United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011 No. 27—Book II

House of Representatives

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011—Continuing

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in the United Nations over and over again we see enemies of America, enemies of our freedom, voting against us over and over again. We see an organization there that's just rife with fraud, corruption, with a tremendous amount of problems. We see the U.N. bring people over here who have diplomatic immunity who have been caught in the business of spying against America, want to harm us. We see in the U.N. an organization that in their Human Rights Commission is populated by countries that are basically run by terrorist organizations.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to take a solid stand against our supporting this kind of organization by giving our taxpayers' hard earned money and taxpayers' dollars to an organization that I believe is not in the best interests of America.

Mr. Chairman, I personally would like to see us get out of the U.N. and get the U.N. out of the U.S., but we cannot do that today. But what we can do is in this continuing resolution we can deny taxpayer dollars being wasted on this organization.

And so I have the amendment to stop the United States from paying dues to the United Nations. I think it's in our best interests to do so. I think it's in our best interests to the taxpayers of America to prevent wasting their hard-earned taxpayer dollars on funding the U.N. through our dues to the U.N. So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to defund the U.N.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the Broun amendment would withhold U.S.-assessed contributions to the U.N., directly contravening U.S. treaty obligations and national security interests. It would isolate the U.S., cripple U.S. diplomatic efforts globally, weaken our leadership within the U.N. to advance crucial foreign policy priorities.

The U.N. is critical to advancing U.S. national security interests, and the Broun amendment would impede our ability to influence crucial counterterrorism actions at the U.N. Security Council, including concrete steps targeting al Qaeda and the Taliban, global action addressing the conduct of regimes such as North Korea and Iran, on which the Security Council has acted forcefully in recent years, imposing the most comprehensive sanctions ever on these regimes, U.N. missions in Afghanistan and Iraq, which play crucial and growing roles in both countries, supplementing U.S. efforts and reducing our burden.

□ 1550

U.N. peacekeeping operations, which are an indispensable tool, have saved untold lives, averted dozens of wars, and helped restore or establish democratic rule in more than a dozen countries.

The Broun amendment would put the U.S. on a dangerous path to isolationism. We learned on September 11, 2001, that we are not immune from events that take place halfway around the world. There are enormous challenges that we all must face together, and the United States cannot close its borders and think that we can protect our own security.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment to effectively withdraw from the U.N. because it would endanger our national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I rise to oppose the amendment.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her outstanding stewardship of American dollars as it relates to our standing in the world.

I understand the gentleman's concern, but the United Nations is where you draw consensus. It is where we are able to sit at the table and ask individual countries to join with us for what democracy means.

As you watch the rising crisis in the Mideast, it is the United Nations that we can draw upon to be able to emphasize democracy. As you watched the conflict in Egypt, where we celebrated what happened, many of you are aware of the tragedy that happened to one of our American reporters, Ms. Logan. The United Nations is where we can call upon the Egyptian Government to explain themselves and to apologize and call upon the U.N. Ambassador from Egypt to apologize to Ms. Logan and apologize to the American people for the tragedy that happened to this woman who was doing her job, the vicious sexual assault that occurred to her. It is the United Nations that we can come and ask others to accept that kind of responsibility.

We need to be part of the world family. The world family is a place where we can get solutions.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentlelady.

This is the 21st century. We have to live with our neighbors. If the United Nations didn't exist, we would have to create it. The fact is that even the Government Accountability Office estimates that a U.N. peacekeeping force is

Printed on recycled paper.

eight times less expensive than funding a military force. We're going to have to move to more smart power in the 21st century. We can't do it all alone, whether it be establishing democracy, securing peace or promoting human rights.

We can't keep putting our own troops at risk, trying to put out the flames that erupt all over the world. The U.N. does that. They don't do it perfectly, but they are largely an international reflection of our American values.

We've got to find a way to secure peace in the world. And ever since Woodrow Wilson came up with the League of Nations, the United Nations continues to evolve, continues to reflect our values and promote our most fundamental foreign policy. This is not the time to be pulling the rug out from under such an important ally.

The U.N. represents every nation in the world. We don't agree with all of them, but we have more influence in the United Nations than does any other nation in the world.

This amendment is not in our national interest. It should be strongly rejected.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I'm sitting here hearing what a wonderful organization the U.N. is, and I can't help but wonder: Where in the heck were they during Rwanda? Where were they? I would love to yield the floor to anybody out there.

You know, that was the most miserable failure and genocide that the world has seen in modern times. Where was the U.N.? And we all know they were absolutely nowhere. There were 800,000 people killed, slaughtered, an absolute genocide; and it went from, I think, April until July 6, 800,000 people killed with machetes on the street, and the U.N. spent the whole 3, 4 months debating the definition of genocide.

The U.N. is not there when you need them. The U.N. spends lots of time condemning Israel, lots of time on anti-United States jabs. They aren't being helpful so far that I can see on Egypt, Tunisia, Yemen, or anywhere else in the Middle East where the pot seems to be boiling over. But I just remember so vividly genocide in Rwanda and the U.N. not being there.

I would suggest to people, you know, we all want to read books. Read the book ''Hotel Rwanda.'' Read the book, ''We Regret to Inform You, But Tonight They Are Coming for Our Children,'' about the genocide in Rwanda. There are lots of books, and it's well documented on how absolutely worthless the U.N. was.

Mrs. LOWEY. May I ask the Chair how much time we have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it very clear that none of us are making a statement that the U.N. can solve all the problems in the world. But I want to reiterate again a comment that my good friend Mr. MORAN made: If we are going to put a cocoon around our country and operate in isolation, we will be less successful in dealing with the extraordinary challenges that we are facing today.

And I would like to say to my good friend Mr. KINGSTON, I'm not quite sure that we would be more successful in dealing with slaughters and genocide without the U.N. We are working very hard with our colleagues and our friends around the world to try and find solutions.

And I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I would ask my friend from Georgia: What's the alternative? Should we have gone into Rwanda? The U.N. was an abysmal failure, but where was the United States? And if we didn't have the United Nations, the United States would be asked to carry that themselves. We can't be the world's policeman.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am not an isolationist, but the U.N. has been an abysmal failure. We need to stop throwing our money down a rat hole. It's not dependent on us to keep the world safe. In fact, we, with our allies all across this globe, can do what's necessary far more efficiently without the wasting of American taxpayer dollars in trying to foster democracy, to foster human rights, to foster women's rights all across the world stage.

Continuing to pour money into the U.N. is not going to do anything except for keep a group of people who are in power there, who go against us as we try to stand firm for Israel, as we try to stand firm for world peace and democracy. Our efforts are thwarted through the U.N. And, in fact, they want to take the U.N. governance and apply it to every American citizen.

This is not in our best interest. It's a waste of taxpayers' dollars. It was totally ineffective, as my good friend from Georgia has said, in Rwanda and many other cases. It's time for us to stop funding this inefficient organization that is not in our best interest.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would prevent the U.S. from paying its annual dues to the UN and UN agencies, and put our nation once again into arrears. Passage of it would also end ongoing peacekeeping operations in nations critical to America's national security interests, including Haiti and Sudan.

Today the United States is in good standing at the United Nations after years of failing to meet our treaty obligations, and as a result, the U.S. is better able to advance our interests. Great nations keep their word, and by working with other countries in the UN, we can be sure that our nation does not go it alone.

In making his argument for fiscal responsibility, Congressman BROUN has picked the wrong target. In 2006, a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study concluded that UN peacekeeping is eight times less expensive than funding a U.S. force. This point was backed up by former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice who said that ''[UN Peacekeeping] is much more cost effective than using American forces. And of course, America doesn't have the forces to do all of these peacekeeping missions, but somebody has to do them.''

In the last ten years, the number of UN peacekeeping missions has grown—with each and every one of them enjoying the active support of both Democratic and Republican administrations. There are now over 100,000 peacekeepers—the second largest deployed military in the world—serving in 14 missions in some of the most dangerous corners of the world.

UN peacekeeping missions help end brutal conflicts, support stability, the transition to democratization, and bring relief for hundreds of millions of people. In 2005, The Human Security Report, a major international study on peace and war, judged that the global security climate improved dramatically since the 1980's, with genocides plummeting by 80 percent. The study attributed that decline to the explosion in conflict prevention, peacemaking, and increases in the number and complexity of UN peacekeeping missions.

The UN force in Haiti has provided security and access for humanitarian aid since the devastating earthquake and before that, the UN kept the peace. In the 1990's, Florida faced wave after wave of illegal Haitians trying to escape from the failed state. Why would we abandon this mission?

The UN force in Sudan was critical in supporting last month's referendum calling for independence and it continues to play a vital role in supporting South Sudan transition to a functional democracy. It's in our benefit to help South Sudan grant freedom to its people, and the UN is doing that. Right now the total cost to the international community for our peacekeeping and humanitarian efforts in Sudan is about $4 billion a year. An article in Foreign Policy just last month noted that a return to war in Sudan could cost the wider international community $30 billion. The UN is our main hope in preventing that from happening, so with passage of the amendment, we'd abandon the mission, possibly threatening stability in Sudan and potentially increasing our future costs.

In both the above cases, it is very likely that if the UN were not there, U.S. troops would have to be and they would be the ones in harm's way. Instead, by supporting UN peacekeeping, we lessen the burden on our own forces and reduce our own expenditures. U.S. Ambassador to the UN, Susan Rice said last week, ''Those of us—Democrat and Republican alike—who support the UN owe it to American taxpayers to ensure that their dollars are well and cleanly spent. But, equally, those who push to curtail U.S. support to the UN owe it to U.S. soldiers to explain why they should perform missions now handled by UN peacekeepers.''

I urge my colleagues to vote NO against the Broun amendment. It is not fiscally responsible—considering we are here today to vote on a bill to reduce costs, it makes little sense

to vote for an amendment that would likely entail greater U.S. military expenditures.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Amendment (Amendment No. 263) to H.R. 1 "Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011", offered by Mr. BROUN of Georgia providing that none of the funds made available by this Act be used to pay any dues to the United Nations.

I strongly oppose this amendment, because it is imperative that the United States pay its dues to the United Nations. The United States not only serves as the host country of the United Nations, it is also a Permanent Member of the United Nations and a Member of the U.N. Security Council. The United Nations serves the critical function of providing a forum where countries from the global community can meet and form a consensus for resolving the most important international issues of our time.

We must remain steadfast in our support for the United Nations especially during these times of rapid political, environmental and economic change throughout the world. We have recently witnessed large scale global events that require a multinational response. The crisis in the Sudan, the Earthquake in Haiti, and the protests for political change in Egypt and countries of the Middle East are just a few recent examples. The magnitude of these events requires a unified international response. The United Nations is the appropriate vehicle for that coordinated response.

Our presence as one of the few Permanent Members and our position and voice on the U.N. Security Council provide the United States with a powerful platform to exercise the kind of leadership necessary to promote peace, security of nations, international trade stability, international monetary stability, international aid to struggling countries and peoples worldwide, responsible monitoring of nuclear weapons proliferation, international human rights observance and adherence to the fair administration of justice.

So, in closing Mr. Chair, during this time when we are debating the funding of our Federal Government, an act of paying dues, it is hypocrisy to even suggest that the United States not pay its dues to the United Nations.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 526 OFFERED BY MR. WU

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce section 3(e) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(e)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents funds under the continuing resolution from being used to provide the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, with exclusive authority to site, construct, expand, or operate an LNG terminal. Simply put, it ends overbearing federal regulation and gives local government and private property owners a say in LNG siting.

This is a States' rights issue. FERC's overbearing, overbroad Federal regulatory structure is preventing States and local communities from having any input, let alone decisionmaking authority, over use of local property.

In Oregon, where there are proposals for construction of LNG terminals, I have heard time and time again from my constituents that they are confused and frustrated by FERC's intrusive projects and unclear timelines. More importantly, their voices are not being heard on decisions that affect their livelihoods and property rights.

FERC has demonstrated in Oregon that it is unwilling to responsibly regulate LNG and is deaf to the needs and concerns of our citizens and communities. Defunding FERC's exclusive approval authority over LNG projects is a crucial first step towards reestablishing a local role in the LNG siting process and ensuring that future energy decisions better reflect local citizens' interests.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment attempts, using the appropriations bill before us, to enact significant legislative changes to a prior law. The law in question, enacted by Congress in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, establishes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the issuer of licenses for liquefied natural gas terminals.

Notwithstanding the merits of the gentleman's concerns, and we can see the gentleman cares deeply about the issue and knows of the issue, this is not the appropriate place to modify such a law, as this amendment would attempt to do. Frankly, such a broad authorizing issue warrants a suitably more broad discussion.

We would be happy to work with the gentleman to facilitate that wider discussion at the appropriate time, on the appropriate bill, and through the appropriate committees of jurisdiction.

In this regard, I yield to my ranking member, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, for the time that he may wish to consume.

(Mr. PASTOR of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I want to thank the chairman for recognizing and providing time.

