion for disaster relief, as requested by the President.

A major improvement to the bill was the adoption by the House of the Jackson Lee-Markey-Grimm-Reed Amendment which prohibits the Transportation Security Agency from changing its Prohibited Items List (PIL) to permit knives on planes. Adoption of my amendment enhances the security of air travel and protects TSA workers, flight attendants, pilots, and federal air marshals.

I am also pleased that H.R. 2217 incorporates several program funding recommendations I made to the Committee, especially the funding provided for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant and the Staffing for Adequate Emergency Response Grant (SAFER) programs. The tragic loss of four firefighters last week in Houston reminds us again of the dangers faced daily by first responders and the necessity of providing them the resources and support required to keep them safe. Specifically, the bill funds in full or substantial part the following programmatic requests I submitted to the Appropriations Committee:

1. $337,500,000, which is 100% of the amount requested, for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program. This program is critical to ensuring that our nation's first responders are adequately trained and equipped to safely and effectively respond to emergencies in their communities.

2. $337,000,000 for the SAFER Program, which is 100% of the amount requested. The SAFER Grant Program provides much-needed funding for career and volunteer fire departments to hire new firefighters and recruit and

retain volunteer firefighters. This program is critical to the thousands of fire stations across the country that are currently operating short of staff and to those seeking to retain current first responders in the face of the economic downturn and recovery.

3. $11,002,000, 91 percent of my request, for the Citizenship and Integration Grant Program, which awards funding to organizations that help legal immigrants prepare for citizenship. Since the current immigration system does not always meet the comprehensive needs of immigrants, integration grants provide culturally sensitive and intentional services to uplift AAPI immigrants. Integration grants are critical as they prevent integration barriers, such as precluding applicants from registering to vote or to secure jobs that require U.S. citizenship.

4. $111,590,000, 86.4 percent of my request, for Alternatives to Detention. These programs provide alternate detention options for low-priority AAPIs where detention is neither mandated nor appropriate. While some immigrants need to be detained because they pose a public safety or flight risk, many immigrants do not need to be jailed and should be placed in less costly supervision programs. A recent report reveals that 40% of individuals held in detention in October 2011 had no criminal history.

It is critical that this legislation continue to undergo further improvement and refinement before it is presented to the President for signature. As Ranking Member of the Homeland Security Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I will continue working with my colleagues across the aisle and in the Senate to ensure that our firefighters and other first responders have the resources needed to keep the American people safe.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the proposal in the President's budget request, which is included in this bill, to shift the responsibility for exit lane staffing from TSA to airport operators across this country.

Since November 2001, TSA has assumed responsibility for staffing exit lanes under the authority of Aviation and Transportation Security Act. Citing budget constraints, in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request, TSA has sought to shift the responsibility and costs for exit lane staffing to airport operators.

This move raises a number of concerns ably described by the Committee in the report accompanying this bill. Particularly troubling is TSA's intention to continue to collect money for performing this function through the Aviation Security Infrastructure Fee while passing the buck along to airports.

Like many of my colleagues, I have heard from my local airport—Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport—about the devastating impact this unfunded mandate would have on airport operators. Mineta airport is already paying $200,000 per year to staff one exit lane because TSA decided it was not "colocated" with the checkpoint screening area, and it cannot absorb the additional costs for more exit lane staffing—over the last few years, the airport has already reduced staff by more than 50 percent due to budget constraints.

At the end my statement is the text of a letter I received from the City of San Jose, CA's director of aviation on behalf of Mineta San Jose Airport outlining these concerns in greater detail.

Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE, I know that you were faced with a challenging task, working within the allocation given and trying to fill holes left by the budget request. And I know from the language you included in the report that you regret being unable to fill this hole in the budget.

I thank you for including language in the report directing TSA to work with airport operators to assess the impact of this change and consider delaying or at least phasing in this shift of responsibility until TSA can certify effective technology solutions that would reduce the cost for airport operators.

I hope that as we move this bill to the Senate and into conference, we will have a more favorable allocation to work with that will allow us to reject this ill-conceived proposal and protect already strapped airports from an unfunded mandate to perform duties that they have never had the responsibility for and which TSA is receiving fees to carry out.

MAY 30, 2013.

Hon. MIKE HONDA,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HONDA: I am writing to express my strong concern over the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) plan to shift responsibility—without funding—for monitoring passenger exit lanes onto airport operators. While all levels of government face tough budget decisions in the current economic environment, we need your help to prevent TSA from shifting this unfunded mandate onto our airport. TSA should also explain to the Congressional appropriators why shifting its security function to airports and airlines is not an abdication of its Federal responsibility under current law.

It is unconscionable that a Federal agency that is responsible for national security make a unilateral decision to shift a security responsibility and the associated costs to airport operators, particularly as there currently exists no regulation or other requirement which specifically assigns the responsibility for monitoring sterile area exit lanes to airport operators. Notably, this regulatory option does not "take into account benefits and costs, both quantitative and qualitative," as stipulated by Presidential Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review.

Congress, through the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (ATSA), delegated the responsibility for passenger and baggage screening to the TSA following the tragic events of September 11. It was decided by Congress that aviation security was a matter of national security and should be provided by the federal government.

Through the Aviation Security Infrastructure Fee (ASIF), based on the airlines' calendar year 2000 costs for passenger and property screening, TSA collects money from airlines to offset the cost of monitoring exit lanes. In fact, TSA provided to air carriers for use in determining their ASIF fee amount, "Calendar Year 2000 Costs for Passenger and Property Screening" (Appendix A to 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1511), which specifically includes, at line item "2", the air carrier's costs for "Exit Lane Monitors".

The TSA, with no Congressional review or legislation, has decided to impose the responsibility for exit lane monitoring on airports. Although the agency proposes to do this through an amendment to airports' Airport Security Programs, which the TSA unilaterally controls, industry will be afforded the opportunity to submit comments. However, TSA is neither required to consider those comments nor make any changes based on industry input.

It is time to take a close look at ATSA to see if its provisions are still appropriate or need some modifications or enhancements. This review should be done in a very thoughtful and deliberate way by the appropriate Congressional Committees, not by an agency that can make unilateral and arbitrary decisions. At minimum, TSA needs to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking and seek legislative changes to promulgate a requirement for airport operators to assume responsibility for monitoring exit lanes.

The cost implications of exit lane monitoring are significant for all airports, and in many cases, these costs will be passed on to airlines. Based on reports from some airport operators, the cost would range from approximately $160,000 per year for a smaller airport to as much as $2.5 million for a larger airport to monitor exit lanes in accordance with the way the TSA performs the function today. At Mineta San Jose the cost to take on the exit lane responsibility is now estimated at $180,000 to $200,000 a year. The Airport cannot absorb these costs through further reductions in staff and services. (Through the Great Recession of the past 4–5 years, the Airport has gone from a staff of 400 in 2008 to just 187 staff members today.) Accordingly, this additional cost would have to be passed on to the airlines through the Airport's rates and charges structure and ultimately be paid by passengers, who are already paying a fee to the airlines as part of their ticket, for security-related costs.

We ask that your office take action to put a stop to this unfunded mandate and require TSA to explain why shifting a security function and the associated costs to airports and airlines is not an abdication of its Federal responsibility under current legislation.

Members of my staff will be in touch with your office shortly to arrange for an opportunity to discuss this issue with you or your staff in more detail. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. SHERRY, A.A.E.,
Director of Aviation.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2217

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security

Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, $103,246,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $45,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That all official costs associated with the use of government aircraft by Department of Homeland Security personnel to support official travel of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary shall be paid from amounts made available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary and the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, with the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, expenditure plans for the Office of Policy, the Office for Intergovernmental Affairs, the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, the Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman, and the Privacy Officer.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,346,000)''

Page 9, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

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

□ 1340

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill for fiscal year 2014. My amendment is intended to restore the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to fiscal year '13 levels by transferring $3,346,000 into the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management. The amendment is wholly offset. It is budget-neutral.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is an integral part of ensuring that our rights and values are carried out through the Department of Homeland Security. Today, it is even more important than ever to ensure that this Office is adequately funded.

While this body continues to increase funding for immigration enforcement—and we expect even more funding and personnel to be added in any comprehensive immigration reform bill that we adopt—it is essential that we maintain adequate safeguards to protect our rights and liberties.

I offered a similar amendment last year that sought to provide the office funding that it requested to adequately review 287(g) and Secure Communities programs, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for directing $2.39 million to be used for review of these 287(g) programs.

As I mentioned last year, I remain gravely concerned about any 287(g) programs that have been found to facilitate racial profiling in our communities or enforcement programs that make it harder for immigrants, especially women victims, to get help from the police.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to insist on fully funding 287(g) programs, as they do here in this bill—$44 million above the President's budget request and cited as one of the reasons for a White House veto—at the very least, we should have rigorous safeguards and oversight. And I'll tell you, I must question whether or not we're on a path that recognizes that oversight is paramount as we continue to allow local police to act as Federal immigration officers. The bill increases these programs for review of 287(g)s, but I question whether or not we really get it.

I am here today because I disagree with the approach of the bill. Specifically, the bill would cut the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties by 15.5 percent and then direct the office to pay for this increase of reviews for the 287(g) and Secure Communities programs by making further internal cuts to other essential areas of their mission.

In addition to oversight of 287(g) and Secure Community programs, the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties provides Homeland Security officials with advice on the full range of civil rights and civil liberties issues.

The office engages with communities that are disproportionately impacted by Homeland Security policies and activities. In 2005, the Office had regular roundtables with Arab Americans, Sikhs, Muslims, and other ethnic minorities. Today, they work in 13 core centers around the country.

The office investigates detention facility violations through site visits to ICE detention facilities to investigate civil rights violations.

Complaints from the public, oversight of intelligence collection, and, as I mentioned, comprehensive immigration reform has a chance of becoming a reality. And we know there's going to be a vast increase of enforcement funding and personnel for this Department, but we can't continue to balance essential rights with the security of our country if we play these zero-sum games. It is essential that we adequately fund the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to implement changes to our immigration law in a way that respects our values that the country was founded upon.

Again, my amendment is budget-neutral, Mr. Chairman. It only transfers a very small amount, which is vital funding, to this $21.6 million office.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unnecessary since the bill already includes ample funding for necessary oversight of ICE's 287(g) program. In fact, on page 11 of the bill's accompanying report, it states:

Included within the amount recommended for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is a total of $2,394,000 for reviews of 287(g) agreements and ICE's Secure Communities. These funds are in addition to the ongoing work of ICE's Office of Professional Responsibility and the DHS Office of Inspector General, who reviews 287(g) agreements for compliance.

So, while I certainly support robust oversight and also demand ICE's compliance with all applicable laws and standards therein pertaining to civil liberties and civil rights, I cannot support additional bureaucracy.

Furthermore, the offset to this amendment will cut CBP's Automation Modernization account—a cut that will impede CBP's processing of trade and result in longer wait times at our ports of entry, which are detrimental impacts to our economy which none of us can afford to accept.

Finally, I think I need to remind Members that the President's budget request decimated operational staffing and enforcement programs. This bill reversed that flawed approach and is holding DHS headquarters' resources in check. Therefore, I cannot support an amendment that increases headquarters staffing beyond what is necessary or what can be afforded, and does so at the expense of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline, support economic growth, and vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support of this amendment by our colleague from Wisconsin to restore funding for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

The bill before us provides $18.3 million for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, which is $3.4 million below the budget request and $3.3 million below current year funding. The amendment would simply restore funding for the Office to the fiscal 2013 enacted level.

Now, I want to commend Chairman CARTER for fully funding the much-needed oversight activities related to the troubled 287(g) program and to the Secure Communities program. Oversight of these programs is probably the highest priority for this office. But with just a little more funding, as provided in this amendment, we can go further to ensure the protection of civil rights and civil liberties across the Department's many functions, programs, and activities.

The Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is the key mechanism at the Department of Homeland Security for ensuring that the proper balance is maintained between measures to protect the country and the personal freedoms that we cherish. So I thank the

gentlewoman for offering the amendment. It's a good amendment, a reasonable amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,838,000)''.

Page 42, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,838,000)''.

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

□ 1350

Mr. REICHERT. I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2217, and I thank the chairman and Mr. DELANEY.

As a former law enforcement officer, I know very well the needs of first responders. That is why I am proposing that we increase funding for the United States Fire Administration by $1.8 million.

This would restore total funding for the administration to the fiscal year 2013 level of $44 million. My amendment is offset by cutting $2.8 million from the Secretary of Homeland Security's departmental operation and administrative account. According to the CBO, the amendment would reduce net budget authority by $1 million and will have no impact on fiscal year 2014 outlays.

Continued funding for the brave men and women who protect American citizens by fighting fires is extremely critical, as we all know. The fire death rate in the United States is one of the highest in the industrialized world. We can prevent deaths by ensuring that the USFA has better resources. Data collection, public education, research, and training are all ways the USFA works to reduce the Nation's fire death rate.

Last year, my district experienced record devastation from forest fires, fires that quickly burned out of control and threatened both homes and entire communities. Tens of thousands of acres were destroyed, and it took over 1,000 firefighters and volunteers to get them under control. Hundreds of families lost their homes, and it was only due to the valiant efforts of our fire personnel that more were not lost.

One of the key roles of the USFA is to work to prepare and prevent those types of fires from happening. They do this by working directly with the local communities and stakeholders. They work to promote the adoption of local codes, protection plans, preventative measures, and much more. They are also a key component of the National Wildfire Coordinating Group, which coordinated wildland fire prevention, preparedness, mitigation, and response programs of various Federal agencies. They do all of this, not just to fight a common natural menace, but to protect lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment, which is endorsed by the International Association of Firefighters, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the Congressional Fire Services Institute. Together, we can ensure the safety of our first responders and the American people they serve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank Mr. REICHERT for his work on this amendment and for his care on this issue. This is a bipartisan and commonsense amendment. It ensures that we fully fund the USFA so that our firefighters receive world-class training.

Fires are not limited to Republican districts or to Democratic districts. Fires do not discriminate against rural or urban districts. Fires do not choose between districts on the coast or in our heartland—and, thankfully, neither do our firefighters. Firefighters serve us all. Across the Nation, when crisis strikes and when the flames begin, our brave firefighters rush in. They risk their lives to save ours. We should do everything we can to make sure that firefighters are trained well. That investment will directly result in more saved lives and fewer tragedies.

Mr. REICHERT has spoken very eloquently and with great care about the benefits of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add that one of the keystones of our firefighter education system is the National Fire Academy, located at the National Emergency Training Center in Emmitsburg, Maryland. This training center in Emmitsburg is a world-class facility and is one of the most important assets in our public safety infrastructure. This is the only Federal facility of its kind. This facility is a tremendous public safety asset for our country. Thousands are trained in Emmitsburg each year. In western Maryland, we are proud to train heroes—heroes who save lives from Maine to Washington State, from Minnesota to Texas.

This amendment restores funding for our critical training facilities to pre-sequester levels at no cost to the taxpayer. I truly thank my colleague for his work on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I want to applaud Chairman CARTER for funding the Fire Administration at a level higher than the administration's request, but the bill before us still provides a slight decrease in funding when compared to the current year. I believe this increase is warranted. The Fire Administration, as we all know, plays a critical role in training our first responders, in enhancing the security of our infrastructure, and in better preparing the response capabilities of our communities.

I do want to register a concern, Mr. Chairman, about the offset for this amendment in that the money is taken from the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, and this is at a time when departmental management funding is already in this bill—$302 million below the request and $147 million below the fiscal 2013 pre-sequestration level.

In dealing with this on the way to conference, we are going to have to pay attention to that offset. However, this is an important amendment, as the Fire Administration is important to all of us, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I want to congratulate Mr. REICHERT for his amendment. I think it is necessary, and I approve of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, under ''Departmental Management and Operations__Departmental Operations__Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $4,359,200)''.

Under ''U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement__Salaries and Expenses''—

(1) after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $43,592,000)''; and

(2) after the sixth dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,400,000)''.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, the 287(g) program has become increasingly controversial and increasingly recognized as a costly failure.

By allowing local police officers to effectively act as Federal agents and immigration officials, it not only increases crime by taking local cops off the beat and not only costs taxpayers money at a time when we have an over $600 billion deficit, but it also creates fear in Latino communities and in other immigrant communities. 287(g) exacerbates tensions and interferes with community policing and the efforts of law enforcement to gain the trust of people in the communities that they need in order to be able to do their jobs well. In effect, it has trained local law enforcement officials to use racial profiling, asking community members where they are born or if they are in this country legally.

Now, the 287(g) program has become infamous because of the implementation in Maricopa County under Sheriff Joe Arpaio and his racial profiling. The practices sanctioned under 287(g) have led to an unprecedented civil rights investigation by the Department of Justice and an independent civil suit. Even Sheriff Arpaio has acknowledged that the Department of Homeland Security directed him and his officers to use racial profiling as part of their policing practices in identifying individuals for deportation.

You know that, if Sheriff Arpaio is citing a Federal expenditure as the justification for his actions, there must be a problem with that Federal expenditure—and in fact there is.

In the fiscal year 2014 bill, the House Appropriations Committee has funded 287(g) at $44 million above the White House request. The White House has even threatened to veto the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, listing as one of its concerns that, in fact, the 287(g) program has been largely replaced by other enforcement mechanisms, like Secure Communities. Now, we don't all agree on Secure Communities, but there is increasing consensus on all sides of the aisle that 287(g) has no place in our communities or in our budget. It doesn't help combat illegal immigration. In fact, it makes it worse, and it increases crime in our communities.

