



Legislative Bulletin.....July 7, 2011

Contents:

Amendments to H.R. 2219 (PART IV)—FY 2012 Department of Defense Appropriations Act

The following Legislative Bulletin contains information on the amendments scheduled to be considered this vote series and 100 amendments pre-printed in the Congressional Record through Wednesday, July 6, 2011.

Order of Business: The amendments to H.R. 2219, the FY 2012, Department of Defense Appropriations Act are scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, June 6, and throughout the remainder of the week under an open rule. The rule ([H.Res.320](#)) waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule also provides for the bill to be read for amendment by paragraph and under the five minute rule. The rule *provides priority for recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record* and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov , (202)-226-9717.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS SCHEDULED TO BE CONSIDERED THIS VOTE SERIES

Lee (D-CA). This amendment would reduce funding in 41 various accounts with the purposes of ending combat operations in Afghanistan. The \$33,000,124,000 in total reductions would be transferred to the Spending Reduction Account. Please see below in the legislative bulletin under amendment 94 for all the specific reductions to each account.

Garamendi (D-CA). The amendment would reduce funding from 38 various accounts dedicated for funding military operations in Afghanistan. According to the bill’s sponsor, the specific reductions to each account are based on CRS analysis of how changes in troop levels would impact spending. The \$22,161,542,000 in total reductions would be transferred to the Spending Reduction Account.

Nadler (D-NY). The amendment would increase and subsequently decrease funding for Overseas Operations and Maintenance of the Army by \$15,000,000. According the sponsor, the intent of the amendment is to require at least \$15 million of Army OCO funding to be used for shelter insulation at Forward Operating Bases to reduce energy requirements.

Poe (R-TX). The amendment would reduce to Overseas Contingency Operations, Defense-wide Operations and Maintenance for the purposes of providing payments to reimburse

cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access provided to United States military operations in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom by \$1,000,000,000 and would place those funds under the Spending Reduction Account. According to the sponsor, the purpose of this amendment is to specifically stop payments to reimburse Pakistan for the war on terror and will not affect payments to other coalition partners.

Lee (D-CA). This amendment would reduce funding available for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund (currently set at \$5 billion) by \$5,000,000,000, and would move this amount into the Spending Reduction Account, thereby eliminating all funding for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund.

Cohen (D-TN). This amendment would reduce funding available for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (currently set at \$475,000,000) by \$200,000,000 and would place this amount in the Spending Reduction Account.

Cicilline (D-RI). The amendment would reduce all funding for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund of \$475,000,000 and place the funding in the Spending Reduction Account.

Cohen (D-TN). This amendment would reduce funding in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (currently set at \$12.8 billion) by \$4,000,000,000 and would place this amount in the Spending Reduction Account.

Poe (R-TX). The amendment would reduce funding for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund by \$1,000,000,000 and would place those funds under the Spending Reduction Account.

McCollum (D-MN). The amendment would reduce total appropriations at the end of the bill by \$124,800,000. While the text of the amendment reduces total appropriations from the entire bill, the sponsor's intent is to reduce funding for military musical units. Yesterday, an amendment to strike section 8127 of the bill that created a spending limitation of \$200 million on musical military units passed by a voice vote.

McCollum (D-MN). The amendment would allow not more than \$20,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act to be used to pay motorsports drivers, racing teams, or racing cars in the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), the National Hot Rod Association (NHRA), the Indy Racing League Indy Car Series, or the American Motorcyclist Association (AMA) Super Bike Racing or otherwise conduct recruiting outreach through motor sports under the authority of section 561(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 114 Stat. 1654A-129). According to opponents of the amendment this would reduce funding for advertising and sponsorship by 80%. In H.R. 1, a similar amendment to prohibit DoD funding at NASCAR races was defeated by a vote of [148 – 281](#).

Cole (R-OK). The amendment prohibits funds for the use to “furnish military equipment, military training or advice, or other support for military activities, to any group or individual, not part of a country's armed forces, for the purpose of assisting that group or individual in carrying out military activities in or against Libya.” According to the sponsor's office, this is similar to language included in the Boland Amendment that passed in the 1983 Defense Appropriations Act. The Boland Amendment was a rider that prohibited U.S. assistance to the Contras for the purpose of overthrowing the Nicaraguan government.

Amash (R-MI)/Kucinich (D-OH). The amendment prohibits the use of funds to be used for the use of military force against Libya. According to the sponsor's office, the use of the word "force" does not address non-force operations like search and rescue or aerial refueling, so our language neither explicitly permits nor prohibits those activities.