This amendment would prevent FERC from carrying out its statutory authority. The term ''enforce'' would impact oversight of existing and operating liquefied natural gas facilities. This amendment appears to prohibit FERC from approving environmental or safety-related amendments to existing liquefied natural gas facilities. This amendment will impact both import and export proposals in addition to almost any new facilities at preexisting plants.

While I understand the gentleman has concerns in his district, the language would impact a much broader constituency, and for that reason I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. WU. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts such time as he may consume.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

On September 11, 2001, when Richard Clarke, George Bush's terrorism czar, was asked to sit in the control room to take over the response on 9/11, the first call he made was to the port of the city of Boston to shut down the port because of the LNG facility in Everett, Massachusetts, in my district. That was the first thought in his mind. And why was that so? Because the al Qaeda had actually come in from Algeria, jumping off those ships in Boston Harbor in Everett, Massachusetts, in my district.

Now we've had a tremendous amount of development of natural gas in the Marcellus shale formation and all across the country, an addition of 30 percent to the natural gas reserves of our country over the last 4 years.

Now if a city, if a State determines that the terrorism threat is so great that they do not want an LNG facility in the middle of their most densely populated area, it should not be the right of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to override the public safety decision made by the State and local police that it is too great of a danger. That is why the Wu amendment is correct.

We have a bonanza of natural gas domestically. If a State decides they can get it from our own people rather than overseas, it is not up to the FERC to make that decision if they are going to override the national security, the safety consideration of that community, in making that decision.

I urge an ''aye'' vote on the Wu amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I wish to express my strong support for allowing states to have a say in the siting of liquefied natural gas (LNG) facilities and Representative WU's amendment #526 to H.R. 1.

Mr. Chair, for years, there's been an ill-conceived proposal to permit an LNG facility in

Fall River, Massachusetts. This is a densely populated urban area with more than 9,000 residents of southeastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island living within a one mile radius of the proposed site.

Siting an LNG facility here comes with enormous security risks as 900 foot long tankers would need to be brought up the Taunton River and pass under four bridges.

From day one, local residents have expressed their vehement opposition to this misguided and dangerous proposal.

Current and previous Massachusetts and Rhode Island governors, local leaders and public safety officials have also fought against this irresponsible project.

Unfortunately, the Republican energy bill of 2005 gave the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) the exclusive authority to site LNG terminals, overriding the role of states and local communities in these critical public health and safety decisions.

In Fall River, FERC has ignored legitimate local concerns, despite Federal laws and regulations directing a preference for remote siting of LNG facilities away from heavily populated areas and directing the agency to consider local input.

Mr. Chair, my constituents in Somerset, Swansea and Fall River have made their opposition to this project loud and clear. Fall River is not the right place for an LNG facility.

Let me be clear—I am not opposed to LNG as an energy source but it should not be sited in an urban area. Off-shore siting is preferable. The Northeast is already in a good position for currently permitted LNG off-shore terminals.

And, I firmly believe that states and local residents should have a say in the decision to locate a dangerous energy facility in their backyards.

Furthermore, Mr. WU's amendment is important because the City of Fall River deserves the right to plan its future and not have its economic development held hostage to a FERC permitting process that does not take local concerns into account.

At a time when so many of my Republican colleagues are fond of saying that Washington has overreached its authority, Mr. WU's commonsense amendment would restore the public's role in the siting of LNG projects and ensure that future energy decisions reflect community interests.

I want to thank my colleagues Mr. WU, Mr. FRANK and Mr. MARKEY for their leadership on this issue.

I urge a "yes" vote on Mr. WU's amendment.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I urge a "no" vote. This is a proposition that ought to be discussed by the authorizers. It should not be considered within the limits of this continuing resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue any new lease that authorizes production of oil or natural gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et. seq.) to any lessee under an existing lease issued by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note), where such existing lease is not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, we all agree that we have to do some serious work to reduce the deficit. But we need to start by first eliminating unnecessary taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies. I'm going to finish the rest of this opening statement in the well.

As a result of a poorly drafted law passed by the Republican Congress in 1995, oil companies are now drilling for free on public lands offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. The Government Accountability Office projects that the American people currently stand to lose as much as $53 billion in royalty payments over the life of these leases. And according to a brand new study, that's as much as $1.5 billion just this year. And with oil prices at $90 a barrel, we do not have to be allowing them to drill on public lands for free and take all of the profit for themselves and giving nothing back to the American taxpayer.

□ 1610

This amendment is very simple. It says to these companies we will allow you to continue to drill and not even pay any royalties, but we're not going to give you an opportunity to bid on any new leases on public lands in our country.

So if you renegotiate so that you are paying your fair share back to the American taxpayer, then fine, you can drill in the future. But we need that $53 billion that they owe in royalties, in taxes to be put towards reducing the Federal deficit.

That's what this debate should be all about: Where do we go to find where the waste is in our Federal Government? The oil companies drilling for free, paying nothing to the taxpayers while reaping windfall profits is absolutely something that we should not tolerate.

This amendment passed in 2006 on the House floor. This amendment passed as part of the BP response bill last year. This amendment passes over and over again with significant Republican support, 60 votes just 5 years ago. In order to reclaim this money, I urge an "aye" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, contrary to what the gentleman from Massachusetts just said, while this happened in 1995, it was not the Republican Congress. It was the Clinton administration and a result of the oil leases that were made under the Department of the Interior at the time and the Clinton administration.

If this amendment passed, companies with existing Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases would be required to renegotiate lease terms with DOI to include price thresholds before getting new leases. Companies with Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases have been successful multiple times in court challenging Interior's authority to include price thresholds in the lease agreements. DOI has lost at the district court, the appellate court, and the Supreme Court. The Secretary does not have the authority to include price thresholds on these leases.

The problem stems from language included in the Deepwater Royalty Relief Act itself and the regulations promulgated to implement the act that did not address or require Interior to include price thresholds in the Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases.

In addition, forcing companies to renegotiate the leases would be a violation of contract law and would be challenged in court. This would only cost us millions of dollars more. This would hinder our leasing ability, reducing revenues to the Federal Government, not increasing revenues to the government, as it limits the pool of potential leases.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, well, we voted to subsidize the cotton industry, NASCAR, agribusiness. You name it, we vote to subsidize it. But now we have an opportunity to correct the most egregious abuse of the Federal taxpayer. $53 billion of oil that belongs to all American taxpayers is basically being given away. It's their oil. It's being drilled offshore. We own it, but we're not charging royalties to the largest American corporations, and that's the real rub of it.

These are the most profitable corporations in America. BP is the biggest beneficiary. Exxon, Shell, Conoco, you name it. Chevron. They're all at the trough. Exxon, for example, last year $383 billion in revenue, and yet we're

told they didn't pay any American corporate taxes. They paid it to other countries, but not to the United States.

You know, at a time when we cut $1 billion out of Head Start and then we're going to give $53 billion to the wealthiest corporations of America, take American taxpayer-owned oil? This is insane.

Now, it may have made some sense when oil was at $20 a barrel, But when oil is over $80 a barrel and the American consumer is having to pay $3.50 a gallon for gas, is this really the time that we should be giving away $53 billion in oil? No.

Let's stop this egregious abuse. We say we're in favor of eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse? This is the worst abuse. Let's stop it. Support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am tempted to ask the gentleman: What part of the contract that was signed by the Clinton administration don't you understand? But I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly oppose the gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment. I wish he would understand that we are not drilling right now. That is the problem.

Many on the other side of the aisle have been thrilled with the administration's moratorium and praises the Department of the Interior and BOEMRE's work or, in true reality, the lack thereof in the deepwater drilling permit process since the BP oil spill.

This amendment is insane, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Massachusetts must be confiding with the likes of George Soros, who happily watched and encouraged the most advanced deepwater drilling rigs leave the Gulf of Mexico and travel to Brazil and Africa. If they are not picking up and leaving the Gulf of Mexico for good, they are filing for bankruptcy, like Seahawk Drilling in my district. This week, Seahawk Drilling blamed its demise on an unprecedented decline in the issuance of offshore drilling permits following the Macondo blowout.

The chief executive, Randy Stilley, said in a statement, ''The decision by regulators to arbitrarily construct unnecessary barriers to obtaining permits they had traditionally authorized has had an adverse impact not only on Seahawk, but on the sector as a whole.''

Seahawk's clients were waiting on 11 projects that were in various stages of the permitting process, none of which had been approved. This just proves this administration and Interior are not serious when they say they have lifted the deepwater drilling moratorium.

The minority is claiming this spending bill is a job-killing piece of legislation, but they are just fine with increasing taxes on an industry that is in limbo and employs hundreds of thousands in my district.

Louisianans are very hardworking, tough folks. They rarely ask for much. Mr. Chairman, they have been yelling loudly and beating down my door to tell me they are fed up and ready to go back to work.

I guarantee you, Americans across the Nation will begin to yell as well when they are paying more at the gas pump when prices should be falling.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York, the author of this amendment in 2006, Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. HINCHEY. At a time when our country is facing record deficits and the oil industry can't count their money fast enough, oil drillers in the Gulf of Mexico are getting away with highway robbery because of mistakes that were made many years ago.

Oil and gas companies are extracting resources from public property without paying royalties, regardless of the price of oil and gas. It's time to fix the problem. The GAO has estimated that not doing so will continue to cost American taxpayers up to $53 billion.

These hugely profitable companies are tapping oil and gas reserves that belong to the American people, selling it back to us, and then reaping a massive profit on the backs of the middle class. But they are not paying one red cent to the public for the oil and gas they have extracted. They get it for free, and we pay the price.

I don't know a single person who would allow an oil or gas company to drill on their private property and not expect to be compensated for the oil extracted from that land. So why should the Federal Government continue to be taken advantage of by the most profitable industry in United States history?

Congress has a chance to correct this injustice.

Last year, oil companies earned over $70 billion in profits when oil prices were significantly lower than they are today. With the cost of oil once again approaching $100 a barrel and prices at the pump also rising, the idea that this industry is still getting royalty relief is downright criminal.

If we're serious about reining in our deficits, then we should adopt this amendment. It's an important amendment; it makes perfect sense, and it is in the best interests of all of the people of this country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. And what is not being pointed out here is, while the gentleman from Massachusetts is talking about companies and royalties, he fails to mention, first of all, that the second largest source of Federal revenue next to income taxes is royalties that are paid by oil companies. They are paying billions of dollars in royalties. They are hiring tens of thousands and, in some cases, probably in the millions of Americans to work in the energy industry. But that, right now, is at jeopardy by this administration's policies. In fact, as my other colleague from Louisiana just pointed out, just last week another company filed for bankruptcy because of this administration's policies shutting off the ability to issue permits and allow people to go back to work.

And so what does this amendment do? Well, my colleague talks about royalties. Let's actually read what his amendment does as opposed to what he says about his amendment.

The amendment by Mr. MARKEY says: None of the funds made available by this act may be used to issue any new lease that authorizes production of oil or natural gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

This is about closing off more domestic sources of energy production at a time when the Middle East has never been more volatile. You might as well just call this the OPEC protection amendment, because it ensures that more of these companies, as they are already doing, will be going out of the country.

And by the way, oh, is this hypothetical? Of course it's not. I have got a list here of some of the rigs by some of the very companies my colleague talks about that are already leaving. And one of the countries that they have already left to bring their assets to to drill because they can't do business in America is Egypt. Two of these billion-dollar assets have actually said it's better to do business in Egypt and drill for energy there than to drill in America because of these radical policies.

So I guess my colleague is okay with shutting off more domestic energy, allowing more American companies to go bankrupt. The White House has acknowledged 12,000 Americans have already lost their jobs because of these policies, and then my colleague wants to bring this amendment to shut even more areas of the Outer Continental Shelf off.

OPEC might love this amendment, but I think Americans who are going to be paying $4 and $5 a gallon for gas at the pump this summer don't agree.

I oppose this amendment.

□ 1620

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

This is really important. The country needs this money. The country owns this land. The country deserves these royalties. And whether we have not collected these royalties because of a mistake or because of a cozy relationship with the oil companies and the other party, for whatever reason these weren't collected, they should be collected.

Royalty relief? No, it's not relief. This is what is supposed to be paid. And I think about all of the things that it should be going for.

Portions of the royalties are owed to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This is what we spoke about yesterday, our Nation's most successful open space preservation program that is supposed to take money from the depletion of resources—these oil resources—and apply it to preservation of parks, recreation, and open space. That's just one of the things that should be done with this money that is owed to the American taxpayers.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would just remind the gentleman from New Jersey that it was the Clinton administration that let these leases.

I would like to now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We hear about a cozy relationship, and that's interesting because when you go back and look at the worst oil spill in American history from British Petroleum, BP, and why it took this administration so long to come down on them, we find out that BP was the one oil company that was willing to support and endorse the administration's crap and trade bill. They were ready to come out and make a big deal out of it.

And that's why—you talk about cozy relationships. Oh, yeah. That's not enough. This administration hired to help oversee these leases the person who was responsible under the Clinton administration for costing this country billions by taking out language that would have gotten us the royalties we should have had.