□ 1400

This amendment will allocate 10 percent of that funding to the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and 90 percent toward deficit reduction. By seeking to cut the funding for a program that relies on racial profiling and increases crime, we're sending a clear message that we won't tolerate any more Arpaios, we care about the budget deficit, and we want to cut wasteful government spending.

Programs like 287(g) have created mistrust between Latinos and other immigrant communities throughout this country and local law enforcement and interfered with community policing. Eliminating 287(g) once and for all will begin to repair the trust that's been lost over the last decade. It will help local law enforcement fight crime, instead of trying to implement failed Federal laws, and will be a step forward in the ultimate goal of this Congress of fixing our broken immigration system and restoring the rule of law so that we can grow our economy and decrease crime.

This amendment is very simple. It would save $44 million from a wasteful government spending program, allocate just over $4 million of that to address some of the cuts that have been made to the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and use the bulk of that for the deficit reduction account.

Let's come together, Democrats and Republicans, to go after wasteful government spending and counterproductive government spending, as it is in this case.

With that, I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. Robust enforcement of our immigration laws is critical to our national security. Clearly, the 287(g) program supports that goal.

Under the 287(g) program, ICE enters into a partnership with State and local enforcement agencies and authorizes them to remove criminal aliens who are a threat to local communities. In effect, the program acts as a force multiplier and ensures more resources to enforce immigration laws and policy. In fact, since January of 2006, the 287(g) program is credited with identifying more than 279,311 potentially removable aliens, mostly at local jails.

ICE's cross-designation of more than 1,500 State and local patrol officers, detectives, investigators, and correctional officers allows them to pursue a wide range of investigations, such as human smuggling, gang/organized crime activity, and money laundering. In addition, participating entities are eligible for increased resources and support in more remote geographic locations.

Currently, ICE has 287(g) agreements with 75 law enforcement agencies in 24 States. Utilizing these funds as an offset takes resources from local sheriffs, police officers, and other first responders and puts it in the hands of a bureaucrat at DHS headquarters.

And while I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion that the deficit is too high, I reject his choice of balancing the budget by jeopardizing public safety and law enforcement.

To his point that the deficit must be reduced, let me point my colleagues to other provisions in the bill that instill fiscal discipline by cutting departmental administrative expenses and bureaucratic overhead by nearly 25 percent and by denying the President's request to create three new offices.

For these reasons, I oppose the amendment, urge Members to join me in opposition, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The gentleman's amendment eliminates increased funding in the bill for the critically flawed 287(g) program, and it increases funding for the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. I want to support the gentleman on both of these fronts.

As our colleague has noted, the 287(g) program designed to facilitate cooperation between Federal and local authorities and immigration enforcement, is, in fact, prone to serious abuse. It's fundamentally flawed in the way it blurs the line between Federal and local roles in immigration enforcement.

Moreover, it simply wastes money. It is very costly. The cost to the taxpayer per removal in the task force model of 287(g) is especially outrageous: $32,789 per removal. Compare that to only $1,500 per removal under the more workable and more appropriate Secure Communities program. So not only is 287(g) flawed and prone to abuse, it's also simply a waste of taxpayer dollars, and it's increasingly redundant as the Secure Communities program takes effect.

The gentleman is redirecting money, I think, in a useful way to the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. The most important activity of that office is to oversee this problematic 287(g) program, as well as secure communities. And the funding level in the bill is short of the request; it's short of the current year's funding. So with a little more funding, we can enable the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to do its job in a much better way.

Ideally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would address other seriously shortchanged areas of the bill. For example, cybersecurity, Coast Guard acquisitions, human trafficking, Secret Service. We can think of a lot. I would like to see some of those things addressed, as well as the deficit reduction item. But I believe this amendment greatly improves this bill both in the money it saves and in the money it redirects.

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

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

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Polis-Chu-Cardenas amendment to strike Federal funding for the 287(g) program.

287(g) is a misguided program. While it claims to help enforce our immigration laws, it actually diverts critical law enforcement resources and makes our communities less safe. By encouraging the police to do the Federal Government's job, 287(g) breeds mistrust in

local law enforcement. Immigrants worry that they will be punished or deported if they talk to the police. This means that victims will choose to suffer in silence. This means fewer witnesses will come forward to help solve crimes.

And this isn't just about undocumented immigrants being scared to come forward. Citizens and legal residents are holding back too. That's because the 287(g) program is a tool that too often relies on racial profiling. Take the case of Sheriff Arpaio in Maricopa County, Arizona. Just a few weeks ago, a Federal judge ruled that he and his deputies violated the constitutional rights of Latinos by targeting them during raids and traffic stops. It's no wonder that 44 percent of Latinos surveyed across the country said they were less likely now to contact police if they were victims of a crime. That's why 10 percent of the funding for 287(g) in this bill will be transferred to the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties that investigates allegations of racial profiling against immigrant communities.

Law enforcement officials from across the country oppose 287(g) because it's getting in the way of their real job: stopping crime and keeping people safe. The 287(g) program takes cops away from going after violent criminals to focus instead on civil violations. According to FBI and census data, 61 percent of 287(g) localities had violent and property crime indices lower than the national average. Former LA Police Chief Bill Bratton decided not to participate in the 287(g) program because his officers ''can't prevent or solve crimes if victims or witnesses are unwilling to talk to us. Criminals are the biggest beneficiaries when immigrants fear the police.''

As if that weren't bad enough, the Department of Homeland Security's own inspector general couldn't tell if the 287(g) money was being used for its intended purpose. In the same 2010 program, the IG cited insufficient oversight and supervision of the 287(g) program by ICE, an ineffective complaint system for abuse, and a lack of focus on their local partners' civil rights issues.

To keep our neighborhoods safe, we need the entire community to come together to solve crimes. Without it, the LAPD would never have solved the murder of Juan Garcia, a 53-year-old homeless man who was brutally killed in an alley just west of downtown Los Angeles in 2009.

□ 1410

At first, the police were stumped. There were no known witnesses and few clues. Then a 43-year-old undocumented immigrant who witnessed the crime came forward and told the homicide detectives what he saw. Because of his help, a suspect was identified and arrested a few days later while hiding on skid row. Because the witnesses were not afraid to contact the police, an accused murderer was taken off the streets, and we are all a little bit safer. We need to end this program today and ensure that no murder, no theft, no assault goes unsolved because of misguided policies like 287(g).

I urge you to vote in favor of the Polis-Chu-Cardenas amendment and end funding for 287(g). It's time to let police fight crime, not illegal immigration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 through 345), $171,173,000, of which not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $4,020,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex; and $7,815,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for the Human Resources Information Technology program: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary for Management shall, pursuant to the requirements contained in House Report 112–331, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, which shall include the information required under the heading ''Office of the Under Secretary for Management'' under title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74), and quarterly updates to such report not later than 45 days after the completion of each quarter.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 10, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank you, and I want to thank Judge CARTER as well.

This amendment is relatively simple. It started back in March of 2010. On March 27, 2010, a rancher by the name of Rob Krentz was on his own property about 20 miles north of the Arizona-Mexico border, and he was murdered. Even now 3 years later, the killer or killers have not been captured. When he was found by the people who lived there, his wife, Sue, was convinced one of the reasons he was murdered was he was in a certain area of his ranch that's a dead zone. Dead zones, Mr. Chairman, exist along the Arizona-Mexico border, the Texas-Mexico border, and are areas where there is no cell phone service. Ranchers rely many times on short-wave radios to communicate with each other and law enforcement. Basically, Rob Krentz could not call for help before he was murdered.

This legislation first started when Gabby Giffords was here in Congress. She proposed in 2010 that we fix that problem by taking about $10 million from the Office of the Under Secretary of Management of DHS and move it to the Border Security, Fencing, Infrastructure and Technology account with the purpose of allowing the ranchers to have access to cell phone service so they can call for help when they're in trouble. The legislation has passed twice, but has not passed the Senate and become law.

So this legislation is being brought to the House again for the third time. I appreciate the support from my friend, HENRY CUELLAR from Laredo, Texas. It's commonsense legislation. There are portions of the border that are not secure, and those portions, those dead zones, let's help the ranchers so they can call for help when they are in trouble. That's what this legislation does.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to accept this amendment from my colleague and friend, Judge POE, which provides $10 million for CBP to procure additional equipment for surveillance and detection at both the southern and northern borders.

Some of the technological solutions CBP procures for border security include integrated fixed towers, tactical communication, and tethered aerostat radar systems. All these systems increase situational awareness and assist law enforcement personnel as they identify and resolve illegal activity. In effect, they become a workforce multiplier, freeing agents to focus on other vital tasks like identifying, tracking, interdicting, and resolving events along the border.

For these reasons, I accept the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 4, line 14, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 8, line 6, after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $22,000,000)''.

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have come to the floor today, along with my colleague, Mr. HORSFORD, to offer a very simple amendment because we must do everything we can to protect our cities, towns, and communities.

The Urban Area Security Initiative, according to the Department of Homeland Security, dedicates funds to:

> Address the unique planning, organization, equipment, training and exercise needs of high-threat, high-density urban areas, and assists them in building an enhanced and sustainable capacity to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism.

However, due to a recent change in qualification criteria, a number of major metropolitan areas will be going without UASI funds despite being qualified for such funds last year. Those areas that will be without funds to prevent and respond to threats include Riverside, California; Portland, Oregon; Orlando, Florida; Indianapolis, Indiana; New Orleans, Louisiana; San Antonio, Texas; Kansas City, Missouri; and Las Vegas, Nevada. Now, if those sound like high-threat, high-density locations to you, you'd be correct. They are. Yet despite recent events, they are not going to be receiving UASI funds this year.

Now, I cannot speak for all of these areas, Mr. Chairman, but I can tell you that Las Vegas, which holds more high-profile, highly attended events than any city in the country, is worthy of UASI funding.

In Las Vegas, law enforcement has to not only defend the Las Vegas metro area, which includes the fabulous Las Vegas Strip with more densely packed hotel rooms than any other city in our country, but also has high-threat areas outside the city, like the Las Vegas Motor Speedway, which holds 140,000 people, and the Hoover Dam, which is not only a popular tourist attraction, but a source of electrical power for more than 1 million people across the southwestern United States.

So today, I have a very simple amendment to the bill. The amendment decreases funding under four different accounts as outlined previously and redirects those amounts to the Urban Area Security Initiative for the purpose of funding the program to the top 35 eligible metropolitan areas.

Now I recognize that as our debt continues to increase, we must work to rein in wasteful spending, and I recognize that all of the funding in the world isn't going to prevent every attack. But in this case, don't we think the safety and well-being of our cities and communities, our families and our children, are a worthy expense? Don't we believe they deserve our support?

My amendment goes to the very heart of the core functions of our democratic government, Mr. Chairman. Our Constitution states that our Federal Government must ''insure domestic tranquility'' and ''provide for the common defense.'' That is the issue at hand with my amendment.

As someone who has worked on the front lines of homeland security as a SWAT physician and emergency preparedness consultant, as well as someone who has worn the uniform in the U.S. Army Reserve, I believe that overlooking the risks faced by the top 35 cities would be a mistake, and we should provide them the funding they need. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment that I am offering along with Congressman HECK would help address some of our concerns about the calculations in the Urban Area Security Initiative funding formula. UASI provides critical funding to cities that are at risk for a terrorist attack.

□ 1420

As a member of the authorizing committee for the Department of Homeland Security, I want to work with the appropriators on this concern.

I have become deeply concerned about how the formula currently being used by the Department of Homeland Security will determine eligibility for this funding. The formula sometimes counts multiple buildings as a single site, something that shortchanges the Las Vegas Strip. It also punishes cities for successfully implementing anti-terror programs. Well, we should not be the victims of our own success.

As it stands now, critical anti-terror programs for major tourist destinations around the country are being defunded, including for Las Vegas, New Orleans, and Orlando, to name a few. That's the Las Vegas Strip, the site of Mardi Gras, and Disney World.

This is not an issue of budget cuts. It's an issue of prioritization. It's an issue of a faulty policy that completely ignores some major international tourist destinations and the threat posed to them.

During a recent House Homeland Security Committee hearing, I asked Boston Police Commissioner Edward Davis about the value of the UASI program in responding to the tragic events of the Boston Marathon attack.

Commissioner Davis told the committee that if it were not for UASI ''there would have been more people who would have died in these attacks. It is critical that we maintain that funding to urban areas.''

He stressed that this is not a frivolous expenditure. It's something that works. It's something that our sheriff is asking for, it's something that our mayor of Las Vegas is asking for, and it's something the people on the ground, the first responders, desperately need.

I visited the Southern Nevada Counter-Terrorism Center recently. They do incredible work in keeping the 2 million residents and the 40 million tourists who come to southern Nevada safe.

In studies on terrorist targets, however, the RAND Corporation has stated that Las Vegas ''stands out in having a high proportion of high-likelihood targets compared to the Nation as a whole.''

The same study also reports that the unique composition of hotels, casinos, and skyscrapers ''increases the overall attack probability in Las Vegas relative to other cities in the same likelihood tier.''

Yet, in my home State of Nevada, Mr. Chairman, we face reduced UASI funding because of flaws in the Relative Risk Profile model that has inappropriately dropped Las Vegas' ranking as a likely terrorist target.

We need a serious reevaluation of the funding formula for UASI. It is wrong that Las Vegas has dropped in ranking, and it is wrong that we will face reduced funds because of faulty calculations.

I urge adoption of this amendment, and I look forward to continuing to work with the appropriators on addressing this very important concern to the safety of our domestic homefront.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. The bill before us today was born out of a need for reform. It consolidates disparate grant programs, provides discretion to the Secretary while balancing fiscal discipline.

In total, this bill provides for $2.5 billion for Homeland Security First Responder Grants. This is $400 million above the President's request for fiscal year 2014 and $35 million above fiscal year 2013.

This bill prioritizes our funding. The consolidation in this bill forces the Secretary to examine the intelligence and risk and put scarce dollars where they are needed most, whether it is port, rail, surveillance, or access and hardening projects, or whether it is to high-risk urban areas or to States, as opposed to reverse engineering projects to fill the amount designated for one of many programs.

This does not mean lower-risk cities will lose all funding. It means the funds will come from other programs,

such as State homeland grants that are risk-and formula-based.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline and vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the chairman in opposing this well-intentioned amendment.

The amendment would cannibalize various administrative accounts throughout the bill, the Office of the Secretary for Executive Management, the Chief Financial Officer, the CBP Salaries and Expenses, FEMA Salaries and Expenses, somewhat obscure accounts, you might say; but, nonetheless, accounts that are vital to the Department's functioning. It would cannibalize these accounts and put $22 million more in grants, presumably for urban grants, UASI.

Now, the grant programs can always use more money. I've championed those programs for years, especially the risk-based UASI program. But we need to think carefully what this amendment is really about.

This is a risky path for this body to go down. It really seems to be about adding cities to UASI, adding cities.

Now, UASI-eligible cities, and there are 25 of them, are picked on a risk basis. There's a formula involving threat and vulnerability and consequence. The estimates are updated every year. This is probably the most strictly risk-based assessment that DHS undertakes.

Do we really want to substitute that for picking these cities on the House floor?

I'm afraid that's what this amendment is all about, or at least it's the path that it could put us on. And so, therefore, I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 41, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

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

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chair, my budget-neutral amendment, authored with my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who was going to be here on the floor today but is attending Senator Lautenberg's memorial service this afternoon, supports our Nation's firefighters in two critical ways.

The FIRE and SAFER grant programs are two need-based, Department of Homeland Security-administered programs that go directly to local fire departments throughout the country. This amendment supports volunteer and career firefighters by giving them resources to purchase highly specialized equipment necessary to carry out their mission.

Mr. Chair, we all recognize the budget pressures facing our Federal Government and the need to prioritize where our tax dollars are spent. FIRE and SAFER grants are a very important partnership with local fire departments and invest in our communities and increase the safety of our constituents.

For that reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which helps to ensure firefighters have the resources they need.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to express support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I stand to urge my colleagues to support this amendment to provide $5 million in additional funding for Firefighter Assistance Grants. This funding would be equally divided between the Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) and Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) programs, which provide equipment and staffing assistance for local fire departments.

In my work to develop the AFG and SAFER programs, I envisioned them as ways to fill needs that local budgets sometimes can't. As we all know, in today's tough budget environment, many states and towns are strapped for cash and have asked their first responders to make sacrifices. These are the times when AFG and SAFER are most important.

These programs put more firefighters on our streets and provide better equipment to keep them safe. For example, in New Jersey's Ninth Congressional District, the towns of Garfield and North Arlington have recently received hundreds of thousands of dollars in AFG assistance for the purchase of electronic accountability systems and Self Contained Breathing Apparatuses. These firefighters are risking their lives to protect our lives and property, and we owe it to them to ensure that they are protected with the best possible equipment.

Earlier this year, my hometown of Paterson received a SAFER grant of almost $7 million to prevent the layoff of 40 firefighters and allow the city to hire 9 new firefighters to replace retirees. This funding goes directly to job creation in our local communities while helping our departments to maintain adequate staffing levels for public safety.