But one of the problems we should never lose sight of, no matter how cozy the relationship was with the Clinton administration and BP and this administration and BP and the 800 hazardous safety violations they overlooked, was that this country's history has been one of integrity.

You go back to the War of 1812. Banks in England had loaned this country's businesses money. And we had the War of 1812. It went on for a couple of years. After that war, we were struggling, but people that owed banks in England paid them anyway. The world took notice and said this is a country that can be trusted. When they give you their word, it means something.

Now this administration and this provision would say, Hey, if we make a contract with you and maybe because of this administration's cozy relationship is too good for you, we'll just come back, cancel the deal, punish you because we were able to lure you into a deal.

There's been more damage done to the gulf States by this President's moratorium. You want to help with jobs. Give them their jobs back. Open up the provisions. Get alternative energy by using the proceeds from the drilling that this group has cut off.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this straightforward amendment to reduce the deficit and protect taxpayers. It says the Nation's biggest oil companies won't be able to buy new leases from the Federal Government if they want to keep drilling on the public's land for free. That's all.

Now, there's a consensus in this Congress that we need to address the Federal deficit. With this amendment, we can.

GAO says we're giving $53 billion to the oil companies over the next 25 years if we do not fix the royalty relief law.

So let's fix it. Let's make the oil companies simply pay their fair share. Let's stop pouring billions of dollars into their already stuffed oil industry coffers. Isn't it time we give our constituents a break instead of the oil companies?

This is about the people we represent. They're taking their savings and they're putting it into their gas tanks and into heating their homes. Big Oil doesn't need this profit.

Let's end the handouts, reduce the deficit, protect the taxpayer. Support the Markey amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Could the Chair inform me as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 2½ minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

This amendment encapsulates this entire week. This week's debate is all about priorities: Will we stand with Big Oil or with Big Bird? With the big corporations or with the little guy?

Shell Oil isn't curing our addiction to oil, but the millions of Americans afflicted with Alzheimer's and Parkinson's need a cure for those diseases; and they need these revenues from the oil companies.

Executives from BP won't be shivering in the cold any time soon, but our Nation's poorest families and senior citizens will be.

ConocoPhillips doesn't need help feeding their profits; but millions of America's poorest women, infants, and children who don't have enough to eat need help staying fed.

Chevron doesn't need special treatment, but special education programs for our neediest students are on the chopping block.

ExxonMobil doesn't need a head start on success, but our kids do need the Head Start program to send them on the right educational path.

My amendment focuses on just the kind of special interest loophole that should be closed before we open attacks on programs for the poorest Americans most in need of help.

One of the several dozen companies receiving this windfall is BP. Imagine that. BP spilled oil freely into the Gulf of Mexico for nearly 90 days, and yet they are now drilling for free in some of those same waters at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Just last week the former president of Shell Oil, John Hofmeister, was quoted in the National Journal as saying, ''In the face of sustained high oil prices, it was not an issue for large companies of needing the subsidies to entice them to looking for and producing more oil.''

Well, I agree with Mr. Hofmeister. At nearly $90 a barrel, subsidizing oil companies to drill is like subsidizing a bird to fly or a fish to swim. You do not have to do it.

Unless this amendment is adopted, ExxonMobil, BP, Shell, ConocoPhillips, and Chevron will continue to hold leases that let them drill on public land without paying taxpayers a single dime. These companies are already getting 100-year-old tax breaks to sell $100-a-barrel oil to make $100 billion a year in profits. They don't need a $53 billion windfall courtesy of the American taxpayer and our national debt.

Vote ''aye'' on the Markey amendment. Cease paying big oil companies' windfall profits for the American people.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You remember Paul Harvey's ''The Rest of the Story''? You want to hear what's really behind this debate?

In the mid-1990s, worried about how much oil we're importing from the Middle East, the government encouraged companies to go out deeper into the gulf to create American-made energy here in the United States. So for 4 years they signed lease agreements. And companies here in America, they paid millions of dollars for these leases with no knowledge of whether there was oil there or not, or gas.

□ 1630

They spent billions of dollars to drill in depths they hadn't before—again, not knowing if they would hit anything or not. They used American companies to do it on American platforms with American workers. And guess what? It worked. They created American-made oil and natural gas, and they kept it here for us. This outraged the Democrats: How could this happen? And by the way, these companies paid billions of dollars of royalty not on the price, but on how much they bring out of the ground. It was a win-win situation—taxpayers win, our jobs win, we get American-made energy.

Outraged, they took it to court. Four times the court said—they wanted the American Government to break its own contract—the court, four times, including the Supreme Court, said no. Now they've tried to extort U.S. companies in saying, you must break your contract, or we will deny you any chance

to do business in the Gulf of Mexico. That's what this amendment is about. It's extortion. They want businesses to break the contract with America that America can't break itself.

If the government has power to force you to break the agreement they made with you, how much power will they have over you, over your family, over your business? And by the way, what's wrong with creating good old-fashioned American energy here in this country with our workers, with our companies, with the revenues coming to us and to the local communities, giving us affordable energy? Isn't that what America is also about?

Our energy jobs aren't expendable. Stop sending our oil and gas workers to the unemployment line. Let them explore right here in America. Does Hugo Chavez really need a bigger incentive to sell more oil in the United States of America?

This amendment needs to go down on this House floor.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to Amendment No. 27 by Rep. MARKEY to H.R. 1, the Fiscal Year Continuing Appropriations Act for FY2011. This amendment attempts to retroactively reverse the express intent of Congress in passing the Royalty Relief Act. In the case of Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas v. Allred, the Fifth Circuit Court specifically held that the Department of the Interior does not have authority to impose royalty relief price thresholds on deep water leases issued from 1996–2000. In reaching this decision, the Fifth Circuit held that Congress was unambiguous in guaranteeing royalty relief, without price thresholds, to holders of these leases up to the volumes specified in the statute. The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and other regulations allow our government to preclude a lessee from obtaining new leases if it has failed to act with due diligence with respect to its existing leases. This amendment would add a new requirement that imposes that same penalty but for an entirely different and unrelated reason. For these reasons, I strongly oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 409 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by division B may be used by the Department of Health and Human Services to implement or enforce section 2718 of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 1001(5) and replaced by section 10101(f) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think that we've made some significant progress in the area of improving health care in this country, the laws related to health care in this country today in this Chamber. This is another portion of an amendment that would address the issue of health care.

As a physician and dad, I care greatly about the issue of health care and came to Congress, frankly, as one of the major reasons was to try to fix the health care system and to make it more patient-centered.

Over the last 2 years, we've seen a significant affront to our health care system with costs increasing, destroying jobs, violating principles to a significant degree as it relates to health care.

Last year, this Congress made a lot of decisions that gave Washington control over our health care system. And a perfect example of that control is that ObamaCare mandates to the companies that provide the health coverage for individuals, helping individuals, how to run their business. Essentially, the Federal Government is in the business of dictating to private companies what they should do to run their business, what kind of coverage they can provide, what kind of prices they can charge, what kind of definition of quality care, and what meets the definition of essential services for individuals. It really is central planning at its finest, and it is certainly not the government's role in a free market system.

The government has already proven that it's not well qualified for mandating and defining what will be counted as quality improvement activity for the purposes of calculating, in this instance, the medical loss ratio. For instance, many of the fraud provisions that are required are excluded from being included in the medical loss ratio. The coding system that is required for health insurers to utilize is not able to be included in the medical loss ratio.

So what it does is compromise the opportunity for brokers to provide the best advice to citizens. It makes it so that these folks who are actually—they're actually the exchanges, Mr. Chairman, if you think about it, but these folks are going to be pinched and pushed out of their jobs, the ones that are actually helping our citizens to weave their way through the morass of health coverage in this country.

The President said famously during this whole debate, ''If you like what you have, you can keep it.'' The fact of the matter is, as you know, Mr. Chairman, and so many others know, that that simply is not true. These medical loss ratio requirements will in fact break that promise to a further degree.

So the amendment is very simple. It makes it so that no moneys in this bill can be utilized for the provision of enforcing the medical loss ratio, destructive provisions in the area of health care. I urge my colleagues to back the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment for some very good reasons on that.

Let me explain what the medical loss ratio is. That is what the people in these private insurance companies call providing health care for the premium dollar you provide. For every time they give you a health service for your premium dollar, they think of it as a medical loss. The medical loss ratio is the amount of your dollar that they actually spend on health care versus CEO salaries, bonuses, stock dividends that are out of control, lobbyist costs that they might incur, advertisements, and so on down the line. The purpose of the medical loss ratio provision is in fact to make sure that they spend a higher percentage of your premium dollar on actual health care.

In 1993, the average used to be about 95 cents of every dollar would be spent by private health insurance companies on health services. Now, however, recent studies indicate that some of these private insurance companies are spending as little as 60 cents of every health care dollar on actual health services and the rest on lobbyists—probably some of whom are down here arguing to kill this provision—on high CEO salaries and bonuses and advertisements, and so on down the line.

The MLR, the medical loss ratio provision in this bill, says an insurance company for individuals or small company plans has to spend at least 80 cents of every premium dollar on health care. And if you're in a large company plan, it's 85 cents. What a novel idea; you get some bang for your buck and the government would actually do something for you for a change, protecting consumer rights and making sure that companies do what they should be doing.

This isn't about profits. The companies are extremely profitable, and this is not going to cramp their style. In fact, this is about greed. The profits for the 10 largest for-profit insurance companies in this country show a whopping $9.3 billion in profits for the first three quarters of 2010. That's $2.1 billion

more than the first 9 months of 2009. So it's gone up 41 percent from 2009. What this is about is them avoiding having to pay premium dollars for health care.

Another provision that I like in this is they're going to have to tell the American public, they're going to have to be transparent in identifying what it is they term as ''health services,'' so people would know if they're trying to put lobbyists fees under health services or excessive bonuses or CEO salaries or advertisements, things of that nature. And I don't think they have any will at all to make sure that people understand where their health care premium dollars are going.

If you don't have a provision like this, we're going to return to what we were; you take the power away from the consumer and you put it with the insurance company. So how do they do it? They raise the premiums or they cut your health care. They take away health care for people that want to get on their parents' plan up to the age of 26 if they're working at a company that doesn't have coverage, or they don't have coverage otherwise. They put on caps annually or lifetime caps so you can't get coverage. They rescind your policy exactly when you're in the middle of your cancer or diabetes care. Or they make sure some other way that you don't get the coverage you ought to have.

Wendell Potter, who was a whistleblower, used to be with CIGNA, one of the larger insurance companies, made it real clear when he was testifying before committees that in fact this is what companies want to do, they want to keep that medical loss ratio in place where they benefit and the consumer loses.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 2½ minutes and the gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to an excellent member of our conference, a new Member, a member of the healing profession, a nurse from North Carolina, RENEE ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, let's be reminded why we are here today. We are here because the leadership of the 111th Congress couldn't even pass a budget. However, my colleagues across the aisle did manage to pass this monstrosity with a closed rule and no debate.

□ 1640

This, my friends, is ObamaCare.

No one had time to read it, much less understand how it would actually affect small businesses. As a nurse and small business owner, I can tell you that this bill is devastating to health care and the economy. Calling a government takeover of one-sixth of the economy ''reform'' over and over and over again does not make it so.

Not only should we pass this amendment; we should pass this CR so we can save the American taxpayers from funding this outrageously bad bill. Then we can get to work providing real health care reforms that give the decision-making back to the doctors, nurses and patients, not to Washington bureaucrats.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just like to remind the gentlelady that I understand she was not here, but we did debate health care in this body for approximately 18 months, so there was a very healthy and robust discussion about health care.

This amendment is a further demonstration of the majority's special interest priorities as they have to do with insurance companies. It really demonstrates the hypocrisy on job creation and deficit reduction as well.

Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlelady from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. I want to follow up on what the gentlewoman from Connecticut said.

This is about Whose side are you on?

If you're with the gentleman from Georgia, you are on the side of the big insurance companies, and you'll want to make sure that they make bigger profits, that they get bigger bonuses, that they pass out bigger dividends and more money to their CEOs; or if you're against this amendment and you want to go with the health care reform bill that we have, you're with the little guy—with the consumer, with the average American.

Right now, the law says that consumers have to receive more value for their premium dollars. Insurance companies are required to spend 80 to 85 percent of premium dollars on medical care and health care quality improvements rather than on the bonuses and the salaries and the dividends for the CEOs and the stockholders.

That's what this is all about. You're going to hand back to the insurance companies control over what happens with the money that you paid in your premium so they can do whatever they want with it and make whatever profit they want. I think it's wrong.

One of the major issues that we face this year is affordability and what consumers are getting for their buck, so to speak. With health care reform, we made health insurance more affordable, and it will become more so as this kicks in further. At the same time, we wanted to make sure that when you spend your premium you get something back: you get good value, and you get good benefits. That's what we're doing with health care reform. We're not worried about the insurance companies and whether they get enough profit. They make enough profit. I'm going to give you some examples.

Let's use Aetna. Between 2009 and 2010, their profits went up 40 percent. I can use that for every one of the insurance companies.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. How much time remains, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself the remaining time.

We've heard this is about ''whose side are you on?'' and that it's about greed. It really is about who decides, Mr. Chairman. In health care, who decides?

The folks on the other side of the aisle want the government to decide. They want the government to decide what qualifies as health care and what kind of health care you can get for yourself and for your family and for everybody across this land. On this side of the aisle, we want patients to decide, patients and families and doctors.

That's what this amendment is all about. Support the 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. PRICE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 296 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Klamath Dam Removal and Sedimentation Study.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, the appropriations committee leadership supported my amendment No. 297 to cancel $2 million that would be used to consider destroying four perfectly good hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River that are generating 155 megawatts of the cleanest, cheapest, and most reliable electricity on the planet—enough to power over 150,000 homes.

Amendment No. 296 is the companion measure. It forbids the Bureau to redirect its remaining funds for this purpose.

Let me emphasize: Congress never authorized this study. Congress never authorized the Klamath settlement. The Bureau of Reclamation is moving forward with it anyway. At a time when skyrocketing electricity prices threaten our economy and when acute capacity shortages threaten the reliability of our grid, destroying 155 megawatts of clean, cheap, and reliable hydroelectricity is simply insane.

We're told this is to save the salmon, but the proposal also includes destroying the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery, which is producing 5 million salmon smolt each year, 17,000 of which return to the Klamath as fully grown adults in order to spawn.

The Bureau is conducting this study without congressional authorization, and the language in this amendment is essential in order to implement the reduction that the House approved on Tuesday.

I thank the appropriations leadership for their support on Tuesday and ask that the House adopt the implementing language.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, as a staunch supporter of dams, I understand my colleague's position on this issue, and I support this amendment.

The constituents I represent overwhelmingly oppose removing functioning hydropower and its associated benefits. I fully share that concern and the disturbing precedent it sets. I think it represents a monumental failure that current Federal laws and regulations provide no alternative that will allow these dams to be operated as cost effectively as they were during the previous licensed term or that will allow the Federal Government to fully meet the obligations it made to the Klamath Basin agriculture with the development of the Klamath Reclamation Project.

As such, this amendment by itself will, unfortunately, not address the underlying issue, which is the environmental extortion that impacts property owners across the West and that impacts the hardworking people who depend on the land for their livelihoods.

Our laws are grossly out of balance, so I look forward to working with Chairman HASTINGS and Chairman MCCLINTOCK on the necessary reforms to prevent this continued abuse and to bring greater certainty to the Klamath Basin's agricultural community.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I just want to make a point.

The gentleman from California is correct. We did accept his amendment several days ago, an amendment which dealt with the reduction of funds—I think it was $1.9 million—but it was not specific to this dam; it was specific to the account. So this is a very different amendment, and that's why we rise in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What we're hearing on this amendment and as to the amendment itself is certainly a switch from what we've been hearing over the past couple of days. I say that because this amendment is a Washington, D.C., solution to a very, very local issue.

□ 1650

This amendment would stop a comprehensive local solution to a major and very costly problem in the Klamath River Basin.

This effort at the local level, supported by farmers and ranchers, fishermen, conservation groups, the privately owned power company in question, tribes, as well as the States of California and Oregon, it has a very bipartisan root. It was negotiated under both the Bush administration and the Obama administration.

It's a study. It does not, nor is it an agreement to, remove any dams.

All the local communities in the Klamath Basin, even those who were opposed to dam removal, support the completion of the study and they are at the table working on this specific issue.

Even the California Farm Bureau is in support of completing this study. It needs to be noted that only Congress can authorize dam removal.

This amendment is not wanted by any of the stakeholders: agriculture, conservation, local government, the dam owners, sportsmen and -women, nor the tribes. It will exacerbate the already serious problems we face in the Klamath Basin watershed.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in voting against this bad amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, nearly a decade ago the farmers and families in the Klamath Basin suffered irreparable harm when two government agencies with conflicting demands and questionable data shut off water for irrigated agriculture, threatening a way of life and the economy of the region. Fertile farmlands turned to dust under the summer sun. A wildlife refuge nearly dried up. Some farmers whose families had tilled the soil and grown crops for generations lost everything and filed for bankruptcy. The stress was too much for some. One died of a heart attack and another took his own life.

Out of that aftermath, the House Resources Committee, then chaired by Jim Hansen of Utah and Richard Pombo of California, went to work with me trying to find short-term solutions and work on the long term. Principals in the basin, as you have heard, found common ground where they had been apart, and they reached agreement that they have brought forth to KBRA and the KHSA.

However, it's clear to me that the agreements as written do not have those in charge of the Resources Committee today. The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) have made that clear. There is little point, then, in spending more of the taxpayers' money, especially during these dire fiscal times, on an effort that is unlikely to move forward in its present form.

Given that reality, I will support the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The House's decision today, however, will not lessen the threat to irrigated agriculture in the Klamath Basin. It does not add to water storage. It does not provide protection to the ratepayers. It does not resolve the water rights disputes.

It does mean, however, the burden of finding a timely and effective solution to conflicts in the Klamath Basin now resides in the Resources Committee and those who rejected these plans, because there is no escaping the fact that the problems remain, the conflicts grow and the courts call all the shots absent legislative action.

Nearly a decade ago, the farmers and families in the Klamath Basin suffered irreparable harm when two government agencies, with conflicting demands and questionable data shut off the water for irrigated agriculture, threatening a way of life and the economy of the region. Fertile farmlands turned to dust under the summer sun. A wildlife refuge nearly dried up. Some farmers whose families had tilled the soil and grown crops for generations lost everything and filed for bankruptcy. The stress was too much for some . . . one farmer died of a heart attack and another took his own life.

Meanwhile, the nation's attention turned to the plight of the Klamath Basin farm families and more than 15,000 members of the community turned out in a symbolic bucket brigade that stretched from one end of town to the other.

I was a member of the House Resources Committee then, and our chairmen, first Jim Hansen of Utah and later Richard Pombo of California, responded to my calls for help with hearings and legislation. And the Bush Administration weighed in, too. We were committed to finding lasting solutions to prevent another water cut off. We put in place historic conservation efforts to improve water management. We got funds to screen the A canal and to remove Chiloquin dam. We created water banks and added to storage—although not by enough.

And then the principals in the Basin who often were on opposing sides, spent years trying to find common ground. They worked in good faith, tirelessly in search of a long-term plan to prevent another water cutoff. They should be commended for their work. And it is

the culmination of that effort—with all of the controversy that surrounds it—that brings us here today.

It is clear to me, that the agreements as written do not have the support of those in charge at the Resources Committee. The gentleman from California Mr. MCCLINTOCK and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, have made it abundantly clear that they will not move forward on the KBRA or the KHSA.

There is little point in spending more of the taxpayers' money—especially during these dire fiscal times—on an effort that is unlikely to move forward in its present form. Given that reality, I will join them today in voting for this limiting amendment.

The House's decision today will not lessen the threat to irrigated agriculture in the Klamath Basin. It does not add to water storage. It does not provide protection to ratepayers. It does not resolve water rights disputes.

It does mean, however, that the burden of finding a timely and effective solution to the conflicts in the Klamath Basin now resides with the Resources Committee and those who rejected this plan, because there is no escaping the fact that the problems remain. The conflicts grow. And the courts call the shots, absent legislative action.

I pray that we never have to see a repeat of the disaster of 2001. I look forward to working with the Chairman Mr. HASTINGS and the Subcommittee Chairman Mr. MCCLINTOCK on whatever plan they have in mind to bring about a comprehensive, Basin-wide solution. And I know they must understand, especially in this water year, how critical prompt action is.

Doing nothing is not an option.

[From Klamath Falls Herald and News, May 27, 2010]

COMMENTARY: HUKILL, SWITZER: AGAINST DAM REMOVAL, BUT FOR KBRA

(By Al Switzer and Cheryl Hukill)

There seems to be some confusion on where we, Commissioners Al Switzer and Cheryl Hukill, stand on dam removal and the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement.

From the very beginning of this process we have publicly stated that we are against dam removal and lobbied for fish ladders or trucking of fish instead. We are for jobs, jobs, jobs, and a strong economy. That message has never changed and will not change.

State Rep. Bill Garrard has stated publicly that his position is against dam removal but for the KBRA, and this is the same position that we have taken and continue to take.

We are not willing that outside entities make the decisions for this Basin when it comes to the water and agricultural issues that face us.

We know that whether we signed the agreement or not, the dams are destined to come out. That was a private company making a private business decision. Government has no business interfering with private industry.

But the destiny of our farmers and ranchers is our priority, and we must be participants of the committees that will be formed as a result of the KBRA.

The agricultural community brings in over $600 million, using a multiplier of 2. It has also created over 4,000 jobs.

Businesses with livable wage jobs will quit looking at Klamath County as a viable place to relocate if we do not have a stable economy, of which agricultural is a huge part.

Status quo is no longer an option. We must never forget what happened in 2001. Every business was affected by the government shutting our water off. At least with the KBRA, a committee of stakeholders will help set the course for our water issues.

If the KBRA had been in effect in 2008, we would have had enough carryover to have 330,000 acre-feet of water instead of the 150,000 acre feet. Why? Because the biological opinion would have allowed the flow of water going down the Klamath River between October and February to be far less than it was this year.

Again, we stand against dam removal, but stand for jobs and a strong economy.

The authors

Al Switzer and Cheryl Hukill are Klamath County commissioners.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from California and Arizona.

This has been a hard-fought battle in my State. In a prior lifetime, I was a legislator in charge of the appropriations process for my home State of Oregon; and for the 10, 12 years I was in the State legislature, this area, this internecine warfare in the Klamath Basin over the use of the water resources was a really hot topic.

As a result, our State and the Federal Government were spending millions of dollars in lawsuits. This agreement, this agreement to have a study to bury that hatchet and come to an agreement is absolutely critical. We have tribes, ranchers, farmers, local officials who have all come together to say let's solve this problem at the regional level.

We in Washington, D.C., should not be getting involved. This is a long-fought battle that finally has come to some accord. We should let it happen and stay out of Oregon and California's business.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the gentleman from Arizona is disingenuous when he says that we didn't know this was about the Klamath when we adopted the funding reduction on Tuesday. That was the entire context of the debate. I mentioned it over and over again. It's not true that this is somehow a surprise if the gentleman was listening.

As to the claim that this is an agreement that has been agreed to by all of the political insiders in the area, let me assure the gentleman from California that it is opposed by the overwhelming majority of voters as tested in several local elections, including the formal opposition to the dam removal by the Siskiyou border supervisors elected by the people of the region.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I was listening; I did understand. Because even though I heard the words, the understanding I had with the chairman of the subcommittee and the reason we supported it was that the reduction of funds was to the account, not these specific projects. So I did listen; I did understand.

But today we are talking about prohibiting money for the study. And I have to tell you that this agreement is to study the potential removal of four privately owned dams, not the agreement to remove dams. It is designed to bring about significant improvements to both environmental conditions and water supplies, certainly, which need to be confirmed through the study.

The studies are scientific. They deal with engineering and economic and environmental-based analysis to determine whether the promise of the agreement will occur. And for that reason, we oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I just want to say to the gentleman, the Oregon Public Utility Commission has ruled that, from the standpoint of the rate-paying public, the settlement agreement is preferable to relicensing under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, known as FERC, as the agreement caps ratepayer cost at $200 million; whereas, fish passage costs, because these dams are old, could exceed $500 million, plus an additional $200 million for O&M. The amendment would force these costs on the rate-paying public without the benefit of accurate benefits and costs.

Being from the Northwest, I want you to know that sometimes, and they are just studying this dam removal, but sometimes by taking out dams you can restore the original habitat and help the salmon recovery, as we are doing on the Elwha Dam project up in Washington State.

The reason we did it: Because it was going to cost so much to fix up the dam, that it was actually cheaper to take them out and restore, and this became a major restoration project. So I wouldn't just assume that this is not a positive thing.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. He is absolutely correct.

What is being dealt with in the Klamath Basin is an unraveling of a serious problem all because the Federal Government has promised more than Mother Nature can deliver. And part of what is being considered—is being supported broadly by Native Americans and business interests. We have been working with utilities——

Mr. DICKS. By the local community.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. A broad range of people in the community. This is something that needs to be seriously studied and done right.

There is a very strong likelihood that if it isn't done properly, there may well be something that happens in the Klamath River Basin where circumstances move ahead and it's not done in the way that I think most people would like.

So I appreciate——

Mr. DICKS. And being from Oregon, you realize that it would do a lot potentially for salmon restoration.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is a tremendous opportunity for the Klamath River Basin. It's a tremendous opportunity for the Native Americans, for agriculture, for sportspeople and to avoid the litigation and the political squirrel cage that we are in.

If you go down there and visit the Klamath Basin, you would find, as I know my good friend from California has, it's a tremendous opportunity. This amendment really would be a mistake.

□ 1700

Mr. DICKS. I thank my friend.

Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman, and I want to agree with you, Mr. DICKS, on the salmon implications of this, and also Mr. WALDEN, who talked about the agricultural implications of not having a solution. This has been an absolute mess for decades, and we've seen the fruits of that disaster bear out in the salmon industry crashing and agricultural problems that we have.

And for the first time in decades, first time ever, we have had all the stakeholders come together. These are people who you couldn't get in the same town with before who are sitting around the same table. They are working out solutions. They have come to some agreements. And this study has to be made, and, Mr. DICKS, you are absolutely right.

Mr. DICKS. And you would think that the gentleman from California would be interested in letting the local community come to a decision on this rather than imposing it from Washington, D.C., and overturning what this local group of people have been working on for years. I mean, this is really a bit much.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I don't need anywhere close to 5 minutes. I simply want to emphasize that the gentleman is correct, that the local people should decide that issue, and they have.

In one local election after another, when this has been the deciding question, the voters themselves have said it is insanity, at a time when we can't guarantee enough electricity to keep their air conditioners running or the refrigerators running, to tear down the generating capacity equivalent to enough for 150,000 residents and 155 megawatts of electricity.

The Siskiyou Board of Supervisors, elected by the people of the region, has taken a very strong stand in opposition to the removal of the dams.

And to the gentleman from California, I too am concerned about the salmon. That's why the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery, which is producing 5 million salmon smolt a year, 17,000 of which return as fully grown salmon to spawn, is so critical. And why they would want to tear that out, along with the dams, is absolutely beyond me and beyond the people of the region who have voted repeatedly on this issue.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think the idea is we wanted to wrap this up without too much debate. I just felt in fairness that the gentleman deserved some extra time. I don't think we need to prolong this.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I would just like to clarify one fact.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I just want to clarify one issue, and that's the cost of energy as a result of this. If this isn't solved, the dam owners, the private owners that are supporting this study will have to make repairs to the dam that far exceed other costs and will drive the ratepayers' utility rates up through the roof. That's why the statement was made about those costs of utilities and the costs to the ratepayers.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. That's the point. It would cost more to fix these dams up. That's the problem we faced on the Elwha. Even though the dams were there, the cost was so high to fix them up that it was better to take them out.

Now, this study will just look at this and the local people will wind up getting hurt if you force them to have to do this. So let the local people decide this and let this study go forward. It is a very inexpensive thing, and this community has worked hard and deserves a chance to look at this.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman.

And I would simply say in response that the gentleman in opposition forgets two important points. Number one, the additional costs are being forced on those private dam operators by the government. It is about time that we recognize that it is the government imposing these regulations that's driving up these costs.

And I would remind him he also forgets the enormous replacement costs. The power coming off those dams is the cheapest and cleanest on the planet. To replace that power is going to cost many, many times the costs currently borne by the ratepayers for the cheap hydroelectricity those dams produce.

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. MCDERMOTT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan for, begin, continue, finish, process, or approve the relocation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Marine Operations Center-Pacific from Seattle, Washington, to Newport, Oregon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am a big fan of NOAA. The scientists and analysts at NOAA do extraordinary work for this country. Unfortunately, NOAA's process for choosing a location for the Marine Operations Center jeopardizes the operation of the Pacific Center and is wasting tens of millions of dollars of taxpayer money.

My amendment would save at least $5 million immediately, and beyond that, probably $10 to $20 million in long-term costs. It would defund the move of the Marine Operations Center from Seattle to Newport, Oregon, for the rest of the year so that there is time for the broken process to be looked into.

Now, this is not a case of sour grapes. If it was what was best for the country, I wouldn't fight tooth and nail against some jobs moving from one place to another. But the Commerce Department's inspector general and the Government Accountability Office have written scathing reports about this move and the decision process. They found it is among the worst run, least transparent, and least competitive bidding processes they have ever investigated. If you want to compare it to the Bridge to Nowhere, this is exactly what it is.

I came from Chicago, and when we looked at something like this, we would always say the fix was in. Spending tens of millions of taxpayer dollars to dislocate hundreds of families to a site that's frequently unavailable for navigation because of dangerous conditions, is not near shipyards or maritime suppliers, is more than 120 miles from the nearest airport, and will be hugely expensive to run every year makes no common sense. And the reports of the inspector general report that very clearly.

Now, Newport is an environmentally sensitive area, and NOAA's own, their

own private consultants say the site is the least qualified destination for the move. Despite all these issues, NOAA has charged ahead and been completely unaccountable. NOAA officials are not willing to admit their huge mistake and fix it. And this is just plain wrong. Taking a breather for the next 7 months while we get a truly transparent process is the right thing to do.

NOAA and Newport are saying that any delay, any examination, any looking at this will have catastrophic consequences. That simply is not true. We have studies from the CRS and others it won't put contracts at risk, it will not increase costs.

So I rise today to stop the process for the remainder of the year, to give NOAA and the Commerce Department time to get their ducks in a row, hit the restart button, and stop wasting taxpayer money.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
THE INSPECTOR GENERAL,
Washington, DC, May 26, 2010.

Memorandum for: Jane Lubchenco, Ph.D., Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere

From: Todd J. Zinser

Subject: NOAA's Acquisition of Facilities to House the Marine Operations Center—Pacific

By letter dated March 5, 2010, Chairwoman Maria Cantwell and Ranking Member Olympia Snowe of the Senate Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, requested that the Office of Inspector General review NOAA's decision to award a lease to the Port of Newport, Oregon, to house NOAA's Marine Operations Center-Pacific (MOC–P). Their letter raised several specific questions regarding the decision-making process that resulted in this lease.

NOAA began the lease acquisition process as early as September 2007, when it initiated a market analysis. It published a Solicitation for Offers for a new lease on November 24, 2008. Four bidders submitted offers, and NOAA awarded a lease to the Port of Newport on August 4, 2009. One of the unsuccessful bidders, the Port of Bellingham, Washington, filed a protest with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) on August 27, 2009—10 days after it received a post-award debriefing from NOAA. On December 2, 2009, GAO sustained Bellingham's protest against NOAA's lease award and recommended that NOAA conduct an analysis of practicable alternatives to the Newport offer. In its January 29, 2010, response to GAO, NOAA stated that it expected to complete all corrective actions relating to the successful bid protest by May 28, 2010.

Although the lease acquisition process began in 2007, the decision-making process related to the acquisition can be traced back approximately 10 years. Together, these processes involved several separate offices within NOAA, the Department, and other federal agencies. In addition, they involved many statutory provisions, regulations, NOAA and Department policies, other administrative directives, and changes in personnel. Given the scope and complexity of these processes, we continue to gather and evaluate information, and in order to gain the best understanding of the facts and circumstances surrounding NOAA's process, we will need to continue our work beyond the time by which NOAA intends to finalize its assessment of practicable alternatives.

Although our review is ongoing, we have identified one issue that warrants higher-level review by NOAA before it finalizes its examination of practicable alternatives. Specifically, based on our review, we believe that NOAA should examine whether it sufficiently complied with the requirement to consider existing federal facilities before pursuing a new lease acquisition. Such an examination will help to ensure that the ultimate decision—whether it be to affirm the original choice or select an alternative approach—is grounded in a more thorough, well-substantiated, and well-documented analysis.

According to 41 C.F.R. 102–73.10, before acquiring real estate by lease, purchase, or construction, federal agencies should first use space in government-owned and government-leased facilities. Similarly, Department of Commerce policy generally disapproves of long-term lease solutions (Department of Commerce, Real Property Management Manual, 5.4.1(d) (2003)). These issues are separate, but both relate to how NOAA assessed its options for MOC–P. We address each issue separately here, detailing factors that may potentially impact NOAA's own assessment of how well it followed these directives.

While there is a lack of detailed criteria against which to measure NOAA's efforts to consider other federal facilities, the Department's Real Property Management Manual does require the Department to make ''every reasonable effort to utilize Government-controlled space'' before leasing space. Our review uncovered some evidence that NOAA considered other federal facilities; however, NOAA was not able to provide evidence that other federal facilities were systematically inventoried, analyzed, and rejected before initiating efforts to acquire a follow-on lease from other sources for MOC–P, nor was the decision to reject other federal facilities well-documented.

For example, we were told by NOAA officials that NOAA had considered collocating with select Coast Guard and Navy facilities, but its consideration was not documented. In preparation for the lease acquisition, NOAA received proposals in mid-2007 for an alternative site analysis to (1) investigate the most functional, efficient, and cost-effective options for reconsolidating MOC–P and (2) provide an indication of how each site might perform during the subsequent lease solicitation process. That study, conducted under contract, was completed in September 2008. Of the 32 ports, cities, and economic development councils contacted, 11 responded, offering a total of 22 potential site options for further analysis. The 22 were further narrowed to a total of 15, only 3 of which were federally-owned: GSA's Federal Center South, the Department of Labor's Tongue Point, and NOAA's Western Regional Center. In November 2008, in an apparent rejection of those federal sites, NOAA issued the Solicitation for Offers.

NOAA also considered and declined GSA's May 2008 offer to fulfill the MOC–P requirements at the GSA-owned Federal Center South (FCS) facility. NOAA's Western Regional Center (WRC) was also rejected as a long-term solution because of what NOAA characterizes as litigation risks in that area. Having ultimately rejected the use of other federal facilities, it is also unclear whether NOAA adequately considered other required alternatives. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–94, which requires cost-benefit analyses of decisions on whether to lease or purchase, is an example of other potentially applicable requirements that may apply to NOAA's decision-making.

Our review has thus far uncovered three key issues regarding NOAA's consideration of other federal facilities.

First, at some time between 2000 and 2007, as detailed below, NOAA may have changed from considering a dispersed model for fulfilling the MOC-P requirement, which could have affected the analysis of available federal facilities.

Although NOAA's 2008 Solicitation for Offers was limited to the lease of a consolidated facility (which would collocate all ships and staff), it commissioned a June 2000 Homeport Alternatives Analysis, conducted by SRI International, in which it contemplated operating from dispersed facilities as a cost-saving measure. This study was commissioned to explore alternative homeports, given the possibility of the Lake Union lease not being extended beyond 2003.

The 2000 study indicated that NOAA was seeking to reduce costs by moving MOC–P staff to the WRC. Noting that NOAA. was evaluating split homeporting, the study also explored homeporting two of four MOC-P vessels in Alaska to reduce ship travel time.

To date, NOAA has not provided an explanation of what factors led to the apparent shift from the 2000 study to the current preference for a consolidated, leased solution. This apparent change in the vision for meeting the MOC-P requirement may have had a significant impact on how NOAA approached its available alternatives.

Notably, since the July 2006 fire that destroyed the MOC-P piers at Lake Union, MOC-P has operated under a dispersed model, using piers at NOAA's WRC and GSA's FCS. Also, NOAA's Marine Operations Center-Atlantic operates in dispersed facilities. This suggests that a dispersed model may be feasible and should have been assessed as part of NOAA's requirements-planning process.

Second, NOAA's analysis of how well it considered other federal facilities should include an examination of how thoroughly it analyzed and weighed its potential long-term options at the WRC and FCS, where it currently operates.

NOAA should consider whether it would have been feasible to maintain its current dispersed configuration while relocating staff to the WRC or other leased offices.

Specifically, we found that the WRC was dredged in the 1970s in anticipation of developing four long piers to accommodate many more vessels, and utilities may already be in place for two additional planned buildings that were not developed.

Although NOAA has cited neighborhood opposition to expanded use of the WRC and litigation against NOAA in that area in the 1970s, MOC-P has been homeported there since 2006. We have reviewed recent letters from some surrounding neighborhood groups that support locating MOC-P at the WRC. The potential cost savings of using these existing facilities may outweigh the litigation risks.

Third, GSA's pre-solicitation offer to serve the MOC-P requirements at FCS may have presented a viable federal facility for NOAA's consideration. This is particularly relevant because of the changed circumstances at this site.

GSA's May 2008 offer arrived well before NOAA issued its Solicitation for Offers in November 2008. NOAA declined this offer one month later, citing the narrowness of the waterway adjacent to the existing FCS pier, the fact that the waterway was a Superfund site, and NOAA's established goal of being operational in a new lease by July 1, 2011.

Since then, GSA has obtained American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds to redevelop three FCS buildings and plans to relocate a large tenant, leaving an existing building potentially available for NOAA, with some modification.

We have been advised that NOAA currently has access to a pier that is sufficiently

equipped and sizable to accommodate three of its vessels.

Although NOAA has cited concerns regarding underwater property lines, it has not provided an indication that this situation has been a problem during its use of the pier since 2006.

Regarding FCS being a Superfund site, according to a senior official at GSA with whom we spoke, this would be an issue for GSA, not NOAA. While the potential issue exists and an environmental impact statement would be required, Superfund liability would lie with GSA or another FCS tenant.

NOAA cited its June 30, 2011, deadline for vacating the Lake Union site in its June 2008 letter declining GSA's offer. However, this deadline was driven by the expiration of the Lake Union lease, and suitable workarounds—such as short-term office leases through GSA—may potentially have been available.

Pursuing such workarounds may have enabled NOAA to garner the necessary time and funding to develop the WRC and FCS individually or together for the MOC-P requirement.