I am relieved that President Obama signed into law reauthorizations for AFG and SAFER this January after the program authorizations had been allowed to lapse. Now we must continue to provide adequate funding. Working together in a bipartisan manner, we have been able to restore over $800 million in proposed cuts to AFG and SAFER over the past 3 years. I am proud that the Fire Caucus gathered the signatures of over 140 on a bipartisan letter to the Appropriations Committee opposing any cuts to these critical programs in FY 2014.

I would like to thank Mr. RUNYAN for his work on this amendment and this issue, as well as Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their work on this bill and for allowing this amendment. Our firefighters are on the front lines of our homeland security. I urge my colleagues to support their local firefighters by supporting this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1430

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $7,667,000)''.

Page 35, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $7,667,000)''.

Page 36, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $7,667,000)''.

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

Mr. GRIMM. I rise today in support of my amendment that would fund the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System at $35.18 million, which is level funding compared to FY 2013 but still reflects a reduction of roughly $6 million from fiscal year 2012.

The National Urban Search and Rescue Response System, or US&R, provides a significant national resource for search and rescue assistance in the wake of major disasters and structural collapse. A typical US&R task force will conduct physical search and rescue operations, provide emergency medical

care to trapped victims, assess and control hazards such as ruptured gas and electric lines, and evaluate and stabilize damaged structures. Due to the critical lifesaving nature of their mission, US&R task forces must be prepared to deploy within 6 hours of notification and must be self-sufficient for the first 72 hours.

These teams have been deployed in responses to the Oklahoma tornadoes, Superstorm Sandy, the Japanese tsunami, the Haiti earthquake, Hurricane Katrina, 9/11 attacks, and many, many other disasters. Current Federal funding for the Nation's US&R teams only provides a fraction of the funds necessary to maintain each task force. It's important to note the recent devastation left in the wake of the Oklahoma tornadoes, as well as Superstorm Sandy, and the subsequent response underscore the importance of the national search and rescue capacity. Providing proper funding for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System will help ensure these highly skilled teams are available to respond to major emergencies without jeopardizing the budget priorities of our local first responders.

I'd also like to thank my colleague and friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who's the lead cosponsor of this amendment and a strong, strong advocate for the Urban Search and Rescue program.

Therefore, I urge you to vote ''yes'' on this amendment and properly fund this critical program, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I am pleased to join my colleague once again in sponsoring this important amendment to restore funding to our Nation's elite Urban Search and Rescue teams.

Our modest, simple, straightforward amendment, which has the support of the International Association of Firefighters, would provide level funding, as my colleague just indicated, for the Department to continue supporting the 28 national teams currently spread across 19 States, including our respective home States of New York and Virginia.

When people are trapped in the unstable rubble of a collapsed building, the window of survivability can be measured in hours. Without highly trained responders, rescue attempts can actually imperil victims and rescuers alike. Thankfully, because of this training, we have made strategic investments in specialized research and search and rescue teams. These elite firefighters and emergency medical technicians are not just first responders, though they are that. For people awaiting rescue, they are often the last hope.

As my colleagues are aware, federally supported search and rescue responders were on the scene recently in Oklahoma after the tornadoes there and in New Jersey and New York after Superstorm Sandy last year.

Prior to coming to Congress, Mr. Chairman, I served for 14 years in local government in Fairfax County, Virginia. For 9 of those years, I shared an office with the fire department. I saw daily the selfless dedication of men and women who put their lives at risk in service to others. Fairfax County is home to one of the most elite US&R teams in the country—in fact, in the world. In partnership with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Agency for International Development, FEMA, and Fairfax County government, the team serves American interests both here at home and abroad.

The team is comprised of highly skilled career and volunteer fire and rescue personnel whose daily duties are to serve the community by responding to local fire and medical emergencies. But when called into service, that team, designated as Virginia Task Force One, is mobilized for quick response to domestic disasters, natural or manmade, with special expertise in collapsed building rescue.

Our team was deployed in Oklahoma City in the wake of the terrorist bombing in 1995 and was among the first on the scene at the Pentagon on 9/11. It was also dispatched to Mississippi and Louisiana in response to Hurricane Katrina in 2005. It has answered the call for help in multiple States, including California, North Carolina, Texas, Florida, Kansas, Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, to name a few.

When disaster strikes, whether natural or manmade, domestically or internationally, the US&R teams have rushed to the scene, saving countless lives and preserving and protecting property. Their heroic efforts have shown this to be a wise investment that absolutely must be maintained.

I urge my colleagues to support the Grimm-Connolly amendment to ensure that this successful partnership with our local partners and first responders is sustained, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I accept this good amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in qualified support of this amendment. When disasters strike, these Urban Search and Rescue Teams stand ready for FEMA deployment, complete with unique tools and equipment and training.

I do want to register another concern about the cannibalizing of management accounts that this amendment, along with other amendments, is undertaking to do. We're already $302 million below the request and $147 million below our fiscal 2013, pre-sequestration, in this departmental management funding, so we've got to pay attention to this as we take this amendment to conference. We've got to have a better offset.

Having said that, I do think this is a meritorious amendment, well justified. I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 19, line 1, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $15,676,000)''.

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $15,676,000)''.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases surface transportation security funding by about $15.6 million, bringing it to the enacted FY 2013 level of $124.3 million. This would be offset by a reduction in a similar amount to the Office of the Under Secretary for Management.

Last April, the United States received a chilling reminder that it remains a target for attacks by terrorists and their sympathizers when two men detonated bombs in my home city at the finish line of the Boston Marathon. Just 1 week later, authorities foiled a plot to attack a passenger train running between Canada and the U.S.

After the September 11, 2001, attacks, we, as a Nation, undertook—and rightly so—a massive effort to strengthen aviation security. We invested significant resources into making our skies safer. I strongly supported those efforts but would also caution that we cannot forget that other forms of transportation remain vulnerable to attack.

Since fiscal year 2002, $69.3 billion in funding has been dedicated to aviation security. However, during that same period, surface transportation security has been funded at about $3.3 billion. Less than 5 percent of our transportation security funding has gone to our transit systems—our rails and buses.

Now it is sometimes said that our military planners are guilty of fighting the last war. I believe that in the war on terror, my fear is that it may be the case here.

□ 1440

Over the last number of years, we have seen buses and passenger rail systems targeted throughout Europe and Asia. I'll just mention a few.

As I mentioned, in April of 2013, there was an al Qaeda-linked plot to attack a passenger train running between New York and Toronto. In July 2006, seven bomb blasts over 11 minutes took place in a suburban railway in Mumbai; 209 were killed and over 700 injured.

In March 2004, coordinated bombings on the Madrid commuter rail system resulted in 191 killed and 1,800 injured. In February 2004, two suicide bombers attacked the Moscow metro stations; at least 40 were killed and over 100 injured. As well in Israel, France and Japan, they have suffered similar attacks on their bus and railway systems.

Many people don't realize that U.S. passenger rail systems carry about five times as many people as do airlines. For a potential terrorist looking to cause as much damage and panic as possible, we cannot ignore the fact that our rails and buses are a target. This amendment is one step to better secure our surface transportation systems that move millions of Americans each and every day.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment. I, too, have concerns about surface rail.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman on his attention to the very real vulnerabilities of surface rail, his attention to this, and I urge acceptance of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), $41,242,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for financial systems modernization efforts: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Future Years Homeland Security Program and a comprehensive report compiled in conjunction with the Government Accountability Office that details updated missions, goals, strategies, priorities, along with performance metrics that are measurable, repeatable, and directly linked to requests for funding, as described in the accompanying report.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, $210,735,000; of which $99,397,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which $111,338,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That the Department of Homeland Security Chief Information Officer shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan, to include each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017, for all information technology acquisition projects funded under this heading or funded by multiple components of the Department of Homeland Security through reimbursable agreements, that includes—

(1) the proposed appropriations included for each project and activity tied to mission requirements, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered;

(2) the total estimated cost and projected timeline of completion for all multi-year enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities that are proposed in such budget or underway;

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance and contractor services costs; and

(4) a current acquisition program baseline for each project, that—

(A) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline;

(B) aligns the acquisition programs covered by the baseline to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how each increment will address such known capability gaps; and

(C) defines life-cycle costs for such programs.

ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), $291,623,000; of which not to exceed $3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which $89,334,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), $113,903,000, of which not to exceed $300,000 may be used for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended at the direction of the Inspector General.

TITLE II

SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, agricultural inspections and regulatory activities related to plant and animal imports, and transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens; purchase and lease of up to 7,500 (6,500 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; and contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; $8,275,983,000; of which $3,274,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee pursuant to section 9505(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9505(c)(3)) and notwithstanding section 1511(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 551(e)(1)); of which not to exceed $34,425 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that account; of which not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations; and of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2014, the overtime limitation prescribed in section 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(c)(1)) shall be $35,000; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to compensate any employee of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for overtime, from whatever source, in an amount that exceeds such limitation, except in individual cases determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, to be necessary for national security purposes, to prevent excessive costs, or in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That the Border Patrol shall maintain an active duty presence of not less than 21,370 full-time equivalent agents protecting the borders of the United States in the fiscal year.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Page 12, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase by $10 million the funding for Customs and Border Protection staffing and to decrease by $10 million the funding for the controversial 287(g) immigration enforcement program.

At a time when our economy is just starting to pick up steam, this amendment is intended to promote trade, travel, tourism, and investment through our Nation's airports and ultimately support our economic recovery.

As the busiest airport in the United States for international flights and the Gateway to the Americas, Miami International Airport is a vital economic engine for south Florida and our country. Unfortunately, MIA has been among the worst hit with inadequate

Customs and Border Patrol staffing levels. On the worst peak travel days, we have over 3½ hours of waiting time, and sometimes up to 800 missed connections.

If we want to continue being the top destination for foreign investors, for immigrants, for tourists, for visitors, and for business people, we need to ensure we have adequate CBP staffing to handle our growing number of visitors.

While these personnel shortages are especially acute at MIA, these delays are prevalent at international hubs throughout the country, impeding the trade, travel, tourism, and investment that we need to fuel our economic recovery and create jobs.

This amendment seeks to reduce the funding of the section 287(g) program to enable the increase of funding for CBP staffing. This immigration enforcement program has been controversial and criticized for many years and has been made increasingly redundant by the development and expansion of other questionable programs, like Secure Communities.

While this appropriations bill provides $68 million in funding for 287(g), that amount exceeds the request from the Department of Homeland Security by $44 million, that is, a $44 million increase over the request.

Both the Major Cities Chiefs Associations and the International Association of Chiefs of Police have expressed strong concerns about section 287(g)'s program, which undermine's public safety and diverts limited law enforcement resources, and exacerbates fear and distrust in our communities. And if that wasn't enough, other immigration enforcement programs like Secure Communities have replaced the need for 287(g), and yet we are continuing to fund a practically defunct program. I believe these funds are better spent in promoting American commerce at our Nation's airports and invigorating our economy.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. Not only do I oppose the increase of $10 million for additional CBP officers; I oppose the offset suggested to pay for the increase.

As drafted, the bill provides for $105 million for hiring 1,600 officers over a 2-year period. In fact, we provide funds sufficient to cover the costs of no less than 21,186 CBP officers, which sets a historical precedent.

The reason we took this incremental approach into hiring 1,600 new officers is because CBP's staffing and deployment plan was not linked to its goals for border security. To address these concerns, the report includes language directing CBP to provide a more complete 5-year staffing and deployment plan.

Furthermore, an internal audit revealed systemic failures within CBP's budget formulation for salaries and benefits of its operational workforce. And though I believe taking a go-slow approach to hiring just makes sense, I oppose the offset, which decreases funds for the 287(g) program.

Under the 287(g) program, ICE enters into partnerships with State and local law enforcement agencies and authorizes them to remove criminal aliens who are a threat to local communities. In effect, the program acts as a force multiplier to ensure more resources to enforce immigration laws and policies. In fact, since 2006, the 287 program has been credited with identifying more than 279,311 potentially removable aliens, mostly from local jails.

So I oppose this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it's a positive contribution to the bill. It improves the balance in the bill, both in what it proposes—positively—and also what it cuts. I think we can use the additional funds in CBP for additional officers. And as has been said many times on this floor today, the 287(g) is flawed and wasteful and can well afford this kind of cut.

So I commend the gentleman on both fronts—adding to the right things, cutting the right things—and I urge adoption of his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1450

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses for U.S. Customs and Border Protection for operation and improvement of automated systems, including salaries and expenses, $707,897,000; of which $325,526,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which not less than $140,762,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $7,655,000)''.

Page 49, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,655,000)''.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, as I stand here, wildfires are burning in my district and in the State of Colorado. The bark beetle epidemic, rampant drought, intense weather occurrences, and deteriorating forest health have increased the propensity for devastating wildfires throughout the Western United States.

According to the National Interagency Fire Center, last year, more than 9.3 million acres of land burned. That is an area that is approximately the size of Rhode Island, Delaware, the District of Columbia, and Massachusetts combined. These fires tragically claimed 13 lives, destroyed more than 2,000 homes, and led to hundreds of millions of dollars in damages. Nearly 400,000 acres burned in Colorado, alone, with the tragic loss of six lives.

The status quo of addressing a problem when it's too late is no longer good enough. The status quo has given us decades of declining forest health. The status quo has given us years of increasingly catastrophic wildfires. The status quo has put people, communities, and ecosystems at risk. We must do more.

Forests are vital for the Western United States. They provide limitless environmental and economic benefits when healthy. It's our responsibility to be able to preserve this incredible natural resource and do all that we can to be able to restore forest health. And we also need to be able to prevent future loss of life and property to catastrophic wildfire.

I urge this body to be able to join with me and my colleague, Congressman POLIS of Colorado, in taking a step to be able to prevent these tragedies. For far too long we've been working to stop fires once they start and mitigate damage once it has already occurred. As the old saying goes, ''an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.'' That is what this amendment is about: getting ahead of this problem by investing greater resources toward prevention so that we can take a more proactive approach to restoring our forests to a healthy, natural state.

Representative POLIS and I have introduced this amendment to direct $7,655,000 to FEMA's National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund, a program uniquely suited to be able to assist in our effort to be able to reduce the occurrence of wildfire, as it would provide funds aimed at mitigating conditions that lead to these fires.

Despite the need for proactive programs such as this in the wake of increased occurrences of extreme weather events, including wildfire, the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund is facing a reduction of nearly $2.5 million this year. Considering the value of this program and the term saving it generates through prevention of destructive fires, I believe there are more

appropriate areas within the Federal Government where it can realize budget savings.

Our amendment is offset by decreasing the same amount of funding in the Automation Modernization account of the Department of Homeland Security, which received an increase of $7,655,000 this year for its IT modernization, despite concerns with transparency of spending within the agency. I share the concerns expressed there.

Senator COBURN's Wastebook provided some troubling findings about wasteful spending within DHS, including the fact that this agency has spent over $35 billion of taxpayers' money in the last 10 years. In fiscal year '10, DHS spent $6.5 billion on IT spending alone. In 2013, DHS planned to spend $4 billion on 68 major IT programs. A third of these programs cost about $1 billion and were identified by the Government Accountability Office as containing waste and not meeting specified commitments.

Besides being replete with wasteful government spending, many programs at DHS have been found to be overlapping, unnecessary, or lacking in transparency. Until these concerns are addressed, I do not believe we should be providing additional resources for these programs at DHS. Instead, we could better use that $7,655,000 to take steps towards proactively reducing the occurrence of devastating wildfires by redirecting those funds to the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment and safeguard our forests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleague, Mr. TIPTON, in bringing forward this important amendment.

Here, in the first year of June, there are already two wildfires that have erupted in my district. Mr. TIPTON and I share northern and western Colorado. Just this last Monday, a wildfire ignited near Evergreen, Colorado. We had an evacuation of several thousand people. These are just the early season fires, and this year's wildfire season could very well be longer and more extreme than ever before. Already, the National Interagency Fire Center has predicted that this summer will bring an increased fire threat to communities in multiple States across the United States.

Unfortunately, last year was a devastating year for fires in my home State. We had two of our most destructive fires in history. In 2012, wildfires destroyed 650 structures, six Coloradans lost their life in wildfires, 384,000 acres of land were burnt and caused over half a billion dollars in property damage.

In addition to wildfires, our country and our State have experienced natural disasters, like droughts and tornadoes. The impacts of these are reminders of how costly and destructive extreme weather can be and how important it is to be prepared and to reduce risks where we can. In total, 11 extreme weather events last year across the country, including hurricanes, tornadoes, and fires, cost taxpayers $96 billion. Extreme weather events have a real impact, a human impact, and a cost.

We have an opportunity in this amendment to reduce and minimize the damage and costs of extreme weather events, like wildfires, by mitigating the threat prior to an event. That is why I join Representative TIPTON in directing $7.6 million to the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund. We can spend a penny now to save a dollar later. The National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund is one of the only FEMA programs that reduces fire danger before a fire starts. By increasing funding to mitigate extreme weather events, we can allocate more resources to preventing the impact of these devastating fires, saving lives and saving money.

Unfortunately, the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund, absent this amendment, is only funded at $22.5 million, which is actually a reduction of $2.475 million, even though events were occurring at higher rates last year and we have no reason to believe that this year will be different.

The Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund, very simply, is a good investment, Mr. Chairman. The Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund investments have already led to significant savings to taxpayers by reducing risks and damages caused by extreme weather.