In our view, NOAA's examination of these issues related to its consideration of other federal facilities will ensure that the final decision regarding practicable alternatives to Newport is thorough and well-documented.

We noted above that Department policy generally disapproves of long-term lease solutions, and it states that leased facilities should not be considered a permanent solution. Yet although the Newport lease award will commit NOAA to a leased solution for another 20 years, our review of how NOAA approached government-owned solutions found little documented analysis. NOAA has told us that leasing was preferred because acquiring funding for such an acquisition would have required considerable lead time and because funding of facilities has historically received lower priority than other funding requirements.

NOAA officials also cited the fact that MOC-P has historically used leased sites.

The relevant documents show that on at least two occasions, NOAA briefly considered acquiring the Lake Union site, which housed all MOC-P operations prior to the fire, but documentation of those efforts was limited to what can be characterized as passing comments. We have not been provided with evidence of systematic efforts to assess the feasibility of purchasing or constructing facilities elsewhere.

We understand that NOAA's consideration of the practicable alternatives to the Newport site is in progress and scheduled to be completed by May 28, 2010. Although NOAA had the authority to define the scope of the practicable alternatives as it saw fit, it limited its assessment to the four offers that it received under the solicitation. However, considering the range of options that were available to NOAA in government-owned and government-leased space, a broader examination may be warranted as part of this analysis.

According to NOAA, it is standard GSA practice for lease-to-build leases not to include a termination clause in the lease, and such a clause was not included in the Port of Newport award. We understand that NOAA obtained a preliminary estimate of potential lease termination costs from the Department of Commerce Office of General Counsel. However, as part of its decision-making process, NOAA should conduct a rigorous analysis of the potential termination costs and document the specific components of this estimate. As it continues to evaluate its practicable alternatives, it would be prudent for NOAA to minimize these potential costs to the extent possible.

Whatever conclusion NOAA reaches, it should carefully examine and document all pertinent factors, including those that we have highlighted. In order for both of our offices to be responsive to the Subcommittee, it is important to examine these issues regarding NOAA's consideration of other federal facilities. As we finalize our response to the Chairwoman and Ranking Member, we will follow up with your office to determine what additional information NOAA may have identified.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

□ 1710

Mr. SCHRADER. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Frankly, I am not sure exactly where my friend from Washington has gotten his facts. Let's be clear up front, if this amendment was enacted, NOAA would face termination liabilities well in excess of the $5 million or $10 million that my good colleague refers to that would be in excess of $50 million, and their ability to conduct the mission critical activities in the Pacific would be in serious jeopardy.

NOAA would have neither the authority nor resources to contract for alternate arrangements, putting in jeopardy the support of this fleet of ships which gather critical data to produce navigational charts of U.S. waters, survey fishery stocks, and maintain instruments which support tsunami warnings, weather forecasts, and climate research. Let me say again for the record very clearly here, after NOAA's current lease is up in June, if this amendment were to pass, NOAA would have no authority—zero, legal or otherwise—to mobilize its Pacific fleet. It would be dead in the water.

There has been a lot of talk about process; but, frankly, this process has been comprehensive, transparent, and legitimate. My friends in Washington State have made sure that's the case. After a rigorous competitive lease acquisition process that followed GAO guidelines, NOAA was awarded a 20-year lease to Newport for the relocation of its Pacific fleet in August of 2009, and it subsequently complied with the IG report that was referred to and met the guidelines.

The facts are clear. NOAA made this decision based on merits, not politics. Let's not have politics undo a good decision. Newport was a superior choice for the taxpayers and the agency's mission in the Pacific. It was the number one choice in cost, and it was the number one choice in technical merit. In fact, the annual lease of the Newport facilities will cost the Federal Government 50 percent less than the three competing sites located in Washington State.

In fact, in 2006, the pier at NOAA's Lake Union, Seattle, facility was destroyed by fire and was never even reconstructed by the host city. On the other hand, the State of Oregon and the local community have spent millions of dollars of their own dollars with no Federal support to construct new facilities in Newport. Newport is actually ahead of schedule and will be ready to hand over the keys to NOAA on May 1 when NOAA's 20-year lease is set to commence. NOAA is contractually obligated, Mr. Chair, to commence the 20-year lease in May of this year.

The new facility in Newport brings costs, offsets, and advantages that my good friend and colleague from Washington conveniently omits. The closer proximity and transit time from the port to the ocean is dramatic. Instead of 8 hours from Lake Union, they get to the ocean in 20 minutes. The new facility is right next to the Hatfield Center, Oregon State University, for great research compatibility. And importantly, the relocation of NOAA's Pacific fleet represents a huge boost to a small rural Oregon coastal community with a great fishing legend and tradition that will bring much-needed jobs and translate into significant economic benefits. This is a David versus Goliath opportunity.

Over the last 4 days, we've engaged in rigorous debate about the fiscal health of our country. For my colleagues that are serious about saving taxpayer dollars and reducing our deficit, you should join me in opposing the McDermott amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the good Representative from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, as I appreciate his leadership. Because this is a process that he has been stewarding, being a key congressional partner. I appreciate his referencing what has happened here, dating back to August 2009.

This has been scrutinized. We are friendly rivals in the Pacific Northwest. And it's a rare, rare, rare, rare occasion that any Federal activity ever leaves the Evergreen State and ends up in Oregon, as my good friend, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, can attest because working with Senator Magnuson, he helped vacuum functions into the State of Oregon.

So you can bet that this was flyspecked to the extreme, but the advantages are overwhelming. The proximity, the technical effort, the local investment has been amazing. So we've been pilloried on this. It's been under a microscope, and we've reached the point now that it's really past the point of no return. If this ill-advised—but I'm sure well-intended—amendment would be adopted by my friend from Washington, the Federal Government would be on the hook for more money; it would be disruptive for NOAA; and, frankly, it would be a disservice to the people who played fair, who went all along the way playing by the rules, making the case.

I strongly urge rejection of this amendment.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chair, I have good friends, and I know they have to defend their hometown as adequately as they want.

But let me read from the IG's report: ''In our view, the more fundamental problems pertaining to NOAA's process prior to the competitive lease process, a primary cause of these problems is grounded in the fact that NOAA did not subject the MOC-P project to a rigorous capital investment planning and oversight process. While the Department has clear property policy, NOAA did not follow it. NOAA thus proceeded with requirements for its desired option of consolidated facility based on justification and consideration of alternatives that, on the face and without additional documentation, are significantly lacking. NOAA's financial analysis of the four offers submitted in response to the solicitation did not assess the total cost to the government, and NOAA provided no evidence that it had thoroughly considered the operational and logistical implications of the relocation.''

Now that's not two rivals from one State and another. This is the Inspector General of the Commerce Department going down and looking at the process. And the fact is that the CRS report, dated 30 September 2010, which I will submit for the RECORD, says that the Federal Government is able to terminate its contracts for convenience. The governmental interest is always higher than the commercial interest. So the Federal Government can get out of this. They save $50 million. It's not going to be $50 million because they still have the pier. They can do whatever they want with it, but they do not have a contract with the Federal Government for the next 20 years in a place that is very far away.

NOAA has been in Seattle for 40 years. That's true. Whence it was created, it was put there for a very good reason. I don't care if it goes to Bellingham or it goes to Oregon or where it goes, but there ought to be a transparent process.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. HERGER

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to implement or enforce Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule (subpart B of part 212 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations), relating to the designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use, in any administrative unit of the National Forest System.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1720

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I'm offering this amendment after much frustration and a lack of responsiveness from the Forest Service to locally elected officials and the recreation community in northern California and across the Nation. For a couple of years now, I and northern California constituents I represent have tried many times to work with the Forest Service on the 2005 Travel Management Rule. Yet we have been completely ignored as the Forest Service presses ahead with route designations that in some cases will eliminate more than 90 percent of the previous access.

Locally elected officials are now at the point of considering litigation against the Forest Service to keep these federal lands open to recreation. It is disgraceful that local counties would have to spend valuable public funding to preserve access to our own national forests. Not only are our counties forced to defend themselves against well funded environmental activists trying to turn every acre of federal land into some kind of sanctuary, but now also against the very agency that is supposed to serve the public.

For these reasons, I believe it is necessary to impose a 7-month timeout on designating these routes.

Chairman SIMPSON, ultimately, we want a workable solution, and I hope to work with you and Chairman HASTINGS to ensure a more balanced implementation of the Travel Management Rule.

I hope that my colleagues can support this amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would stop a very careful planning process that determines what routes off-road vehicles can use through our national forests. Now over the past few decades, we know that the availability and capability of off-road vehicles has increased tremendously. That means more Americans are enjoying access to, and recreational opportunities in, their national forests, but the resulting proliferation of random routes results in severe impacts, particularly on the quality of our water supply and the physical safety of national forest visitors.

The national forests are spectacular lands. There are 193 million national forest acres all over this Nation. Oftentimes, we take them for granted and fail to realize that the national forests are the headwaters for much of our Nation's surface waters. The clean, pure water produced on a national forest is a national treasure and the economic resource that supports industry and agriculture nationwide. In fact, half of the American West gets their drinking water from national forests, while in many rural communities, it is 100 percent.

The proliferation, though, of random trails created by off road vehicles, increases erosion and pollution into water sources with no possibility for mitigation by culverts or other measures that would be available to land managers on designated routes.

This amendment is poorly considered. The amendment would stop a reasonable, locally oriented planning process that has been going on for 6 years to allow recreational access to our forests, but to do so in a way that also protects the sustainable production of water, timber, wildlife, and other natural resources.

The Forest Service has been called upon to designate which motorized routes are appropriate in the eyes of inclusive groups of local community leaders, with particular consideration to visitor safety and the ability of the Forest Service to comply with its other mandates. It is practically impossible to maintain trail conditions without designated routes or to avoid accidents to hikers, damaged equipment, or even visitors getting lost in the back country.

Route designation enables land managers to guide motorized users away from sensitive wildlife habitats at appropriate times of the year, helping to maintain quality herds.

In summary, the planning process that this amendment would repeal is local, driven by longstanding productive partnerships among local, State, and federal agencies; Indian tribes; and a diverse array of commercial and noncommercial interests. Halting this planning process would squander those investments and rebuke the sincere commitment it reflects on the part of so many citizens to protect their public lands. All who love and use our national forests should oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. HERGER. I have to comment that really all we're doing is asking for a 7-month timeout so that we—our local officials, our local communities have not been counseled with, they have not been brought into the process, and to have 90 percent in many areas declared off-bounds is not reasonable.

I would like to yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from California is absolutely right. These Travel Management Rules are highly exclusionary. They severely limit the public's access to the public's own land with devastating consequences for the local economies of every mountain town that's affected.

As Butte County Supervisor Bill Connelly writes, ''the roads within the National Forests are used by thousands of residents and visitors for transportation and recreation. These activities generate revenue for our rural communities which are critical for their survival.''

This is not a small matter. The Forest Service now controls 193 million acres within our Nation, a land area the size of Texas. In recent years, the Forest Service has utterly reversed the vision of its founder, Gifford Pinchot, ''to provide the greatest amount of good for the greatest amount of people in the long run.'' Instead, we confront an increasingly elitist and exclusionary attitude that is vividly illustrated by the draconian restrictions in the forest travel management plan. It bears far more resemblance to the public's exclusion from the royal forests under King John than to an agency that is supposed to encourage, welcome, facilitate, and maximize the people's use of our national forests.

These amendments restore the inclusionary vision of Gifford Pinchot by restoring the public's access to the public's land.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time remains?

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

Mr. MORAN. I would yield those 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman. And I rise in opposition to the Herger amendment.

In 2001, the Forest Service finally admitted the obvious—the road system through our national forests is far larger than it should be. Though the Forest Service can't tell us for sure, the best estimate is that the national forests are crisscrossed by more than 308,000 miles of roads. That is eight times the length of the entire United States interstate system. Forest roads could wrap around the Earth 15 times.

From 1975 to 1985, the Forest road system doubled. And that is just the authorized roads. It is estimated that there are an additional 60,000 miles of user-created, illegal roads through the forests, cut through sensitive areas just because it looked like fun.

The massive tangle of roads fragments the forest, destroying habitat, increasing erosion, and decreasing water quality. And the problems get worse each year as the Forest Service road maintenance budget falls further and further behind. Real maintenance needs for this massive road system just don't happen. The current backlog is estimated to be $10 billion.

And do you want to know how we know it's really so bad? Because it was the Bush administration that finally announced in 2001 that a planning process for inventory of the road system to figure out how many miles of roads it really needed, closing illegal roads, and starting to work on a more efficient system, were needed.

The Herger amendment stops the Bush administration planning in its tracks just as it is about to be completed. And I just believe that the Members really should not take it upon themselves to end this 7-year process that is going to finally bring some order to the Forest Service. I urge a ''no'' vote on the Herger amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Again, we're not saying we shouldn't look at this, we shouldn't examine it, we shouldn't have regulations. We should. Those of us who live in these areas, we care about the environment more than anyone does. That's not the question.