The amendment is completely offset by reducing the same amount of funding in the Automation Modernization account. In fact, our amendment actually decreases costs in the first year by $4 million. The Automation Modernization account has already been noted by the committee of lacking transparency regarding how the funds are managed. And of course, while I support the DHS modernizing its technology systems, I cannot support increasing that account in this time of fiscal constraint, especially when the result of these disasters could very well cost more than an ounce of prevention now.

So this bill increases the account by $7.655 million that we're directing to the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund to proactively reduce the threat of wildfires and save taxpayer money. Now, we can't stop wildfires, but we can take measures to reduce their impacts on our communities and to save taxpayer money.

That is why I am proud to join Representative TIPTON, and I've offered this commonsense amendment that would allocate $7.655 million in additional resources to the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I would like to accept this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I, too, urge adoption of this amendment.

I want to commend the chairman, though, while I have a moment, for putting in $22.5 million for pre-disaster mitigation into this bill. He did that at my request. We had a proposal for the President, which was quite inadequate in this respect, and so the chairman has put this money in. This is an amendment that would add more to that, and it is money we can quite well use.

□ 1500

I don't believe the offset is ideal. The offset would slow down the IT initiatives at Customs and Border Protection, which are designed to modernize customs processes and risk-based targeting efforts. I don't necessarily think it's the best process for us on the House floor to be establishing carveouts in the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. We need an all-hazards approach. We don't necessarily want to rank the threat of fire higher than the threat of hurricanes and so forth.

Having said that, though, I think this bipartisan pair of cosponsors has made a very compelling case today for the threat that their areas face, and I urge my colleagues to support them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

For expenses for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology, $351,454,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aircraft systems, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including salaries and expenses and operational training and mission-related travel, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts; $802,741,000; of which $292,791,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which $509,950,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft that are one of a kind and have been

identified as excess to U.S. Customs and Border Protection requirements and aircraft that have been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2014 without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on any changes to the 5-year strategic plan for the air and marine program required under this heading in Public Law 112–74.

CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, equip, furnish, operate, manage, and maintain buildings, facilities, and related infrastructure necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs, immigration, and border security, $471,278,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, an inventory of the real property of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and a plan for each activity and project proposed for funding under this heading that includes the full cost by fiscal year of each activity and project proposed and underway in fiscal year 2015.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals, and investigations, including overseas vetted units operations; and purchase and lease of up to 3,790 (2,350 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; $5,344,461,000; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations under section 3131 of the Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2081); of which not to exceed $11,475 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security; of which not less than $305,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline and activities to counter child exploitation; of which not less than $5,400,000 shall be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)); and of which not to exceed $11,216,000 shall be available to fund or reimburse other Federal agencies for the costs associated with the care, maintenance, and repatriation of smuggled aliens unlawfully present in the United States: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of $35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, $15,770,000 shall be for activities to enforce laws against forced child labor, of which not to exceed $6,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount available, not less than $1,600,000,000 shall be available to identify aliens convicted of a crime who may be deportable, and to remove them from the United States once they are judged deportable: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prioritize the identification and removal of aliens convicted of a crime by the severity of that crime: *Provided further*, That funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, not less than $2,835,581,000 is for detention and removal operations, including transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, $31,541,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for the Visa Security Program: *Provided further*, That not less than $10,000,000 shall be available for investigation of intellectual property rights violations, including operation of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue a delegation of law enforcement authority authorized under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) if the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General determines that the terms of the agreement governing the delegation of authority have been violated: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue any contract for the provision of detention services if the two most recent overall performance evaluations received by the contracted facility are less than ''adequate'' or the equivalent median score in any subsequent performance evaluation system: *Provided further*, That nothing under this heading shall prevent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from exercising those authorities provided under immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))) during priority operations pertaining to aliens convicted of a crime.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, beginning on line 22, strike ''*Provided further*, That funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2014:''.

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike the provision in H.R. 2217, which states:

Funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2014.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement has interpreted this provision, which has been in past appropriations bills, to require the maintenance of a daily detention population of 34,000 people. This detention bed mandate ties the hands of ICE and restricts its discretion to make detention decisions even when release could be appropriate. Indeed, this is an unprecedented mandate for law enforcement as no other law enforcement agencies have a quota for the number of people that they must keep in jail.

This detention bed mandate is a drain on ICE's limited resources. On March 19 of this year, I participated in a Judiciary Committee oversight hearing with ICE Director John Morton that addressed this issue. Director Morton explained that ICE had interpreted language in the previous continuing resolution as requiring the agency to keep ''a yearly average daily population of approximately 34,000 individuals.'' Accordingly, ICE has been maintaining an average daily detention population well over 34,000 people with the numbers fluctuating between 35,000 and 37,000 people. Due to this fiscally unsustainable mandate, ICE released more than 2,000 individuals earlier this year to avoid burning through its detention funds.

Detention is extremely costly, and it strains ICE's limited budget in an era of fiscal restraint. Mandating ICE to keep 34,000 detainees in custody each day forces ICE to forgo alternatives to detention that would save taxpayer money. In fact, a single detention bed is approximately $122 per day; and with additional administrative costs, it can rise to $164 a day. Meanwhile, alternatives such as ankle bracelets, parole, telephonic, and in-person reporting, curfews, and home visits can run from 30 cents to $14 per day.

By untying ICE's hands by striking this minimum detention population requirement, we can allow ICE to pursue effective alternatives and make budgetary savings. ICE agents could use these savings when focusing on their many additional responsibilities, such as cracking down on drug smuggling, human trafficking and child pornography—all priorities which are shared by Republicans and Democrats alike.

I would like to thank my friend, Congressman BILL FOSTER, for his dedication to this issue.

Detention takes an enormous toll on our communities, and mandating ICE detain 34,000 individuals a day does not secure our borders or make us safer. The Deutch-Foster amendment would strike this arbitrary provision from the bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. I rise today in support of this amendment, and I would like to thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for joining me in the fight on this important issue.

Our amendment would end the costly and inhumane practice of imposing arbitrary immigrant detention requirements by striking the language in this bill which mandates that the Immigration and Customs Enforcement, otherwise known as ICE, maintain 34,000 immigrants in detention every single day.

Mandatory detention comes at a high cost both for taxpayers and immigrant families who are needlessly torn apart. Immigration detention costs the United States $2 billion a year. That's $5.4 million a day or $164 per day per detainee. Despite the availability of

other proven cheaper methods, including ankle bracelets and supervised release that cost the Federal Government anywhere from 30 cents a day to $14 a day, we continue to use detention as the primary method for immigrants facing deportation. Not only is this quota fiscally irresponsible, but it makes it impossible for DHS to make rational decisions about detention based on enforcement priorities and needs.

There is also a high human cost. Most immigrants in detention are held in county jails or facilities run by private prison corporations often hundreds of miles from anyone they know. Human rights abuses have been well documented in facilities across the country. Many immigrants in the system have strong ties to their communities and no criminal records; yet they must fight their cases from a distant jail all because of this arbitrary quota. No other law enforcement agencies in our government have such quotas. Rather than a per-day bed quota, ICE's use of bed space should be based on actual need, which is the approach used in every other law enforcement context.

In his letter from the Birmingham jail, Martin Luther King, Jr., said:

> Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

Mandatory detention quotas distort our system of justice and are a threat to freedom and justice in our country. Mr. Chairman, I rise to end this costly and needless injustice, and I urge my colleagues to support our amendment.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter of support for this amendment that is signed by 66 local, national and State groups, which I submit for the RECORD.

JUNE 5, 2013.

Re H.R. 2217—Support Rep. Deutch's Amendment to Eliminate the Immigration Detention Bed Mandate

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: As organizations that work to protect and advance the rights of individuals in immigration detention, we write to encourage bipartisan support of Rep. Deutch's amendment (co-sponsored by Rep. Foster) to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act, H.R. 2217, that would eliminate the immigration detention bed mandate.

Congress has mandated through appropriations that DHS maintain a daily immigration detention level of 34,000 individuals, a micro-managing approach that does not exist in any other law enforcement context. DHS already uses a Risk Assessment Tool to help determine whether an individual presents a risk of flight or a risk to public safety and whether that person should be detained. Yet the bed ''mandate'' precludes the agency from making decisions about detention based on its enforcement priorities, policies, and need. It also makes increased efficiencies, effective alternatives to detention, and other cost-savings efforts for taxpayers impossible—an irresponsible approach for the federal government to take when Washington seeks to reduce federal spending. Alternatives to detention have received bipartisan support for its cost-savings from groups such as the Council on Foreign Relations' Independent Task Force on U.S. Immigration Policy, the Heritage Foundation, the Pretrial Justice Institute, the Texas Public Policy Foundation (home to Right on Crime), the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Conference of Chief Justices.

Today, taxpayers pay upward of $2 billion a year to fund immigration detention, approximately $5.5 million each day. Decades ago, criminal justice and correctional experts observed that holding all individuals subject to incarceration in jails or prisons was unsustainable, unnecessary, and a wasteful use of resources. It is common in the criminal justice system to use an array of less costly custody options, such as electronic monitoring and house arrest, to meet pre-trial and post-sentencing needs. The federal sentencing guidelines expressly allow substitution of a prison sentence with alternatives to incarceration. The immigration detention system should follow suit and conform to established best practices.

We urge you to support this important amendment, which will eliminate this arbitrary immigration detention quota and save critical taxpayer dollars. Please feel free to contact Royce Murray with any questions.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Adrian Dominican Sisters.
All of Us or None.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Immigration Lawyers Association.
Americans for Immigrant Justice, formerly Florida Immigrant Advocacy Center.
America's Voice.
Arab American Institute.
Congregation of St. Joseph.
Detention Watch Network.
Human Rights First.
Immigration Equality Action Fund.
Japanese American Citizens League.
Justice for Immigrants.
Justice Strategies.
League of United Latin American Citizens.
Lutheran Immigration Refugee Service.
NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
National Center for Transgender Equality.
National Council of La Raza (NCLR).
National Immigrant Justice Center.
National Immigration Forum.
National Immigration Law Center.
Physicians for Human Rights.
Service Employees International Union (SEIU).
Sisters of St. Francis, Sylvania, OH.
Sisters of St. Joseph, TOSF.
Sisters of the Most Precious Blood, O'Fallon, MO.
Sisters, Home Visitors of Mary.
South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT).
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC).
Southern Poverty Law Center.
The Advocates for Human Rights.
The Center for APA Women.
UC Davis Immigration Law Clinic.
Women's Refugee Commission.

STATE ORGANIZATIONS

Advocates for Survivors of Torture and Trauma.
California Immigrant Policy Center.
Florence Immigrant & Refugee Rights Project.
Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights.
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children.
Maria Baldini-Potermin & Associates, PC.
Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition.
New York Immigration Coalition.
Northwest Immigrant Rights Project.
OneAmerica.
Pax Christi Florida.
Political Asylum Immigration Representation Project.
Scott D. Pollock & Associates, P.C.
Sisters of Mercy West Midwest Justice Team.
Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates.
Voces de la Frontera.

LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition.
Dominican Sisters of Houston.
Gesu Immigration Study Group.
Good Shepherd Immigration Study Group.
Gospel Justice Committee Sisters of the Most Precious Blood of O'Fallon, MO.
Immigration Taskforce, SWPA Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.
Justice and Peace Committee/Sisters of St Joseph/West Hartford, CT.
Justice for Immigrants, District 4 & 5.
Milwaukee New Sanctuary Movement.
PCUN, Oregon's Farmworker Union.
Reformed Church of Highland Park, NJ.
Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester.
University of Miami School of Law Immigration Clinic.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I rise in opposition to this amendment, which strikes the legal requirement for 34,000 detention beds.

The simple fact is that sovereign countries control their borders and have an immigration system with integrity that adheres to the rule of law.

This last Friday, I visited the ICE facility in Houston, Texas. I find it interesting the numbers that they explained to me that were going on today in the Houston-Corpus Christi region, which takes in the entire gulf coast of Texas along with what we call the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. They informed me that we are having a massive encroachment into our country from across the border right now of approximately 100 OTMs a day in addition to the Mexicans who are coming across the border. It's interesting that we talk as to the alternatives to incarceration. In the Houston office alone, 64,000-plus are on alternatives to incarceration, which is almost double the number of detention beds for the entire United States in one office. So I think, with this, we get a better picture of what this invasion is all about.

The attacks of 9/11 taught us that immigration enforcement matters. It matters to our security. The Boston Marathon attacks underscored this sobering lesson. Each year, more than 1 million aliens attempt to illegally enter the United States without proper documentation, or they enter legally but overstay and violate their visas.

Though reasonable people can disagree, I believe detention beds are a

critical component in enforcing U.S. immigration laws with the detention and eventual removal of those aliens who enter this country illegally. Therefore, the bill recommends $2.8 billion to fully fund ICE's obligation to maintain no fewer than 34,000 beds.

□ 1510

In contrast, the President's request provided funds sufficient to support 31,800 beds, justifying the request by saying there's no need to support 34,000 detention beds, even though, as I speak today, those in detention are at 38,000 beds. So it looks like we've got overage, not shortage.

The facts, however, refute this completely.

First, as of last Friday, more than 38,000 illegal immigrants are being held in ICE custody, many of whom meet the mandatory detention requirements.

Second, by the administration's own estimate, there's at least 1.9 million removable criminal aliens in the United States.

There is general acknowledgement of an illegal alien population of approximately 11 million. That estimate goes up to as high as 20 million in some quarters.

Clearly, detention beds are necessary. This bed mandate is needed.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Deutch-Foster amendment, and I commend my colleagues for addressing one of the major problems in this bill.

Once again, this bill sets an arbitrary minimum of 34,000 ICE detention beds, whether or not ICE needs them, whether or not the population it is managing on a given day warrants detention.

This detention bed mandate denies ICE the flexibility it needs to manage its enforcement and removal resources in response to changing circumstances. It prevents ICE from making full use of cheaper alternative forms of supervision when it's appropriate.

The specific number of beds is not the main issue here. The problem is attempting to micromanage detention operations from the floor of this House and doing it, by the way, in a way that wastes money and reduces flexibility. I've never understood why we would want to do that, and yet this keeps appearing in the bill produced by our majority colleagues.

Once again, we need to remove this provision, and I commend Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FOSTER for focusing attention on this so effectively.

I urge adoption of their amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FOSTER's amendment.

I think it is absolutely astonishing. We can have a conversation about different people who are here undocumented and whether or not they ought to be in detention and whether or not they have a criminal record and whether they're a danger to our country, but to say that 34,000 beds have to be filled no matter what is so un-American. It's so un-American to say we're going to build X number of prison cells and then, no matter what the law says, we're going to fill them. We start with the need to fill the cell?

What the Deutch-Foster amendment would do would be to strike that mandate. It doesn't strike the idea that some people are going to be detained. It just strikes the idea that we have to fill what Janet Napolitano, who is the Homeland Security Secretary, just said is arbitrary. These mandated levels effectively mean that ICE, our immigration system, can't make detention decisions based on risk to our country, to our people, the various agency priorities. Its officers have to focus instead on filling daily quotas. And as a result, growing numbers of immigrants are held in detention. In fiscal year 2011 alone, ICE detained 429,000 people.

Let's talk about those people. Some of them are dangerous criminals, but most are not. Over half of the immigrants detained in 2009 and 2010 had zero criminal history. Of those who did, about 20 percent had only traffic violations. Only 11 percent of the detainees with felony convictions had committed violent crimes.

Included among those detained are victims of trafficking, families with small children, elderly individuals, individuals with serious medical and mental health conditions. Many of those detained have U.S. citizen children or spouses and deep ties to their American families and their communities. Many have potential claims for lawful status, but still are detained for months or even years. Some are even survivors of torture seeking asylum in the United States.

In my district, the Heartland Alliance Marjorie Kovler Center works with survivors of torture and emphasizes that placing these individuals in detention can be particularly traumatic, even replicating the feeling of vulnerability that they experienced during their torture.

And the irony is this: detaining large numbers of immigrants who have no criminal convictions, except immigration charges, does not make us safer. It's not necessary to enforce immigration law—we don't need it to enforce the immigration law—and it represents a major waste of taxpayer dollars. Each detainee costs the government around $164 a day to hold. I understand why the prison industry, the private prisons in particular, would love to see $164 and set this goal of detaining all these people every day.

So we should detain people because they pose a threat to our communities, not to meet congressionally mandated quotas. The criminal justice system does use a range of cheaper and effective custody options: electronic monitoring, house arrest. Alternatives to detention cost between 30 cents and $14 per individual per day, far less than our current spending on detention.

We're making real progress toward immigration reform. The Senate is considering language that would allow undocumented immigrants to come out of the shadows and earn the chance to pursue their American Dream.

Let me tell you, as a first-generation American, I find this policy so offensive to me, and my district is one of the most diverse in the country. To say we have to fill prison beds with these people, whether or not they're criminals, whether or not they pose harm to our country, this is not who we are as Americans. These provisions don't make us safer and they don't solve the immigration challenges we face. They are a waste of taxpayer money.

I urge support of the Deutch-Foster amendment in promoting real immigration reform and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I agree strongly with the impassioned plea by my colleague from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), and I'm very grateful for this amendment to be brought forward by Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FOSTER.

This really is an outrage. It's an outrage to our values as Americans, and frankly it's an outrage to taxpayers. The cost of holding an immigrant overnight is $120. We have viable and proven alternatives to detention that we should be using for noncriminal aliens.

Again, what we're talking about here are different folks. When we're talking about criminal aliens, I don't think there's any dispute to the extent that we have criminal aliens. At any given time, this can be approximately 40 percent of the people in detention. When I visited the ICE facility in Aurora, they keep them separate, they wear different colored jumpsuits. They're criminal aliens, and they are—however many we have that have been apprehended for a crime—subject to deportation orders. It's perfectly fair to keep them in some form of detention.

But the majority, 60 percent, are noncriminal aliens. They were in the wrong place at the wrong time. It could have been a tail light out. They could have been going 10 miles over the speed limit. Yet, we as taxpayers are removing noncriminal aliens from their homes, from being the breadwinner for their family, from supporting their kids and being an asset to our country

and instead turning them into a liability for taxpayers to the tune of $120 a day. Again, I don't see how this makes fiscal sense at all. We're paying for free rooms, free board, food, medical services. All of these are being provided at taxpayer cost for folks.

□ 1520

How is this a good deal for Americans? It just doesn't make any sense to me when we have at one-tenth the cost alternatives to detention that include call-ins and ankle bracelets. There's a comprehensive program for noncriminal aliens that can do it at a much less expensive cost. And in detention, many of them remain for a period of months. I've even talked to folks, noncriminal aliens, who'd been in limbo for over a year, some approaching 2 years.

So yes, anybody who opposes this amendment is saying U.S. taxpayers should foot the bill for food and board and health care for someone who is here illegally for 2 years. Why do people want to subsidize our illegal population? It's absolutely absurd.

This is a commonsense measure. However many beds we need for criminal aliens, let's have. However many we need for noncriminal aliens in terms of alternatives to detention, let's do. Obviously, what we really need is comprehensive immigration reform to address this issue. There's no way I don't think people on either side of the aisle think that we should pay for 12 million people to be detained at the cost $120 a day. I can't even add that up in my own mind, but I can tell you, it'd be a deficit buster right there.

So let's start here. Let's address our deficit. Let's make sure that we keep families together. Don't take parents away from kids. Don't force taxpayers to buy medical care and lodging and food for people who aren't even here in this country illegally. We can do that right here, right now by passing the Deutch amendment. I call upon my colleagues to join me in doing so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important amendment, the Deutch-Foster amendment. First of all, this is the right thing to do, but to bring the conversation back to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle pivot to in almost every policy discussion we have in this body—cutting spending.

In a budget age where many in this body celebrate the draconian and harmful cuts of the sequester, it seems we've come to accept as the norm indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts that in many cases fall on the backs of the most vulnerable among us. Cutting spending in this Congress no longer equates to targeted cuts to inefficient or duplicative government programs to root out waste. Cutting spending in this budget climate is simply about the bottom line. But it doesn't have to be that way.

This amendment is the perfect example of how we can cut spending in a smart and efficient way while defending those most vulnerable. By ending the arbitrary 34,000-bed mandate for immigration detention, we can cut spending and do the right thing.

How's this for a bottom line: alternatives to immigration detention save money. We're spending more than $5 million a day to detain immigrants, 45 percent of which have no criminal record, according to Human Rights Watch. That equates to roughly $164 per day per detainee for detention and roughly $2 billion per year.

On the other hand, alternatives to detention only cost between 30 cents and $14 per day per detainee, and they have proven to be safe and effective. According to Julie Myers Wood, who ran ICE under President Bush, 96 percent of individuals enrolled in alternatives to detention show up for their final hearing and 84 percent comply with removal orders.

So what's stopping us from putting in place these effective, cost-saving policies? Another harmful appropriations policy rider, mandating a daily detention level of 34,000 immigrants. In no other law enforcement context do we impose such a ridiculous quota. You wouldn't tell a county jail or a State prison that you have to keep ''X'' number of prisoners in that facility.

Mandating such a high level of detention makes absolutely no sense. By doing so, ICE is effectively prohibited from making decisions about detention based on enforcement policies, efficiency, and need.

All-too-often in this body, we look for someone else to blame. But in this case, we have no one to blame for this wasteful policy but ourselves. We have the power to change a policy that does nothing but waste the taxpayers' money and cause undue hardship to immigrant families across the country. I urge my colleagues to vote for increased efficiency and compassion, and urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I have listened to the arguments from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I find it interesting. First, those who cross into our country without and contrary to the laws of this great Nation have committed an illegal act. Calling them not illegal doesn't make them not illegal.

I really would like to point out that we have a curious way to discuss this as a policy; that is, no one here stands responsible for the decision. You know, the alternatives to incarceration were created by judges, and the judicial system stands in a little different situation than the Members of Congress. When one of these people who's let out under alternatives to incarceration in fact commits another criminal act—and believe me, it happens—nothing more than just DWI, when you run over a little kid—the judge, who puts him on that particular forum, is held responsible. And he is now going to read his name in the newspaper that he put that person out that should have been in jail, out on an alternative to incarceration. Or if the person commits another criminal act even more severe—murder, rape, robbery—if it happens when the judge puts him out on alternatives, the judge has to take the heat.

But as we have this great policy debate in Congress, no one who is arguing to release all these people on alternatives is taking any heat at all on what the accomplishments in the criminal realm will be of those we release.

I approve of alternatives to incarceration. I just told you that 64,000 people alone in the city of Houston's jurisdiction, which is the valley all of the way up to Beaumont, were out on alternatives. But detention beds are also full and overflowing. When I visited the ICE unit there, the red uniforms were the majority, and the red uniforms are criminal aliens. They have committed crimes in this country.

And so I think we are being a little bit safe to make these arguments as we stand here in these hallowed Halls. Never is our name going to appear in any newspaper when one of these people commits an act that causes damage to our fellow citizens. And yet we make this argument very passionately. I just want to remind everybody that we are responsible for those criminal aliens that we release, and criminal aliens are right now being released. And, in fact, Ms. Napolitano, after I asked her specifically, Are you releasing anyone from detention, she looked me right in the eye and said, No. And 2 days later, she released 2,300. And of those 2,300, the top two categories were both represented in that release—the most serious and the second-most serious categories of crimes we hold people for.

So this is a policy. This administration continues to have a policy of not enforcing the law, and, quite frankly, we need this availability of beds so we can enforce the law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses of immigration and customs enforcement automated systems, $34,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to plan, construct, renovate, equip, and maintain buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs and immigration, $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

AVIATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing civil aviation security services pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107–71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), $4,872,739,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which not to exceed $7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $3,824,625,000 shall be for screening operations and not to exceed $1,048,114,000 shall be for aviation security direction and enforcement: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available in the preceding proviso for screening operations, $2,972,715,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be available for Screener Compensation and Benefits; $163,190,000 shall be available for the Screening Partnership Program; $382,354,000 shall be available for explosives detection systems, of which $83,845,000 shall be available for the purchase and installation of these systems; and $103,309,000 shall be for checkpoint support: *Provided further*, That any award to deploy explosives detection systems shall be based on risk, the airport's current reliance on other screening solutions, lobby congestion resulting in increased security concerns, high injury rates, airport readiness, and increased cost effectiveness: *Provided further*, That security service fees authorized under section 44940 of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available only for aviation security: *Provided further*, That the sum appropriated under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $2,752,739,000: *Provided further*, That any security service fees collected in excess of the amount made available under this heading shall become available during fiscal year 2015: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 44923 of title 49, United States Code, for fiscal year 2014, any funds in the Aviation Security Capital Fund established by section 44923(h) of title 49, United States Code, may be used for the procurement and installation of explosives detection systems or for the issuance of other transaction agreements for the purpose of funding projects described in section 44923(a) of such title: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any recruiting or hiring of personnel into the Transportation Security Administration that would cause the agency to exceed a staffing level of 46,000 full-time equivalent screeners: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso shall not apply to personnel hired as part-time employees: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a detailed report on—

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

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

(3) labor savings from the deployment of improved technologies for passenger and baggage screening and how those savings are being used to offset security costs or reinvested to address security vulnerabilities:

Provided further, That Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the leadership; the heads of Federal agencies and commissions, including the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Homeland Security; the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, and the United States Attorneys; and senior members of the Executive Office of the President, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall not be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage screening.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will designate the amendment.

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 20, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $4,872,739,000)''.

Page 15, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $7,650)''.

Page 15, line 24, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $3,824,625,000)''.

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $1,048,114,000)''.

Page 16, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,972,715,000)''.

Page 16, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $163,190,000)''.

Page 16, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $382,354,000)''.

Page 16, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $83,845,000)''.

Page 16, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $103,309,000)''.

Page 16, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,752,739,000)''.

Page 93, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $4,872,739,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would completely eliminate funding for the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, and transfer that money to the spending reduction account, saving taxpayers nearly $5 billion.

Congress intended for TSA to be an efficient, cutting-edge, intelligence-based agency responsible for protecting our airports and keeping our passengers safe and secure, but today it has grown into one of the largest bureaucracies in the Federal Government. They've had a 400 percent increase in staff since they were created. A good portion of those are headquarters employees making six-figure incomes, on the average.

What's worse is that the American passengers aren't getting a good return on the more than $60 billion investment that they've spent on TSA. Reports indicate that more than 25,000—repeat, 25,000—security breaches have occurred in U.S. airports since 2001.

Plus, we have evidence today that terrorists on the no-fly list still have been able to board U.S. aircraft—terrorists boarding U.S. aircraft, in spite of TSA.

Furthermore, we've seen report after report on TSA employees displaying a lack of professionalism, being inadequately trained, and even engaging in theft and other illegal activities.

Just about the only thing that the TSA is consistently good at is using its extensive power to violate American travelers' civil liberties. Veterans, the disabled, the elderly, and even small children have been the victims of overly invasive searches by TSA officers. This is all evidence that the TSA has veered dangerously off course.

I've repeatedly asked that we use our resources to focus on intelligence and technologies that could be more effective when it comes to catching terrorists. I've called for the privatization of TSA, and so have many other of my colleagues. But we still have yet to see the necessary changes made to the TSA personnel or to its procedures that will ensure the safety and security of our airports and passengers.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment to zero out funding for the TSA forces Congress and the Department of Homeland Security to start from scratch on a leaner, more effective, and more focused and more productive system for protecting our U.S. citizens. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is this amendment is unnecessary and harmful to national security, in my opinion.

Now, am I happy with TSA? No. I have criticism of TSA also. Most people who travel have some criticism of TSA. But zeroing out TSA and leaving our airports unsecured is not the solution to the problem.

If the gentleman's argument is that we're being fiscally responsible to do away with the TSA part of this budget, I would argue the contrary. This bill, quite frankly, has made cuts, and, in fact, for 4 years now we have reduced spending in this bill. That's not a good argument.

It's easy to get mad at somebody that interferes with your life every time you travel, especially when you travel every week, but the reality is, this would be a mistake to national security. This would be a mistake to our country.

And even though we have criticism of TSA, our job is to fix TSA, not abolish TSA. And I know there's plenty of folks that think that abolishing it is a good idea, but, quite honestly, it would be a real tragedy to leave our airports undefended. We need to make them better. And I think one of the things we're doing is the oversight that we've provided in this bill so that we can take a hard look at DHS across the board and come up with solutions where things need to be fixed; and, of course, if TSA's on the radar screen, they ought to be fixed.

But I think this is a mistake. I think it's bad policy. I think it's good grandstanding but bad policy, and I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I join the subcommittee chairman in strong opposition to this amendment. The gentleman's amendment would eliminate entirely the TSA aviation security account from this bill, more than $4.8 million.

Now, I oppose this dangerous amendment on numerous grounds, but I'm most appalled by the fact that it includes no language on who, if not TSA, would be securing our Nation's airports and under what authority, what guidelines.

If this amendment were to pass, not only would the public not worry about bringing knives on planes, but terrorists would be able to bring guns and explosives on planes. So surely the sponsor can't be suggesting that as an acceptable outcome of this amendment.

I just have to say, the job of this subcommittee and of this bill is to provide for the defense of our homeland. That's our bottom-line obligation, and this amendment is in direct contradiction to that obligation. So I urge the resounding defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 15, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 16, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 19, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with an amendment that cuts $4 million from the Transportation Security Administration and provides these resources for small and rural airports, airports that have had important passenger screening devices removed as a result of the Federal Aviation Administration Modernization Act.

Passengers in rural airports in my district, including Yampa Valley, Montrose, Gunnison, Durango, they've all been impacted by unnecessary delays and intrusions because of the removal of security screening devices that were sent to larger airports.

In the interest of protecting passenger privacy, the FAA Modernization Reform Act of 2012 required the use of Automated Target Recognition scanners, or ''Gumby scanners,'' at all airports by June 1 of 2012. While the intent of Congress was admirable and protecting the privacy of passengers should be a priority, TSA's interpretation and implementation of the law has caused numerous problems for passengers traveling from small and rural airports throughout the country.

One of TSA's manufacturers who provided equipment for passenger screening could not comply with the changes in the law and provide new equipment. As a result, TSA decided to remove 174 of these noncompliant machines throughout the country. Rather than waiting for funding for new machines or finding alternative ways to be able to fix this problem, TSA made the arbitrary decision of taking compliant scanners from small and rural airports throughout the country and giving them to larger airports that lost their noncompliant scanners.

□ 1540

One alternative could have been the cost-effective private-Federal alternative screening model that was put forth by then-House Transportation Chairman JOHN MICA that would have saved billions of dollars and not compromised security at small and rural airports.

TSA's implication that security checkpoints at small and rural airports are somehow less critical is inaccurate. Once passengers clear screening at small and rural airports, they typically do not receive additional screening for connecting flights at any other potentially larger airports.

The amendment will assist with reducing unnecessary delay for passengers at small and rural airports by providing funding to be able to speed up the replacement of security equipment removed by the TSA. It is important to note that the funds being redirected from TSA toward improving passenger screening at small airports come from its administrative budget and, as such, do not impact passenger security.

There are numerous concerns with transparency and waste in the TSA budget, including a recent agreement by the TSA to purchase $50 million worth of new uniforms that are unnecessary, wasting approximately $212 million each year on the inefficient SPOT program and billions on the Transportation Worker Identification Credential program. I believe that these resources could be better used to more efficiently screen passengers at small airports, strengthen security, prevent delays and unavoidable intrusions.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I share some of these concerns with the gentleman from Colorado, and I believe that outstanding questions still remain over the timeline for replacing the AIT scanners. I expect TSA to sufficiently answer the question posed here today.

I urge TSA to move forward with the replacement of AIT scanners at the affected airports as soon as possible. I commit to the gentleman from Colorado that the committee will look into this issue further and do everything within its power to fix the problem to the extent that it does not cost the American taxpayers more money. It's my understanding that this amendment will not result in the need for additional TSA screeners.

Therefore, I accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would suggest that for now we accept this amendment and continue to work on the problems that the amendment highlights. My understanding from TSA is that they have prior-year funding available to replace detection machines that were removed due to the FAA Modernization Act. The machines that were removed didn't meet certain privacy standards and were removed at the cost of the contractor. TSA is currently testing new machines that could be used to replace the roughly 250 that were removed from airports across the country. Clearly, of course, this needs to be done.

So I'll be happy to work with the gentleman to press TSA to move at an expeditious pace to replace these with more advanced machines, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $12,500,000) (increased by $12,500,000)''.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support our amendment which strengthens the Federal Flight Deck Officer program, or FFDO. Our amendment increases funding for the FFDO

by $12.5 million, bringing the total authorized for the program to $25 million, with the Congressional Budget Office reporting no budgetary impact.

Since its creation in 2003, this program has provided training to pilots who are willing to step up and volunteer to protect their fellow citizens by defending the airliners that millions of Americans fly on every year. As part of TSA's risk-based approach to aviation security, which I've strongly advocated for on the Homeland Security Committee, the FFDO program plays an integral role in providing an additional layer of security against a hijacking or terrorist attack.

Since its inception, the FFDOs have protected thousands of flights each day and over 100,000 flights a month, at a fraction of the cost to taxpayers compared to the Federal Air Marshal Service. As the first line of deterrence and the last line of defense, it only makes sense that we should continue to provide adequate funding to the FFDO program. While zeroed out in the President's budget, we believe the FFDO program provides a cost-effective solution in protecting passengers aboard our airliners.

I applaud Chairman ROGERS, Subcommittee Chairman CARTER, and the Appropriations Committee for finding ways to prioritize spending so this program did not meet its demise. With that said, $12.5 million represents more than a 50 percent cut from last year's amount. At this level of funding, the FFDO program would be unable to recertify all the pilots currently in the program, maintain its current management structure, or train any additional officers.

We have offered a responsible and fully offset amendment that moves $12.5 million to the FFDO program to ensure that we are using our resources wisely and in a manner that directly benefits America's safety. The House unanimously agreed to a similar amendment offered in the FY 2013 Homeland Security Appropriations bill, and I hope my colleagues will join me this year in providing the support that such a valuable program deserves.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. It's been nearly a decade since, on a bipartisan basis, against bipartisan opposition, we fought and were successful in creating the Federal Flight Deck Officer program. Since that time, over hundreds of thousands of flights have been protected by armed pilots.

There was controversy at the beginning. Could we trust pilots with guns? Well, we trust them with our lives. We trust them with planes that were used as weapons of mass destruction by the terrorists in 2011. Of course, we can trust them with guns. But they need proper training because it's an unusual environment in which to possess and use a weapon—and use a weapon as the last line of defense—should a plane be taken over by terrorists.