The question that is being presented and what we're asking for is, since the Forest Service has not been consulting with local government, they have not been consulting with the local communities, we are asking for a 7-month timeout so that they can consult with us and then we can continue to come up with a plan where we work together and not have, again, an all-powerful government in Washington dictating and preventing those that are local from being able to enjoy our own recreation in our national forest.

□ 1730

I urge an ''aye'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HERGER. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 323 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide benefits described in section 1001D(b)(1)(C) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)(1)(C)) to a person or legal entity in excess of $250,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, no serious effort to reduce the Federal Government is complete without addressing agricultural subsidies. Even in time of record high farm prices and profits, we still gave $16 billion in subsidies last year.

There are no meaningful limits. They are easily evaded, doubled if you are married. They don't cover loan deficiency payments or marketing loans. This amendment would establish a hard limit of $250,000 per entity.

In 2009, almost 1,500 entities got $250,000 or more. Something called Fidelity National Insurance Titles, probably not a family farm, raked in more than $4 million in 2009. For the past 15 years, Riceland Foods in Arkansas has collected a half-billion dollars from the taxpayers.

I strongly urge that you join with me, Taxpayers for Common Sense, the Environmental Working Group, Humane USA, a wide variety of groups and organizations, to establish this limit, save $100 million this year and more in the future, and start us on a path of reform that we can realize in the upcoming farm bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to say about this and to my friend from Oregon is, I believe we should put farm subsidies on the table. And that's why in this bill we have included cuts to very popular agriculture red state, if you will, programs, rural development, the Farm Service Agencies, and the NRCS. All kinds of conservation programs are cut in this. However, there are a number of traditional farm programs that we are going to let the ag authorizing committee deal with, because that's where they need to be dealt with.

So I want to say this. While I oppose the gentleman's amendment, I don't oppose you seeking a reduction to the subsidies. But we believe that this has to be dealt with in the farm bill. And I look forward to working with you and the chairman of the Agriculture Committee on that when it comes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the ranking agriculture appropriations member, a champion of agriculture reform and of agriculture, Congressman FARR.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise reluctantly because Mr. KINGSTON and myself, I think, have a great deal of respect for how we ought to be managing the future of payments, and

I concur with his remarks. But I am rising in favor of the amendment because I think we have to push the attention to how vital it is that we reform this program, and I don't think you get that attention without bringing this amendment to the floor and passing it.

It's going to be hard to implement in the next remaining months, as so many of the amendments that we've adopted here in the last 3 days, but I do think that it is worth the debate of how we focus on the rest of the year. Because, frankly, we ought not to be just paying entities in this country hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars because they didn't get the price they wanted at the market.

I represent the biggest growing area, and we don't get any of these payments. Not a single farmer. These are just a few entities, and it's wrong. So we ought to adopt the amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is wrongheaded at this point in time, as my colleague from Georgia has said.

The farm safety net is an integral series of compromises and changes from 2002 to 2008 that the folks went through in order to come to that agreement. To pull out one segment of that safety net, and in an ad hoc manner without any testimony, without any references to what it might do to the overall program, in my view, is wrongheaded. Next year is the time to do this.

We will go through a rigorous debate across the section. The conservation folks will be able to weigh in. All segments of the farm safety net will be represented at the table during the farm bill debate next year under the leadership of Chairman LUCAS. That is the time in order to do this.

We will have opportunities to do this work thoughtfully. There will be trades and compromises that will have to be made because, in all likelihood, we will have less money under the farm bill next year than we had in 2008.

As an aside, if we could go back to 2008 levels, I'm sure most of our agriculture guys would love to do that, since that is the mantra of the Republican House this week, to go back to 2008 levels. We'll take that. Throw us into the briar patch. But to do this today on an ad hoc, pulling this element out and changing it in this manner, is wrongheaded and I oppose it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague, Congressman KIND, who has been a tireless champion of agricultural reform, coming as he does from farm country in the upper Midwest.

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, and to my good friend from Texas, I hear what you are saying. But I have been around here long enough to realize that next year never comes. The next farm bill that addresses comprehensive reform never happens.

I commend the gentleman from Oregon for offering this amendment and trying to begin the process now, because I know how difficult it is.

In fact, earlier today I offered an amendment, a very straightforward amendment, that would end a new American taxpayer subsidy program to the tune of $150 million a year that is now going to Brazilian cotton agribusinesses, and it was defeated on the floor. That just shows you what we have gotten into with these outdated farm programs and the institutional interests and the special interests that maintain the status quo.

These large taxpayer subsidies going to a few very large agribusinesses have got to end. They are not fiscally responsible, they are not responsible to the American taxpayer, they are not helping family farmers throughout the country, they are driving up land prices, leading to greater consolidation of production in agriculture making it very difficult for new beginning farmers to enter the occupation. From the State of Wisconsin, where the average farmer's age today is 58 years old, that's a pretty serious topic for the new generation of farmers taking over these farm operations.

This is difficult, I understand. There are built-in special interests fighting reform and maintaining the status quo. But this also has to be on the table when it comes to serious budget deficit reduction. It is distorting the marketplace, and it's distorting trade policy. And there will be more successful WTO challenges against our farm programs unless we have the institutional will to change them.

I encourage support for my friend's amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I want to make three points real quickly.

Number one, we have shown in this bill that we understand our mandate is to reduce spending. We are going to take on ag subsidies.

Number two, we have already shown that in this bill with cuts to rural development, Farm Service Agency, the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

And, finally, we talk about next year? This is last year we are debating. We are debating the year in which planting decisions have already made.

□ 1740

This is last year's budget we're still working on. That's why we can't do this in the midseason.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close on this amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has the right to close.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I have one more speaker, and we will close with him.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well, I have listened to the language about damaging the farm safety net. There is a massive farm safety net in place. We're just reducing the safety net to a mere quarter million dollars a year.

My friend, Mr. KIND, is absolutely right. Tomorrow never comes here. I've been on the floor of the House when the House instructed the conferees to accept this exact limit. We were rolled by the Ag Committee and ignored.

This is an opportunity for us to not deal with the savings that you're taking away from nutrition and from the environmental titles. Talk about the safety net. What about your cuts to WIC?

For heaven's sakes. A hundred million dollars savings to the taxpayer. Get started on reform now and join in a bipartisan effort. I've been pleased to work with Congressman FLAKE, Congressman KIND, Congressman RYAN. Year after year we have brought these issues to the floor and been rolled. Now is the time to start by adopting it and changing the system.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just want to say that the ag section of this bill cuts $5.2 billion. Three to four of those billions comes straight from production agriculture, not from school nutrition and other socially sensitive programs.

I yield the balance of my time to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

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

Why are we making policy decisions in an appropriations bill? This amendment changes current law. This is a decision that needs to be made in the context of the next new farm bill. We'll consider the farm bill next year in an open and transparent manner. We have a committee process that can review the merits of any proposal and all proposals. And they'll be debated and they'll be considered and allowed for the Members to offer their opinions and cast their votes.

In fact, if you look at the 2008 farm bill under Chairman PETERSON's leadership, we made significant reforms. Yes, cuts in the areas, lowering the overall payment caps significantly. But I guess the opponents of farm programs will not be satisfied with that until every last marketing tool has been eliminated.

I know it is a popular parlor game in some circles to see how far you can jerk farmers around, but making these changes midstream in a 5-year farm bill is disruptive to market decisions that producers have made in some cases years ago. All farmers and ranchers want certainty. They plan to work under current law.

Plain and simple, the author of this amendment wants to change agricultural policy, and this debate does not belong in this bill.

And I would remind my friends, we today, this week, are a part of a bold,

new, open legislative process. Maybe that's not how you did it in the past, but when we do this farm bill, it will be done in committee and on the floor in the same open way we're doing this.

Let the process run its course. Let us work our way through this open process when it should be done in the next farm bill next year. Is that so much to ask?

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 408 OFFERED BY MR. CLYBURN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Of the funds made available by this Act for each of the following accounts or activities, 10 percent shall be allocated for assistance in persistent poverty counties:

(1) ''Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs''.

(2) ''Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, Economic Development Assistance Programs''.

(3) ''Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Construction''.

(4) ''Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Education''.

(5) ''Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education''.

(6) ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services''.

(7) ''Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration''.

(8) ''Department of Housing and Urban Development, Economic Development Initiative''.

(9) ''Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs''.

(10) ''Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants, Water and Wastewater''.

(11) ''Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Transportation Community and System Preservation''.

(12) ''Department of the Treasury, Community Development Financial Institutions''.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term ''persistent poverty counties'' means any county that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1990, 2000, and 2010 decennial censuses.

(c) Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, each department or agency listed in subsection (a) shall submit to Congress a progress report on the implementation of this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment, and I have called it the 10–20–30 amendment. It deals with what we call ''persistent poverty counties''—those places in America that have experienced a poverty rate of at least 20 percent for the last 30 years.

My amendment requires that at least 10 percent of the funds in certain accounts be directed to counties where 20 percent or more of their citizens have languished below the Federal poverty level for the last 30 years; hence, the 10–20–30 approach.

Mr. Chairman, approximately 15 percent of all counties in America qualify as persistent poverty counties. These counties are diverse and spread across the country, including Appalachian communities in Kentucky and West Virginia, Native American communities in South Dakota and Alaska, Latino communities in Arizona and New Mexico, African American communities in North and South Carolina. They are urban communities in Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore, and St. Louis.

Democrats represent 149 of these counties, with a total population of 8.7 million. Republicans represent 311 of these counties, with a total population of 8.3 million. Fourteen of these counties, with a total population of 5.3 million, are split between Democrats and Republicans. A total of 43 Democrats and 84 Republicans represent all or a part of these counties, and 35 of our 50 States have at least one persistent poverty county. Fifteen of South Carolina's 46 counties qualify for this ignoble recognition, and I happen to represent seven of those counties.

This is not a red State or a blue State issue. That's why on this map beside me the persistent poverty counties are colored in purple. There is no political affiliation for poverty. Poverty has never been limited to race, region, or creed.

These counties do not have the resources to hire sophisticated, high-powered grant writers and lobbyists to help compete for the finite amount of dollars that should be available to them.

In today's New York Times, there is a front-page story which I would ask everybody to read. It is entitled, ''For Much of Rural America, Broadband is a Dividing Line.''

Mr. Chairman, I was particularly struck by the words of Mrs. Sharon Jones, a small logging company owner in Coffeeville, Alabama. Listen to her words. ''We are trying to pull ourselves into the 21st century.'' Mrs. Jones says, ''I don't think the rest of the world understands there is a piece of the world here that is really challenged.''

Her business, her customers, and her neighbors are the reasons we included the 10–20–30 amendment in the Recovery Act in the Rural Development section of the Agriculture title, and it is working well.

The formula allowed many persistent poverty counties to benefit from the Recovery Act, and they do not otherwise receive funds. Projects like these are crucial to meeting the basic needs of the community and laying the groundwork for future success.

□ 1750

This amendment builds on that success, and I hope to work with my Republican colleagues to have it included in the final version of H.R. 1.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make one comment. I wanted to thank Mr. CLYBURN for raising this issue, and I wanted to thank Mr. REHBERG for agreeing to work with him.

Out of the 28 counties that I represent in southern Missouri, 14 of those 28 are persistent poverty counties. And the gentleman is absolutely correct when he says that for a lot of those communities it is very, very difficult to find the means by which you can get people to help write grants for you, for example, and other things. So I think this is an important issue on which we can all work together. I am so pleased Mr. CLYBURN raised it, and I really just wanted to thank Mr. REHBERG for his generosity in working with us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, and therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rules states, in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 566 OFFERED BY MR. BOREN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require a person licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to report information to the Department of Justice regarding the sale of multiple rifles or shotguns to the same person.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this bipartisan amendment with Congressman REHBERG of Montana, my colleague and a fellow member of the House Second Amendment Task Force.

I am proud to report that two important groups have endorsed this amendment, the National Rifle Association and the National Shooting Sports Foundation. Our amendment would prohibit the ATF from using any funds in this act to collect information from federally licensed firearms retailers about multiple rifle sales.

Last December, ATF published an emergency request in the Federal Register. It asked the Office of Management and Budget for the power to collect information from firearms retailers on all sales of two or more semiautomatic rifles within five consecutive business days. This would include many of today's most popular rifles used by millions of Americans for self-defense, hunting, and other lawful purposes.

ATF officials have said this information collection would apply only to licensed firearms retailers in certain States—Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California. However, ATF's request published in the Federal Register does not mention a geographic limitation. This means we have to take the ATF at its word. I have heard numerous concerns about this ATF request from fellow Oklahomans, including sportsmen, gun owners, and responsible firearms retailers alike.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose granting ATF this information-collecting authority for three reasons: first, it would subject responsible firearms sellers who are often small business owners to burdensome reporting requirements. Second, ATF would catalog records on Americans who purchase rifles, thereby compromising their privacy. And, finally, ATF lacks legal authority to collect this information. The Gun Control Act of 1968 requires Federal firearms dealers to report multiple sales of handguns.