We've done other things to provide security like Federal air marshals, armored flight decks. But still, we know that this program is essential, it's inexpensive, and it is something that pilots want to do. There were openings last year for a few additional training spots. Over a thousand people volunteered for those slots. Many, obviously, were not chosen.

If this program were eliminated, as was proposed in the President's budget, or even if it's cut in half—and I appreciate the fact that the committee has labored to find money to restore half the funding—many officers will not be recertified, new officers will not be allowed to join, and we will lose this last critical line of defense and one that is wonderfully random. A terrorist could never, ever know if the pilots on that plane were armed. It's pretty hard to spot the air marshals, but it's even impossible to know what the pilot has behind that locked flight deck door.

So we're recommending an amendment to our colleagues that would take money out of other parts of the bureaucracy of the TSA at no increase in debt or deficit and fully fund this program so that thousands of pilots can continue to participate meaningfully as the last line of defense against a future terrorist attack.

I think this amendment has tremendous common good sense about it. It's very cost effective. And I would hope that my colleagues will join us on a bipartisan basis in supporting it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

□ 1550

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also want to thank particularly the committee leadership, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PRICE, and the staff. They've done an excellent job in trying to put into appropriations language, and amount of money expended, reforms that are long overdue in TSA.

I'm pleased to join the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), in this bipartisan amendment to restore the $25 million for the Flight Deck Officer program.

I can't, for the life of me, understand why the Obama administration would propose to Congress that we zero out one of the most cost-effective mechanisms we have to ensure the safety and security of the flying public.

Now, this program costs $25 million, and that's out of a $5 billion expenditure for TSA—$25 million. It is probably the most cost-effective layer of security that we have. Just a few dollars underwriting, again, the expense of training these pilots who have asked for the ability to protect their aircraft themselves and their passengers.

We put this in place—everyone was against it. You heard Mr. DEFAZIO tell the story of this. The Senate was against it. The administration was against it. The airlines were against it. We brought it out here in a demo project, and the House overwhelmingly voted to support this program; and it's done it time and time again because it is cost effective and it's a good layer of security.

Now, let me tell you what these pilots do. These pilots go at their own expense. They're not paid per diem. They're not paid for the flight. I went out to visit the program, and I have to admit, whether it was a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, everybody tried to do the program. And so they put the training facility almost on the border of Mexico. I had to take three flights—one to Denver, one to Albuquerque, and another jumper flight—and then drive almost 2 hours to the border to get to this flight facility. That's what these pilots are doing on their own dollar for a weeklong training program that, again, this is the cost of that training program but the expense is borne by the pilot. I saw men, I saw women, I saw pilots for cargo, passenger all going to get this training.

Why would you want to end a program that is so cost effective and gives us this protection?

So, I don't want to belabor this. Mr. HUDSON and Mr. DEFAZIO have stated the case well. Thousands and thousands of flights are protected, and thousands of pilots participate on their own dime.

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

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

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, moments ago, the TSA Administrator announced that he will reverse his earlier decision to allow knives back onto airplanes. Knives will now continue to be a part of the prohibited items list on our aircraft, making our passengers and our crew more safe. This is positive news.

However, the administration's desire to zero out this FFDO program—allowing our trained pilots to be armed on the aircraft—puts us in a position that will put us more at risk, will put passengers and flight crew more at risk. The TSA not allowing knives on planes, that's just one step for passenger and crew safety when we need a comprehensive approach to keep our passengers and crew safe, which would include not allowing knives on planes, which would include risk-based screening, which would include, as my friends from the other side have talked about, increasing funding for intelligence operations to make sure we know who is getting on these airplanes. But it

would also mean keeping the Federal Flight Deck Officer program fully funded.

This is a program I know about because of a personal friend in Livermore, California, who is a Southwest pilot. I have seen firsthand over the last 7 years how serious he has trained to be ready for this program. As my friend and colleague from the other side just mentioned, they fly down to Texas routinely to train down there, and they are very diligent. They do this many times on their own dime. And a lot of skill and effort is put into their training to make sure that if something dangerous were to happen on that aircraft, they would be prepared. It is a task they take seriously, and it's a task we want them to continue to be supported by in the Federal Government.

So, to have comprehensive airline passenger security, we want to restore the Federal dollars for this, put it back at $25 million. And I appreciate that this amendment was offered.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I accept the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of a colloquy.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, as chair of the House Transportation Security Subcommittee, I want to raise my concern about a delay in finalizing a rule to improve the security of FAA-approved domestic and foreign repair stations. This rulemaking, mandated by Congress in 2003 and again in 2007, has languished for almost 10 years.

By way of background, TSA signed off on the rule late last year, and DHS completed consideration early this year. The Office of Management and Budget is currently reviewing the rule. I hope that OMB will complete this rulemaking by June 14, 2013, which is the end of the 90-day clock for their consideration.

At this time, I yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I share the gentleman from North Carolina's concern on that. The House Appropriations Committee included report language asking for final action on this rule. It is well past time to finalize this rule, whose delay has impeded manufacturers in growing critical markets for aviation exports.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank my colleague.

At this time I would like to yield to my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I very much appreciate my fellow North Carolinian raising this issue.

I agree with his assessment that OMB needs to finalize this rule as soon as possible. It's critical to establish this risk-based security regime for these repair stations. So we do hope for a rapid conclusion of this protracted episode, and I appreciate his raising the matter.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It's Mica amendment 8, designated and preprinted.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $31,810,000)''.

Page 16, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $31,810,000)''.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, first I want to again thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their excellent work, and again his staff. They have gone through some of the expenditures for TSA not only in the dollar amounts, but also in the language that's contained supporting their appropriations measures, some excellent provisions.

Now, I do offer this amendment, which is no greater increase in spending, but does move some money around from TSA administration to support our private screening partnership program. As you heard earlier from one of the speakers, this program is very successful, it's cost effective, and many airports want to avail themselves of it.

TSA has thwarted all the efforts to increase the private screening under Federal supervision, and they came up with a whole host of excuses. Also, they have cooked the books as far as the cost of operating these private screening operations.

□ 1600

Now, you've got to remember that if you look at this bill, it puts a limit of 46,000 screeners, I believe, in the past. We've increased that from 40,000. Mr. ROGERS and I did that some time ago. Actually, if you go online, you'll find 51,000 screeners. We're not sure exactly what the figure is right now. It may be less than that.

There are a total of 66,000 TSA employees. So that leaves approximately 15,000—even at our most conservative estimate—of the number of people in administration.

Right now, there is close to $1.2 billion spent on nonscreener salaries. That's $1.19 billion, to be exact, in this bill. So this moves a small amount of money—$20-some million—over to, again, the private screening account. I think it's justified. I think we're going to need it.

I have several amendments that I'm going to offer in a minute that I would like to expand, again, on the size of the bureaucracy and what TSA is doing to thwart the privatization effort that could bring cost-effective screening to play and do a better job and save taxpayers money.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I accept this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would provide an additional $32 million for the Screening Partnership Program. I have no objection to the concept of the Screening Partnership Program. If a local airport authority applies to participate in the program and a private company can provide screening in accordance with TSA standards and costs, then so be it.

In fact, this bill increases funding for the SPP by $15.6 million over current-year levels and $10 million above the request in anticipation of the program's vast expansion. But I am unaware of a surge in demand for participation in the SPP that would warrant a 30-percent increase in funding for this program. The offset for the amendment is aviation security direction and enforcement, which the bill already cuts by $20 million below the request.

Now, Mr. Chairman, should additional demand warrant funding for the SPP above what is already provided in this bill, we could work with the TSA to transfer funding to meet that demand. But it simply makes no sense to provide such a significant increase for the SPP when it is almost certain that those additional funds are going to go unused.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my objections to the limits placed on DHS regarding the UASI Grant program. My district is slated to lose $2 million due to the limit of awards to only 25 UASI grantees. While I believe that counterterrorism funding should go to the places

that need it the most, an arbitrary cap, along with a flawed formula, is not helping our Nation's efforts to prepare for, and respond to, natural disasters and potential terrorist attacks. I have voiced these concerns on a number of occasions over the past few months with DHS Secretary Janet Napolitano, and I appreciate her willingness to work with me on this issue.

I want to acknowledge other Members of our Nevada delegation for joining with me today to work on this issue through a proposed amendment, but I have a number of reservations about their approach. I am concerned about reductions in salary accounts for agencies that are charged with keeping our Nation safe and prepared for all types of emergencies. Furthermore, their amendment provides additional funding, but not additional instruction, so there is no guarantee that additional cities, like Las Vegas, will receive any of this increased funding in the amendment.

I am proud to represent Las Vegas, one of the premier vacation and business destinations in the world. Ensuring that my constituents and millions of visitors who we welcome every year stay safe is a top priority of our local government and law enforcement. Without UASI funding to sustain and enhance our regional capabilities, Las Vegas, as well as our portion of the large FEMA Region IX, will be at a significant disadvantage in preparedness, response, and recovery capabilities.

Hundreds of thousands of people gather in large venues in southern Nevada every day. Fifteen of the world's 25 largest hotels are in my district on the Las Vegas Strip with a total of over 62,000 rooms. In 2012, some 37.5 million visitors came to Las Vegas and over 21,000 conventions are held each year. On any given day, tens of thousands of tourists walk along the 4.2 mile Las Vegas Strip, just a few miles from critical Federal assets, including Nellis Air Force Base and Creech Air Force Base, as well as the National Nuclear Security Site and Boulder Dam.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that counterterrorism funding decisions should be made using forward-looking, risk-based metrics. It is critical that DHS update their decision-making matrix to reflect these principles. DHS does not accurately count expected visitors in their decision-making process. It is important to remember that visitors to our city would need the most assistance in the event of a natural disaster or terrorist attack because they are unfamiliar with the area, as well as with local evacuation and safety plans.

In Las Vegas, we welcomed over 40 million travelers to our city this year, an increase of 400,000 over last year. We are also expecting our local population to continue to grow. Yet despite these increases and increases in other components of our risk profile, Las Vegas actually slipped in DHS' risk rankings. This fall in ranking caused the city to fall out of contention for a grant, and it was announced that we will not receive the funding we need. This is not good planning and should be remedied immediately.

I pledge to work with my colleagues from districts with other tourist destinations and with the Secretary to be sure that the formulas are updated and improved and that the funding goes to where it is truly needed.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,334,000)''.

Page 19, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $23,334,000)''.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I have this amendment and I have several others. I'm going to combine my remarks on this amendment and one of the other amendments to expedite this process.

I am very pleased that the previous amendment to take money out of administration—TSA administration—which I believe is extremely bloated, and putting it into, again, the private Screening Partnership Program, that successfully passed. With that passing, I had a second amendment to take a similar amount to put those funds into the transportation security support and intelligence account.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have created this multi-billion dollar bureaucracy that has been unable to connect the dots. Here is almost every terrorist incident. We'll put this in the RECORD. TSA failed every single time. They have never connected the dots. We need to be putting the money not into this huge screening bureaucracy that hassles veterans and little old ladies and children—and you've seen it all.

□ 1610

We have created this unbelievable detriment to the American right to fly and to be a free citizen, and it's so difficult to get this darned thing under control, but I'm telling you that the money needs to be going into security.

When Mr. DEFAZIO and I helped create TSA, the purpose was to connect the dots, so I would move money out of administration. They have 4,000 to 5,000 people just within a mile or two of here who are doing nothing, with most of them making, on average, $104,000. Someone told me who just left there that there were four secretaries in his office making over $100,000 apiece. Do the math. We only have 457 airports in the country. That means you've got about 17 people in administration out there and about nine in Washington in administration overseeing this program. It's totally out of control.

So the Mica amendment that I'm going to ask to withdraw in just a second would take money out of administration and put it into connecting the dots in security. I know that's a dumb idea.

Then the other thing is that the staff has done a great job here. There is some good report language, but TSA is thwarting the intent of Congress to allow the honest competition of the private Screening Partnership Program. We never intended to keep this all bureaucratic. Only Bulgaria, Romania, and Poland have a similar screening model as the United States today.

What they've done is they've packed each of the private screening operations with huge bureaucracies left in place. In San Francisco, there are somewhere between 60 and 85 TSA administrators who, most of them, are making in the $100,000 range and don't have a job. How would you like that position? In Kansas City, there are 51 that they left there of private screening. They don't need these positions. They leave them there to jack up the cost to try to make private screening look more costly.

So, while you have language again in this bill—and it's good language—we need to hold TSA accountable to stop cooking the books and to give us honest accounting, and then allow for the natural process of evolution to private screening under Federal supervision—you don't do away with TSA—then finally getting TSA and Homeland Security to concentrate on security and intelligence and on connecting the dots to stop the terrorists before they ever get to the airport or get to screening.

Date	Target	Description	Arrest location	Suspect(s)	Nationality	Status
22-Dec-01	American Airlines 63	A man was put into custody after attempting to detonate a shoe bomb. Conspirators include a British man, Saajid Badat from Gloucester, England and a Tunisian man Nizar Trabelsi, who is in jail in Belgium in a plot to blow up two airliners bound for the United States, using their shoe bombs.	Paris to Miami	Richard Colvin Reid	British Citizen	Serving a life sentence without parole
8-May-02	?	A man was arrested after returning from Pakistan for allegedly attempting to build a dirty bomb. Arrested by U.S. Customs agents at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport on May 8, 2002, and held as a material witness on a warrant issued in the state of New York stemming from the September 11, 2001 attacks.	Chicago, Illinois	José Padilla	U.S. National	Sentenced to 17 years in prison [4]
Sep-02	?	Reportedly are six naturalized American citizens who were friends from childhood in Yemen; were arrested for allegedly providing material support for al-Qaeda and running a terrorist cell in Buffalo, NY.	Buffalo, New York	Lackawanna Six: Mukhtar Al-Bakri, Sahim Alwan, Faysal Galab, Shafal Mosed, Yaseinn Taher, and Yahya Goba.	Yemen	Each sentenced to 10 years of prison or less[6]
13-Mar-03	Brooklyn Bridge	A man was arrested and accused of giving aid to al-Qaeda and attempting to destroy the Brooklyn Bridge.	Columbus, Ohio	Iyman Faris	Kashmir, entered US in 1994, became US citizen in 1999.	Sentenced to 20 years in Prison [8]
Jun-03	?	Eleven members of the Virginia Jihad Network were arrested and accused of training for holy war around the globe. A federal grand jury indicted 11 people on conspiracy, firearms and other charges, six members have pleaded guilty and received prison sentences. Two others were acquitted of all charges. Ali Al-Tamimi sentenced to life imprisonment, others less than 20 years or less.	Northern Virginia	Ali al-Timimi, Ali Asad Chandia, Muhammed Aatique, Hammad Abdur-Raheem, Ibrahim Ahmed Al-Hamdi, Seifullah Chapman, Khwaja Hasan, Masoud Khan, Yong Kwon, Randall Todd Royer and Donald Surratt.	US Nationals	—
Aug-04	New York Stock Exchange, World Bank,International Monetary Fund.	Security in the United States was put on high alert after a plot surfaces to destroy the New York Stock Exchange and other financial institutions in New Jersey and Washington. Dhiren Barot converted to Islam at age 20. Came to the U.S. on a student visa in August 2000. Returned to UK in 2001, arrested by UK authorities in 2004.	United Kingdom	Dhiren Barot	Indian	Sentenced to life in prison, reduced to 30 years in 2007.
28-Aug-04	Herald Square subway system	Two men were arrested after attempting to bomb the New York subway system on the day before the 2004 Republican National Convention. Over a period of several months in 2004 he was recorded by an FBI informer Osama Eldawoody plotting to plant a bomb in the 34th Street Herald Square station of the New York City Subway.	New York, New York	Shahawar Matin Siraj and James Elshafay.	Pakistani and US National	Sentenced to 30 years in prison [14]
Aug-04	Pakistani diplomat	Two leaders of an Albany Mosque, Mohammed M. Hossain and Yassin M. Aref, conspired with a man who claimed to have ties to Islamic terrorists in laundering $50,000 in payments for a Chinese missile that he showed them. In fact, the contact turned out to be an undercover informer for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the RPG-7 missile was a disabled weapon owned by the federal government.	Albany, New York	Yassin Aref and Mohammed Hossain	Banglideshi and Kurdish	Both sentenced to 15 years in prison
Jun-05	?	In June 2005 Hamid Hayat was arrested and charged with providing material support to terrorists, and of lying about it to FBI agents. The prosecution alleged that Hamid Hayat had spent the better part of two years at an al-Qaeda training camp in Pakistan, returning in 2005 with an intent to attack civilian targets in the United States. Umer Hayat was also arrested and charged with two counts of making false statements to the FBI regarding the investigation of his son and of certain members of the Muslim community of Lodi.	Lodi, California	Hamid and Umer Hayat	Pakistani	Hamid was sentenced to 24 years in prison
Aug-05	Los Angeles-area military bases, synagogues and other places.	Indicted on terrorism charges related to conspiracy to attack military facilities in the Los Angeles area and of attempting to fund their campaign by robbing gas stations in Southern California.	Los Angeles, California	Kevin James, Levar Washington, Gregory Patterson, Hammad Samana.	US Nationals and Pakistani	James sentenced to 16 years in prison
Dec-05	Williams Natural Gas (Wyoming), Transcontinental Pipeline, Standard Oil refinery.	A man was arrested on suspicion that he had plans to destroy several sites. Reynolds was formally charged with a firearms offence for possessing a hand grenade, though a sealed statement from the FBI also stated that he intended to blow up multiple pipelines in the United States in a bid to help further terrorist causes.	Pennsylvania	Michael Curtis Reynolds	US National	Sentenced to 30 years in prison
Feb-06	Troops in Iraq, Toledo, Ohio citizens	Three men were arrested for allegedly planning to build bombs for use by terrorists in Iraq and were arrested and charged with conspiracy to provide material support to terrorists in Iraq and engage in violent jihad in their home town, as well as making verbal threats against the President of the United States. The investigation was conducted by the FBI and the Toledo Joint Terrorism Task Force, with the cooperation of an informant called 'The Trainer' who has a U.S. military background in security.	Toledo, Ohio	Mohammad Zaki Amawi, Marwan Othman El-Hindi, and Wassim Mazloum.	U.S. National, Jordanian	Amawi was sentenced to 20 years in prison, the others 13 and 8 years, respectively.
Apr-06	Washington D.C.-area buildings	Two men from the U.S. state of Georgia, were arrested after videotaping Washington-area buildings and sending the tapes to a London based jihadist website. Ahmed and Sadequee were reindicted by a federal grand jury in December, 2008. Both men were again charged with conspiring to provide material support to terrorists, including trying to join Lashkar-e-Taiba in 2005. According to the new indictment, the videos were passed to another convicted British terrorist, Aabid Hussain Khan, on whose computer they were found subsequent to his own arrest.	Toronto, Ontario	Syed Haris Ahmed and Ehsanul Islam Sadequee.	Pakistani	Ahmed sentenced to 13 years in prison, Sadequee sentenced to 17.[26]
Jun-06	Sears Tower and FBI offices	The charges centered around the group's belief that they were being offered money by someone in Yemen to help their mission in Liberty City, provided they supported the al-Qaeda jihad. The FBI agents represented themselves as representatives of al-Qaeda (but who were actually undercover FBI agents), and persuaded Batiste to provide plans for a stated intention to destroy the Sears Tower in Chicago, the FBI field office in Miami, and other targets.	Miami, Florida, Atlanta, Georgia	Narseal Batiste, Patrick Abraham, Stanley Grant Phanor, Rotschild Augustine, Burson Augustin, Naudimar Herrera, Lyglenson Lemorin.	US National	Five of the men were convicted. Batiste was sentenced to 13 years in prison.
Jul-06	Port Authority Trans-Hudson train tunnels.	Living in Lebanon who was charged with plotting a mission to blow up the PATH train tunnels beneath the Hudson River between New Jersey and lower Manhattan, New York City, United States with a team of suicide bombers with backpack explosives. He was arrested by the Lebanese Armed Forces, a division of the Internal Security Forces (ISF), in the Mouseitbeh area of west Beirut on April 27, 2006.	New York, New York	Assem Hammoud	Lebanon	

Date	Target	Description	Arrest location	Suspect(s)	Nationality	Status
7-May-07	Fort Dix	Six men were arrested after attempting an attack on the Fort Dix military base. The men were arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) on May 8, 2007, and were prosecuted in federal court in October 2008. On December 22, 2008, five were found guilty of conspiracy to commit murder in their intentions to kill U.S. military personnel; four received life sentences, while one received 33 years in prison. The remaining member was thought to have had a minor role in the plot and was sentenced to five years in prison for weapons offenses.	Fort Dix, New Jersey	Dritan Duka, Shain Duka, Eljvir Duka, Mohamad Ibrahim Shnewer, Serdar Tatar and Agron Abdullahu.	Duka family ethnic Albanians from Debar, then in Yugoslavia, currently the Republic of Macedonia. The Duka family entered the United States illegally through Mexico in October 1984. Palestinian, Turkish, and Albanian.	Four of the men received life sentences, one man received five years in prison and the other received 33
3-Jun-07	John F. Kennedy International Airport	Four men were arrested in New York after a plot is revealed to bomb the fuel line of JFK airport. Defreitas was arrested in Brooklyn, New York. Kadir and Ibrahim were arrested in Trinidad on June 3, 2007. Nur surrendered to police two days later in Trinidad.	New York, New York	Abdul Kadir, Russell Defreitas, Kareem Ibrahim, Abdel Nur.	Guyana, Trinidad	
20-May-09	New York City Synagogues/U.S. Military Aircraft.	Four men were arrested In April 2009, Cromitie and his three alleged accomplices chose their targets. They allegedly attempted to both bomb the Riverdale Temple and nearby Riverdale Jewish Center in the Bronx, and, using Stinger surface-to-air guided missiles, shoot down military planes flying out of a nearby air base. The men placed fake bombs wired to cell phones in three separate cars outside the Riverdale Temple and nearby Riverdale Jewish Center, both in the Riverdale community of Bronx. New York City Police Department Commissioner Raymond W. Kelly said one of the suspects placed explosives, while the other three suspects served as lookouts As the men were returning to the vehicle, the signal was given for the arrest. An 18-wheel New York City Police Department vehicle blocked the end of the street. The FBI informer also served as the driver of the suspects' vehicle. Another armored vehicle arrived, and officers from the department's Emergency Service Unit smashed the blackened windows of the S.U.V., removed the men from the vehicle, and handcuffed them on the ground. None offered resistance.	New York, New York	James Cromitie, Onta Williams, David Williams, Laguerre Payen.	US Nationals	All serving 25 year sentences
19-Sep-09	New York Subway System	Zazi, a native of Afghanistan who lived in Colorado, was arrested and convicted of plotting to bomb the NYC Subway system. He was trained by al-Qaeda in Pakistan. 5 others were also indicted on related charges. On September 19, 2009, authorities arrested Zazi, and on September 21 they charged him in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado with making false statements in a matter involving international and domestic terrorism.	New York City, NY	Najibullah Zazi, Adis Medunjanin, Zarein Ahmedzay, Mohammed Wali Zazi, Imam Ahmad Wais Afzali and Naqib Jaji.	Afghanistan	
24-Sep-09	Dallas skyscraper	A 19 year old was arrested on charges that he intended to bomb a downtown Dallas skyscraper. The device was a dud provided by FBI agents posing as al-Qaeda members. Smadi activated a timer connected to the decoy with a cell phone, then rode with an undercover agent and waited to watch the explosion. Instead, the phone rang an FBI number, and Smadi was arrested.	Dallas, Texas	Hosam Maher Husein Smadi	Jordanian	On October 20, 2010, sentenced to 24 years imprisonment and will be deported after serving his sentence.
16-Oct-09	Various overseas targets	Colleen LaRose, also known as JihadJane and Fatima LaRose, is an American citizen charged with terrorism-related crimes, including conspiracy to commit murder and providing material support to terrorists. Lars Vilks was a named target in response to drawings of the Prophet Muhammad. LaRose was arrested on Oct. 16, 2009, at Philadelphia International Airport as she returned from London. She allegedly confessed her role in the plot to kill Vilks to FBI agents shortly after her arrest, according to two people close to the investigation.	Philadelphia, PA	Colleen LaRose, Jamie Paulin-Ramirez, Ali Charaf Damache, Abdul Salam al-Jahani.	Americans, Algerian and Libyan	
25-Dec-09	Northwest Airlines Flight 253	'Underwear Bomber': On Christmas Day 2009, Abdulmutallab traveled from Ghana to Amsterdam, where he boarded Northwest Airlines Flight 253 en route to Detroit. He had a Nigerian passport and valid U.S. tourist visa, and purchased his ticket with cash in Ghana on December 16.	Detroit, Michigan	Abdul Farouk Abdulmutallab	Nigerian	
1-May-10	Times Square	A Pakistani American who attempted the May 1, 2010, Times Square car bombing. He was arrested approximately 53 hours after the attempt,[9] at 11:45 p.m. EDT on May 3, 2010, by U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers after he had boarded Emirates Flight 202 to Dubai. On June 21, 2010, in Federal District Court in Manhattan he confessed to 10 counts arising from the bombing attempt.	New York City, NY	Faisal Shahzad	Pakistani	Convicted and sentenced by a federal judge in New York City to life imprisonment without parole
27-Oct-10	Arlington Cemetery (WMATA station)	A Pakistani-born Virginia man was arrested and accused of casing Washington-area subway stations in what he thought was an al-Qaeda plot to bomb and kill commuters.	Arlington, VA	Farooque Ahmed	Pakistani	Sentenced to 23 years in prison after pleading guilty
28-Sep-11	The Pentagon, United States Capitol Building.	Rezwan Ferdaus is a U.S. citizen, born and raised in Massachusetts, of Bangladeshi descent, who was arrested by the FBI on September 28, 2011, for allegedly plotting to attack The Pentagon and United States Capitol with remote-controlled model aircraft packed with explosives. He was also charged with supporting al-Qaeda and plotting attacks on U.S. soldiers abroad, by making IED detonators.	Washington, D.C.	Rezwan Ferdaus	Banglideshi	
7-Jan-12	Tampa, FL, various targets	Sami Osmakac is a man who allegedly plotted an attack, to avenge what he felt were wrongs done to Muslims, in the area around Tampa, Florida. Osmakac, an Albanian from Kosovo and a naturalized US citizen, was arrested January 7, 2012, for the alleged attack plan, which involved bombing nightclubs, detonating a car bomb, using an assault rifle, wearing an explosive belt in a crowded area, and taking hostages.	Tampa, FL	Sami Osmakac	Albania	
17-Feb-12	United States Capitol	A Moroccan man who was arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for allegedly plotting to carry out a suicide bombing on the United States Capitol. El Khalifi thought he was working with al-Qaeda operatives, but was actually in contact with undercover FBI agents. He was sentenced to prison for 30 years in September 2012.	Washington, D.C.	Amine El Khalifi	Morrocan	

10-Aug-12	Wainwright Building	On the morning of August 10, 2012, several St. Louis television and radio outlets received an e-mail from a person who said they were going to bomb the Wainwright State Office Building in downtown St. Louis. The e-mailer was taken into custody by ATF and FBI and is currently charged with attempt to commit mass-murder and attempt to commit a terrorist act.	St. Louis, Missouri	Mark Anthony Grady	
17-Oct-12	New York Federal Reserve	A Bangladeshi man was charged with trying to blow up the Federal Reserve building in New York. While Nafis believed he had the blessing of al-Qaeda and was acting on behalf of the terrorist group, he has no known ties, according to federal officials.	New York City, NY	Quazi Mohammad Rezwanul Ahsan Nafis	Bangladeshi

With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. I will work with the committee, and we will finalize better language to get this done.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, when Congress created the Transportation Security Administration in 2001, we defined ''TSA security screeners'' in law as ''Federal security screeners.'' Their role, as defined by the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, is to screen passengers and luggage at airports across the country. However, beginning in 2005, TSA administratively reclassified ''TSA security screeners'' as ''transportation security officers'' and proceeded to upgrade their uniforms to reflect those of Federal law enforcement officers with metal officer badges.

My concern and those of many of my constituents is that, despite their appearance, TSA officers do not have any Federal law enforcement training to reflect their current title and appearance. This can be confusing to the traveling public as they interact with TSA officers at airports and now on the highways, at rail stations, ferry terminals, bus stations, and at other mass transit facilities across the country.

I strongly believe that Congress has an obligation to ensure that the title and appearance of Federal employees properly reflects their training and background. Until we are able to pass a legislative fix to correct TSA's administrative decision, we need to use the power of the purse to ensure that TSA screeners are not abusing the current perception that they are trained Federal law enforcement officers.

I would like to commend Chairman CARTER and committee staff for their due diligence and dedication in working with my office to address this issue. I am pleased that we were able to reduce screener uniforms by $18 million, a 20 percent decrease, so that we can continue to monitor this issue.

I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman CARTER and his staff in moving forward on finding a permanent solution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I share the gentlelady's concern of this implication that these are law enforcement officers. It is something that anyone who has ever dealt with law enforcement officers should be worried about, so I thank her for working with us and for explaining to us her concerns. I don't want anyone to be out there fooling the public, having people think they're trained law enforcement officers when they're not. I think that's an important thing at every level of law enforcement.

Representative BLACKBURN brought this to my attention and to the attention of the committee last year. We appreciate her staying on top of these issues. In fact, I asked the staff to look into this matter earlier this year. As a result, as she has described, this bill cuts the screeners' uniforms by $18 million, which is about a 20 percent decrease. In fact, this bill calls for a net decrease of $387.5 million to TSA, or 8 percent below the FY13 enacted levels.

Finally, the committee has directed TSA to provide a report describing in detail how TSA is complying with the Buy American Act and to provide Congress with the total number of uniforms and screener consumables purchased in fiscal years '12 and '13.

Moving forward, we will continue to work with the gentlewoman from Tennessee to ensure TSA screeners are not abusing the perception that they are officers of the law. We credit her for shedding light on this issue, and I thank her for bringing it to the attention of the committee. I am willing to work with the gentlewoman in any way she chooses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to surface transportation security activities, $108,618,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

TRANSPORTATION THREAT ASSESSMENT AND CREDENTIALING

For necessary expenses for the development and implementation of screening programs of the Office of Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing, $182,617,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to transportation security support and intelligence pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107–0971; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), $901,666,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, $50,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for headquarters administration until the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailed expenditure plans for air cargo security, checkpoint support, and explosives detection systems refurbishment, procurement, and installations on an airport-by-airport basis for fiscal year 2014 and the completion of a security assessment measuring the effectiveness of using the Transportation Worker Identification Credential: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the expenditure plans and report detailed in the preceding proviso.

FEDERAL AIR MARSHALS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Air Marshal Service, $821,107,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Federal Air Marshal Service shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act a detailed, classified expenditure and staffing plan for ensuring optimal coverage of high-risk flights.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase or lease of not to exceed 25 passenger motor vehicles, which shall be for replacement only; purchase or lease of small boats for contingent and emergent requirements (at a unit cost of no more than $700,000) and repairs and service-life replacements, not to exceed a total of $31,000,000; purchase or lease of boats necessary for overseas deployments and activities; minor shore construction projects not exceeding $1,000,000 in total cost on any location; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–09377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note; 96 Stat. 1920); and recreation and welfare; $6,839,416,000; of which $340,000,000 shall be for defense-related activities, of which $24,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which not to exceed $15,300 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be for expenses incurred for recreational vessels under section 12114 of title 46, United States Code, except to the extent fees are collected from owners of yachts and credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, $167,683,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Coast Guard Headquarters Directorates until a revised future-years capital investment plan for fiscal years 2015 through 2019, as specified under the heading ''Coast Guard Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'' of this Act is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, $13,164,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

RESERVE TRAINING

For necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; operations and maintenance of the Coast Guard Reserve program; personnel and training costs; and equipment and services; $112,991,000.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; $1,222,712,000; of which $20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which the following amounts, to remain available until September 30, 2018 (except as subsequently specified), shall be available as follows: $18,000,000 shall be available for military family housing, of which not more than $6,828,691 shall be derived

from the Coast Guard Housing Fund established pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 687; $860,553,000 shall be available to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve vessels, small boats, and related equipment; $149,710,000 shall be available to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve aircraft or increase aviation capability; $74,930,000 shall be available for other acquisition programs; $5,000,000 shall be available for shore facilities and aids to navigation, including waterfront facilities at Navy installations used by the Coast Guard; and $114,519,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs: *Provided*, That the funds provided by this Act shall be immediately available and allotted to contract for the production of the seventh National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for post-production costs: *Provided further*, That the funds provided by this Act shall be immediately available and allotted to contract for long lead time materials, components, and designs for the eighth National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for production costs or post-production costs: *Provided further*, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years capital investment plan for the Coast Guard that identifies for each requested capital asset—

(1) the proposed appropriations included in that budget;

(2) the total estimated cost of completion, including and clearly delineating the costs of associated major acquisition systems infrastructure and transition to operations;

(3) projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next 5 fiscal years or until acquisition program baseline or project completion, whichever is earlier;

(4) an estimated completion date at the projected funding levels; and

(5) a current acquisition program baseline for each capital asset, as applicable, that—

(A) includes the total acquisition cost of each asset, subdivided by fiscal year and including a detailed description of the purpose of the proposed funding levels for each fiscal year, including for each fiscal year funds requested for design, pre-acquisition activities, production, structural modifications, missionization, post-delivery, and transition to operations costs;

(B) includes a detailed project schedule through completion, subdivided by fiscal year, that details—

(i) quantities planned for each fiscal year; and

(ii) major acquisition and project events, including development of operational requirements, contracting actions, design reviews, production, delivery, test and evaluation, and transition to operations, including necessary training, shore infrastructure, and logistics;

(C) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline and the most recent baseline approved by the Department of Homeland Security's Acquisition Review Board, if applicable;

(D) aligns the acquisition of each asset to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities of comparable legacy assets, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each asset will address such known capability gaps;

(E) defines life-cycle costs for each asset and the date of the estimate on which such costs are based, including all associated costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the asset;

(F) includes the earned value management system summary schedule performance index and cost performance index for each asset, if applicable; and

(G) includes a phase-out and decommissioning schedule delineated by fiscal year for each existing legacy asset that each asset is intended to replace or recapitalize:

Provided further, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall ensure that amounts specified in the future-years capital investment plan are consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Coast Guard in the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for that fiscal year: *Provided further*, That any inconsistencies between the capital investment plan and proposed appropriations shall be identified and justified: *Provided further*, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 6402 of Public Law 110–0928 shall apply with respect to the amounts made available under this heading.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; $9,928,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which $500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)): *Provided*, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, payment for career status bonuses, concurrent receipts and combat-related special compensation under the National Defense Authorization Act, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, $1,460,000,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 652 vehicles for police-type use for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of motorcycles made in the United States; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director of the Secret Service; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; payment of per diem or subsistence allowances to employees in cases in which a protective assignment on the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee requires an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at a post of duty; conduct of and participation in firearms matches; presentation of awards; travel of United States Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act; research and development; grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; and payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; $1,534,589,000; of which not to exceed $19,125 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; of which $2,358,000 shall be for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children; of which $6,000,000 shall be for a grant for activities related to investigations of missing and exploited children and shall remain available until September 30, 2015; and of which not less than $8,000,000 shall be for activities related to training in electronic crimes investigations and forensics: *Provided*, That $18,000,000 for protective travel shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That $4,500,000 for National Special Security Events shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That the United States Secret Service is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from Federal agencies and entities, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, for personnel receiving training sponsored by the James J. Rowley Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available under this heading at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of $35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be made available for the protection of the head of a Federal agency other than the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Secret Service may enter into an agreement to provide such protection on a fully reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be obligated for the purpose of opening a new permanent domestic or overseas office or location unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such obligation: *Provided further*, That for purposes of section 503(b) of this Act, $15,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, may be transferred between ''Protection of Persons and Facilities'' and ''Domestic Field Operations''.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for acquisition, construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of physical and technological infrastructure, $51,775,000; of which $5,380,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be for acquisition, construction, improvement, and maintenance of facilities; and of which $46,395,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, shall be for information integration and technology transformation execution: *Provided*, That the Director of the Secret Service shall submit to

the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for its Information Integration and Technology Transformation program that describes funding for the current fiscal year and the following 3 fiscal years, with associated plans for systems acquisition and technology deployment.

TITLE III

PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary and the Offices of the Assistant Secretaries for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, support for operations, and information technology, $50,522,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), $1,176,629,000, of which $200,000,000, shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided for the ''Infrastructure Security Compliance'' program, project, and activity, $20,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation until the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives an expenditure plan for the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards program that includes the number of facilities covered by the program, inspectors onboard, inspections pending, and inspections projected to be completed by September 30, 2014.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

The revenues and collections of security fees credited to this account shall be available until expended for necessary expenses related to the protection of federally owned and leased buildings and for the operations of the Federal Protective Service.

OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for the Office of Biometric Identity Management, as authorized by section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b), $232,190,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $113,956,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an expenditure plan for the Office of Biometric Identity Management: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for the Office of Biometric Identity Management program, to include each fiscal year starting with the current fiscal year and the 3 subsequent fiscal years, that provides—

(1) the proposed appropriation for each activity tied to mission requirements and outcomes, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered, noting any deviations in cost or performance from the prior fiscal years expenditure or investment and management plan for United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology;

(2) the total estimated cost, projected funding by fiscal year, and projected timeline of completion for all enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities proposed in such budget and underway, including and clearly delineating associated efforts and funds requested by other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security and in the Federal Government and detailing any deviations in cost, performance, schedule, or estimated date of completion provided in the prior fiscal years expenditure or investment and management plan for United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology; and

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance, contractor services, and program costs associated with the management of identity services.

Mr. CARTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 35, line 10, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any intervening amendments to that section?

Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Health Affairs, $123,425,000; of which $25,072,000 is for salaries and expenses; and of which $79,534,000 is for BioWatch operations: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, $18,819,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for biosurveillance, chemical defense, medical and health planning and coordination, and workforce health protection: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, $914,795,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act of 2000 (division C, title I, 114 Stat. 583), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404, 405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–295; 120 Stat. 1394), and the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141, 126 Stat. 916): *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $27,513,000 shall be for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System, of which none is available for Federal Emergency Management Agency administrative costs: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $22,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for capital improvements and other expenses related to continuity of operations at the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center.

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For grants contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, $1,500,000,000, which shall be allocated as follows:

(1) Notwithstanding section 503 of this Act, $1,264,826,000 shall be distributed, according to threat, vulnerability, and consequence, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security based on the following authorities:

(A) The State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605): *Provided*, That notwithstanding subsection (c)(4) of such section 2004, for fiscal year 2014, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall make available to local and tribal governments amounts provided to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this paragraph in accordance with subsection (c)(1) of such section 2004.

(B) Operation Stonegarden.

(C) The Urban Area Security Initiative under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604).

(D) Organizations (as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such code) determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be at high risk of a terrorist attack.

(E) Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance, under sections 1406 and 1513 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1135 and 1163), including Amtrak security: *Provided*, That such public transportation security assistance shall be provided directly to public transportation agencies.

(F) Port Security Grants in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 70107.

(G) Over-the-Road Bus Security Assistance under section 1532 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53; 6 U.S.C. 1182).

(H) The Metropolitan Medical Response System under section 635 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 723).

(I) The Citizen Corps Program.

(J) The Driver's License Security Grants Program in accordance with section 204 of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (49 U.S.C. 30301 note).

(K) The Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program under section 1809 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 579).

(L) Emergency Operations Centers under section 614 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5196c).

(M) The Buffer Zone Protection Program Grants.

(N) Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grants.

(2) $235,174,000 shall be to sustain current operations for training, exercises, technical assistance, and other programs, of which $157,991,000 shall be for training of State, local, and tribal emergency response providers:

Provided, That of the amounts provided in paragraph (1) under this heading, $55,000,000 shall be for operation Stonegarden; *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraph (1), applications for grants shall be made available to eligible applicants not later than 60

days after the date of enactment of this Act, that eligible applicants shall submit applications not later than 80 days after the grant announcement, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall act within 65 days after the receipt of an application: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 2008(a)(11) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)(11)), or any other provision of law, a grantee may not use more than 5 percent of the amount of a grant made available under this heading for expenses directly related to administration of the grant: *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2), the installation of communications towers is not considered construction of a building or other physical facility: *Provided further*, That grantees shall provide reports on their use of funds, as determined necessary by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, lines 7 and 10, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $97,500,000)(increased by $97,500,000)''.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2014 Homeland Security appropriations bill that will provide $97.5 million for the Port Security Grant Program. I offer this amendment in conjunction with my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman also from California.

I represent Port Hueneme, a critical west coast commercial port and home of Naval Base Ventura County. The presence of the naval base makes the port a potential target of those who seek to do our Nation harm. I believe we must do more to protect Port Hueneme and other ports across this great Nation from potential threats.

□ 1620

The Port Security Grant program is a critical component of our strategy to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure against risks associated with potential terrorist attacks.

The vast majority of critical U.S. maritime infrastructure is owned and/or operated by State, local, and private sector maritime industry partners, which is why this State and local grant program is so critical.

The funds that the program makes available to non-Federal entities are intended to improve port-wide maritime security risk management, enhance awareness, support training and exercises, and support port recovery capabilities.

Grant recipients must use funds to address vulnerabilities in port security and support the prevention of, detection of, response to and recovery from attacks involving improvised explosive devices and other nonconventional weapons.

My amendment simply ensures that the Port Security Grant program will be funded at $97.5 million, which is at the same level as the previous fiscal year.

This program is a critical Homeland Security initiative for Port Hueneme in Ventura County and ports across our great country.

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

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

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for this amendment that I'm cosponsoring with my good friend from California, Congresswoman BROWNLEY.

This straightforward and simple amendment will keep the Port Security Grant program funded at last year's levels and ensure it's protected from further cuts.

U.S. ports remain one of our country's most important economic engines as they link our Nation to the rest of the world and the global economy. Each day, our ports move both imports and exports totaling some $3.8 billion worth of goods through all 50 of our States. And according to the American Association of Port Authorities, the U.S. port industry supports 13.3 million jobs and accounts for more than $649 billion in personal income.

That's why I cofounded the bipartisan congressional PORTS Caucus with my good friend TED POE from Texas in order to ensure that Congress recognizes the vital role ports play in our national economy and the importance of keeping them competitive and, most importantly, secure.

Despite their growing importance, ports have failed to garner the attention and the resources that they deserve.

During my very first Homeland Security hearing, I asked Lee Hamilton, vice chairman of the 9/11 Commission, ''What should Congress be doing to improve security at our Nation's ports?'' He responded by saying, ''My judgment would be that we have not focused enough on our ports.''

For instance, despite a peak funding level of $400 million as recently as 2009, Congress has decreased funding for the Port Security Grant program nearly every year since. This is despite the fact that ports remain extremely vulnerable to attacks.

According to the Congressional Research Service, a 10-kiloton to 20-kiloton weapon detonated in a major seaport would kill 50,000 to 1 million people and would result in direct property damage of $50- to $500 billion and indirect costs of $300 billion to $1.2 trillion due to trade disruption. And while an attack of this magnitude may seem unlikely to many Americans, experts agree that a major attack at one of our Nation's ports is more likely than ever before.

Just last week in a discussion regarding the likelihood of a nuclear attack at a major seaport, former DHS Under Secretary Jay Cohen stated that it's not a question of if it's going to happen, ''but rather a question of where, when, and to what magnitude.''

As someone who can see the Port of Los Angeles from my backyard, this statement provides a sobering reminder that we must be doing anything and everything we can to guard against this threat.

The port complex of LA/Long Beach is responsible for approximately 44 percent of all the trade that comes into this country. If an attack were to ever occur there, it would be economically debilitating not only for my district, but for the entire country, as well.

This amendment will ensure the Port Security Grant program maintains last year's funding and will protect the program from any further budget cuts.

By appropriately funding this program, we'll allow our port operators to continue to increase our capability to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from chemical, biological, nuclear, and other nonconventional attacks.

And while ideally I would like to see this program returned to its previous authorized level of $400 million, ensuring this critical program is protected against further cuts is one of utmost importance at this time.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, while I have concerns with carving out funding amounts for specific grants, I will accept the amendment.

I was born and raised in Houston, Texas. I had something happen to me many years ago as a young lawyer in a hearing at the Port of Houston. Back in 1968, I was told by the Coast Guard that every day two ships pass each other in the Port of Houston, and should those ships collide, just the mixing of those two cargos would explode and kill every man, woman, and child on the Texas gulf coast all the way to Corpus Christi. That's without a nuclear weapon.

We are the largest petrochemical port in the United States. I too am concerned about our ports. I'm very concerned that they could be a target of attack that could cause great damage both in structures and in human life.

So I join my colleagues from California to accept this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I too rise in support of the amendment, which would simply require a funding floor for the Port Security Grant program at the current level.

I very much appreciate the gentlewoman's intent with this amendment. Our seaports are critically important to our Nation's economy, and, therefore, have been a primary focus of our security and preparedness efforts.

Because our bill does not currently allocate State and local program funding among the major Homeland Security Grant programs, I do have concerns with carving out funding for one specific program. But the funding level which our colleague has proposed is equal to the amount allocated to ports in 2013 and that we anticipate would be available in 2014.

Therefore, I support the gentlewoman's amendment, urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $97,500,000) (increased by $97,500,000)''.

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

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, if we learned anything about the Boston Marathon bombings, it is that real threats exist against our homeland from outside actors motivated by outside forces with great access now from readily accessible materials that they can get on the Internet, and they can become radicalized also on the Internet and can target us here at home with IED devices.

I rise in support of my amendment, Mr. Chairman, which would require that at least $97.5 million of the $1.5 billion provided to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for State and local government Homeland Security grants would be used for mass transit security programs.

These programs are listed on (1)(E) on page 38 of the bill. The main FEMA and Department of Homeland Security mass transit security effort is their Transit Security Grant Program.

I want to start by thanking Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for the increase in funding for the account that funds local grant programs for security and terrorism readiness.

□ 1630

I organized a letter, signed by 39 other Members of Congress, asking for funding that is sufficiently robust for TSGP, the Transit Security Grant Program, to be able to meet our needs for mass transit security. Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE listened to our request, and more money will be available for this critical security program.

While the FEMA State and local grant account funds a variety of homeland security initiatives, my amendment addresses the critical, if often overlooked, element of mass transit security. Mass transit, which mostly includes bus and rail, is used by millions of Americans every year. In fact, according to the American Public Transportation Association, there are over 10.5 billion passenger trips in 2012 alone. That amounts to over 28 million trips per day.

We're fortunate in the East Bay of California, which I am privileged to represent, to have an excellent bus system and the world-famous Bay Area Rapid Transit system, also known as BART. There were over 400,000 BART passenger trips just this past April.

Unfortunately, some of what makes mass transit so great, that it is easily accessible and carries so many people quickly through critical urban centers, makes it vulnerable to terrorist attacks. In June 2009, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, summarized the issues facing mass transit, writing the following:

According to the Transportation Security Administration transit officials and transit experts, certain characteristics of mass transit systems, such as multiple access points and limited barriers to access, make them inherently vulnerable to terrorist attack and therefore difficult to secure. High ridership, expensive infrastructure, economic importance, and location in large metropolitan areas or tourist destinations also make them attractive targets for terrorists because of the potential for mass casualties and economic damage.

Just 2 months ago in April, a plot to target trains in Canada was thankfully disrupted before anybody was hurt. And, of course, everyone remembers the horrible London attacks from 2005, and the Madrid transit attacks in 2004.

No American, in any part of our country on any of our mass transit systems, should live in fear of a mass transit attack. And damaging mass transit in our key urban centers wouldn't only harm that particular area but could ripple through our Nation's economy. Transit security means economic security. Everyone has an interest in protecting our public transit systems, and that's where TSGP comes in.

Through TSGP, local mass transit systems receive grants to protect and minimize damage from terrorist events. Example of uses include surveillance training, public awareness campaigns, detection equipment, security cameras, and the hardening of infrastructure.

The continuing resolution for fiscal year 2013 provided a floor of $97.5 million for mass transit security, before sequestration, of which $10 million was reserved for Amtrak. My amendment would use that same number. And since the bill before us is based on sequestration levels already, that would amount to an increase in the floor for fiscal year 2014 over fiscal year 2013.

To provide such broad discretion for the Department of Homeland Security is important. However, I also understand the argument that the Homeland Security Secretary should be able to distribute money based on risk and potential harm. I know some Members may feel we shouldn't set minimum amounts to be spent out of this account.

To provide such discretion is important, but it ignores our constitutional responsibility to provide clear direction on how the money is spent. And, it risks certain priorities being ignored. Moreover, the Transit Security Grant Program is a competitive grant program, and so within that framework money would only be distributed based on risk and damage potential.

Last Congress, minimums were included for this account when a compromise was developed with the Senate, including for transit security. I hope the same thing will happen again. My amendment gives this House an opportunity to state now on the record that we value mass transit security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I'm willing to accept this amendment. Once again, I have the same concerns as my colleague, Mr. PRICE, about the carving out of funding amounts for specific grants, but I will accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would simply require a funding floor for public transportation security assistance and railroad security assistance at the current level. I appreciate the gentleman's intent with this amendment. Public transportation infrastructure is absolutely critical to the functioning of our economy, and, therefore, is and must be a primary focus of our security and preparedness efforts.

The same reservation applies to this amendment as to the previous amendment. We do not currently allocate State and local program funding among the major homeland security programs. So we have some concerns with carving out funding for specific programs, but the funding level proposed here is equal to the amount allocated to transit in 2013 and that we anticipate would be available in 2014. Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants for programs authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), $675,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which $337,500,000 shall be available to carry out section 33 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229) and $337,500,000 shall be available to carry out section 34 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. HECK of Nevada.

Amendment by Mr. GARCIA of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 257, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—167

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—257

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews
Campbell
Green, Al
Holt
Jackson Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger

□ 1703

Messrs. POE of Texas, SANFORD, CUELLAR, PAYNE, ROONEY, MAFFEI and Ms. FUDGE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RANGEL, HINOJOSA, CONNOLLY, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 245, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—180

Andrews
Bachmann
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin

Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—245

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Green, Al
Holt
Jackson Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger

□ 1711

Messrs. ELLISON and SEAN MALONEY of New York changed their votes from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 268, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—156

Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cuellar
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Gosar
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Horsford
Hunter
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kline
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Petri
Polis
Pompeo
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tsongas
Veasey
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Watt
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—268

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Cicilline
Clarke
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Delaney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman

Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Davis, Rodney
Green, Al
Holt
Jackson Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger

□ 1716

Messrs. CARNEY and CUMMINGS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 196 I was unavoidably detained during this five minute vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 236, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—186

Andrews
Barber
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—236

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Coffman
Green, Al
Grijalva
Holt
Honda
Jackson Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger

□ 1721

Mr. HOYER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FINCHER. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Ms. Julie A. Allen, Director of Elections and Information Technology, Missouri Secretary of State's Office, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held June 4, 2013, the Honorable Jason Smith was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighth Congressional District, State of Missouri.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

JUNE 5, 2013.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, June 4, 2013, for Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District in Missouri, show that Jason Smith received 42,145 or 67.1 percent of the total number of votes cast for that office.

To the best of our knowledge, this election will not be subject to a recount as provided in §115.601, RSMo.

According to Missouri statutes, the counties have two weeks to return their certified