What I'd like to do at this time is yield to my colleague and friend from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) for any comments he might have.

Mr. REHBERG. Thank you, Mr. BOREN. And I thank the chairman for allowing this opportunity.

It's one of those situations where you'd like to believe the administration is not trying to creep into an area that is not necessarily something they would try and slip by anyone. But when you talk about gun control, we get very serious about the Constitution and the creeping of various rules and regulations in areas that Congress has specifically stayed out of, didn't want us to be involved in. And so there is always that lingering thought in the back of your mind like, what's going on here?

Now I don't tend to believe that I would be a scary individual, but if I were living in one of those four States, I would be in this category of having purchased two long rifles because I happened to buy a hunting rifle for myself and my son, who was of age. For Christmas I went out and bought two, and it throws me into that category. I would like to think I'm not considered a gun runner for a Mexican cartel or something like that, but that's the effect of a regulation like this. And so I hope that we will seriously consider this not necessary.

We took the action that created regulation on handguns, we understand that. But when it comes to a long rifle—we're talking hunting rifles, we're talking about other types of rifles that are out there—this doesn't really make sense. So I really thank Mr. BOREN for taking the lead on this amendment. It's really important to those of us who are active firearm users.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1¼ minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and his colleague and my colleague from Montana.

Let me say first and foremost that this was a request having to do with the four States on the southwest border. It would not have involved our great friend from Montana in his purchase of rifles. This was limited to long guns that would have detachable clips. Multiple purchases would have been required to be notified. So if someone went to buy 1,000 AK–47 assault weapons and semi-automatic clips that were detachable, they would have to be reported.

Now, this reporting requirement already exists for pistols or for handguns. There was a request made, OMB denied it, wanted to get a series of public comments. So there was no rush on the administration's behalf to rush this through under the cover of some emergency order. It's been out for public comment. And I think that is a reasonable thing to think about whether or not we would want to have a notification to our government if someone was buying large quantities of assault weapons, especially along the border, which many, many of our colleagues have told us about being a place of significant danger related to organized crime to the south of our sovereign Nation.

So this is a request that's been made. It's been met, however, with this amendment. And I think we all know the result of what might happen here in the House regarding this. I hope that we're prepared to live with the consequences of whatever votes we might cast in this matter.

This has nothing whatsoever to do with hunting rifles or guns used in sporting activity. This has to do with long guns with detachable clips used for only one purpose, and that is, shooting large numbers of rounds and killing large numbers of people. So we should be clear about it; it's a request that's been made. It's been noticed on the public record for comment by the administration. It relates only to these four States. It is modeled after a regulation that already exists now for handguns. So I know that some may get paranoid about these issues, but I think we should have at least some paranoia about what this could portend if we don't take reasonable action in the protection of the citizens that we've been elected to protect.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

□ 1800

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Ms. CHU. Thirty thousand.

That's how many people were violently slaughtered by the Mexican drug cartels in just 4 short years. One of them was Bobby Salcedo, an American citizen and rising star from my district. He was kidnapped and murdered last year with a semiautomatic rifle.

I oppose this amendment because it makes it harder to stop these types of violent acts. This amendment will prevent the tracing of bulk sales of the military-style rifles, popular with cartels, that have resulted in tragic murders like Bobby's. Last year, the U.S. military announced that, if the drug war continues, it could cause the Mexican Government to collapse, and the cartel war could spread over the border into the U.S. This amendment makes the drug war worse.

Every day, people are dying from this war, even American citizens. We must stop it, and we can by opposing this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I don't know if anybody has noticed what has gone on

in Mexico recently. The previous speaker just spoke of the drug wars that are going on. It's a known fact that much of the equipment that's used to carry on those wars comes from the United States and is smuggled into Mexico.

This is a very sane and necessary attempt to slow down the availability of high-caliber, high-capacity automatic weapons that are smuggled into Mexico. It makes no sense not to know what's going on, because this is dramatically affecting the border States and American citizens who happen to be in Mexico.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this amendment is very simple. It prevents the ATF from imposing burdensome reporting requirements on responsible firearms retailers; it protects the privacy and Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens; and it ensures that the ATF will not circumvent the will of Congress.

Again, I remind my colleagues that this amendment carries the full support of the National Rifle Association and the National Shooting Sports Foundation.

I urge adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, 48 hours ago, two officials of the United States Government, ICE agents, were attacked. They were in an armed vehicle which was traveling south of the border. One of those agents died. The assault weapons used in this incident, like tens of thousands of them that have found their way into Mexico, have crossed the border through these legal purchases.

This is about notification to the Department of Justice. It doesn't stop the sale. It notifies the DOJ that large amounts of these guns have been purchased. I think it's a reasonable thing. I leave it to my colleagues to make a reasonable judgment about this amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment serves no legitimate purpose and would only compromise our national security and put more Americans in harm's way.

By barring the use of Federal funds to mandate Federal firearms dealers to report the sale of multiple long guns such as semiautomatic assault rifles, this amendment would undermine the Obama Administration's efforts to combat cross-border illegal gun trafficking.

We must do everything we can to secure the border, strengthen our anti-gun-trafficking efforts, and help the Mexican Government fight the drug cartels.

The Mexican drug cartels are killing people at a staggering rate—more than 30,000 since 2006. And long guns are widely known as the cartels' weapon of choice.

Some may shrug their shoulders and conclude this is just another problem beyond our reach. That would be a mistake.

The drug cartels are getting their guns from the United States.

Since 2006, the ATF has seized more than 10,000 firearms and nearly one million rounds of ammunition destined for Mexico, where the public is not allowed to purchase or possess guns.

Authorities in Mexico say most of the guns used in police assassinations and cartel bloodshed originate in the United States and have pressed the U.S. to reduce the flow of weapons south.

And this isn't just a border state problem. The impact of this trafficking is felt in my hometown of Chicago.

According to the National Drug Intelligence Center, Mexican drug trafficking organizations have infiltrated small and large cities in 48 U.S. States, affecting our national security.

For example, Mexican drug cartels have a significant presence in Chicago, which Federal officials say is a key transfer point for drugs heading to Minnesota and points north and east.

Last year, eleven alleged drug traffickers with connections to the Sinaloa Cartel were indicted by U.S. Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald in Chicago as part of ''Project Deliverance,''—a multi-state and agency effort to disrupt the flow of drugs and guns across the border.

The drug cartel's violent war for control, which is fueled by illegal trafficking from the U.S. to Mexico, seriously impacts our public safety.

The ATF's proposal to compel federal firearms dealers to report the sale of multiple long guns is not about gun control or compiling a registry of long gun owners.

This is a law enforcement response to the evidence from successful tracings of weapons recovered in Mexico.

Recent tracings show that a large number of these weapons were first sold by a licensed gun dealer in California, Arizona, New Mexico, or Texas.

This amendment would undermine law enforcement's capacity to combat illegal gun trafficking and put Americans at even greater risk of gun violence.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

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

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

Mr. REHBERG. 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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to take any action to effect or implement the disestablishment, closure, or realignment of the United States Joint Forces Command.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me start off by saying that this is an amendment that the Congressional Budget Office has said is cost neutral, so we are not talking about revenue coming in or going out. The second thing about this amendment is that it is not dispositive—it doesn't ultimately make a decision. The third thing is that this is an amendment that is supported, not only by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, but by every single subcommittee chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

So what does it do?

It simply states that, before we turn out the lights on the men and women who, without question, have the most expertise and experience and who have had the legal authority to assemble the teams to fight our wars and to respond to our national emergencies, we are going to know who will replace them.

Any time this Nation faces a crisis, there are two observations that always emerge. First, we realize how ineffective our government agencies are in assembling cross-agency teams to respond to that crisis. Second, we realize how good our military is at putting those teams together.

One of the reasons for our military's success is that, for over a decade, whether we go to war or defend our homeland, the military does it as a team. They can bring together a Coast Guard cutter, Army Special Ops units, a marine expeditionary unit, an Air Force squadron, a Navy carrier group, Reserve units, and when needed, even allied partners in a combined response that we call ''jointness.''

It is a competitive advantage for which no nation in the world can rival us; yet, as hard as it is to believe, it is an advantage we did not have just 20 years ago.

One of the reasons we have that advantage is that, for over a decade, a single group has had the legal authority to bring those teams together, and that was the Joint Forces Command. They have assembled the majority of our forces in Iraq, a majority in Afghanistan; they've had control of over 80 percent of our continental U.S.-based combat-ready conventional forces; and they've assembled our military teams for our national disasters.

On August 9, 2010, the Secretary of Defense announced he was closing that command allegedly to save money; but the next day, when the Pentagon briefers came, they were asked by the House Armed Services staff one question: How much money will you save?

Their answer was, ''Not a clue.'' We don't have a clue.

For days, weeks, months, Members have been asking how much this is going to save and who is going to be able to put teams together when this

command is gone. The Pentagon's response has been deafeningly silent. It is not because they are bad people; it's just because they don't know the answer.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply says the answers to those questions are too important for us not to wait until September 30, which is all this amendment does, to give our committees and this body the chance to get the answers and to make sure we do not go back 20 years.

If there is any Member in this room who can answer even the most basic core question presented by this closure, which is who will ultimately have the legal authority and expertise to put together the teams we need to fight our wars and respond to our crises, then you can vote with good conscience against this amendment; but you cannot, because nobody at the Pentagon can answer that question either.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation deserves a better answer than ''we don't have a clue,'' and this amendment gives them a chance to find that answer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. The amendment would prohibit the use of funds to take any action to dis-establish the Joint Forces Command. In FY 2010, Secretary of Defense Gates recommended dis-establishing the Joint Forces Command, and included this as part of his efficiencies initiatives in the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

On January 6, 2011, President Obama issued an official memorandum accepting the recommendations of Secretary Gates and of chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mike Mullen, and approved dis-establishment of Joint Forces Command.

The Department of Defense expects to save at least $240 million annually by dis-establishing the command. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff retains responsibility for promoting joint operations and essential functions. The resources needed to perform these functions will be assigned to other organizations in Hampton Roads and the Navy support activity in Norfolk, Virginia. All told, DOD estimates that about 50 percent of the current level of effort will remain in the Norfolk, Virginia area.

We've been through so many rounds of BRAC. I can sympathize with the gentleman from Virginia, and I understand his concerns about this.

□ 1810

But, you know, your side is taking the position that we have to reduce spending on some of the most sensitive programs that we have in our government.

I happen to have chaired the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee just for a brief time but was a member of the committee for 32 years, and I am now the ranking Democratic member. We went through this budget very, very carefully this year, Mr. YOUNG and I did, and we came up with $15 billion of cuts.

We have to give some respect to the Secretary of Defense, who, in fact, was a Republican and serving in this administration. Some of these things I know are painful and it affects your community. I have had that problem over the years myself. But just like the alternate engine, sometimes we have to make these hard decisions.

The Secretary of Defense, I think in this case, deserves the benefit of the doubt. I think the Virginia delegation is totally correct in asking for substantiation for what they are doing and why they are doing it.

But, you know, Joint Forces Command is—I have been there and visited there. The responsibility is to assign forces to various contingencies.

You know, we only have so many forces, so we do look at all the plans there are. There is going to be this fleet or this division or this going here, there and everywhere, depending on what the scenario is. So I think the Chairman, Mike Mullen, and the Joint Chiefs can do that just as well as having a separate command.

And, again, I say we have to make some hard decisions. We are cutting the heart out of the domestic programs of this country and defense has to give something up here. If you look at the various commands, this one makes as much sense. And the Secretary of Defense has made the decision. It is supported by the top members of the joint staff and, for that reason, I regretfully have to object and oppose the amendment.

Mr. FORBES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. I would ask the gentleman if all this amendment does is give us until September 30 to answer those questions. All the leases are in effect. They can't be changed until that period of time, so we are not talking about cost. But this is the question I would ask the gentleman:

You mentioned that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had the authority to be that joint provider and to allocate those troops. But I would ask the gentlemen if, in fact, they do have that authority, because Goldwater-Nichols and the reauthorization act expressly prohibited them from being able to do that. And so I would ask the gentleman if it doesn't make sense, at least before we cut out the lights, regardless of the ultimate decision you make, to make absolutely sure we know who is going to be able to have that authority before we make that final decision.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman's point.

As I have been told, there has been an effort to try and keep 50 percent of the people and the activities in your area in Virginia, and that's one of the most important defense areas the country has.

So I think you guys are working hard, and I think that the Department is responding as best they can, but, again, I think we should reject the amendment and let this thing work out as the Department has recommended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. May I inquire how much time I have left, Mr. Chairman?

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

Mr. FORBES. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Virginia.

This amendment would give Congress time to conduct oversight over the decision to close Joint Forces Command pure and simple, and specifically it would allow us to determine how the closure could impact national security.

In August, it was announced by the Pentagon that JFCOM would be disestablished, but there was no transparency in that decision. Congress was not informed, and Congress asked multiple times for the analysis that was done that led to the decision to close JFCOM without getting that information.

This leads me to believe that a thorough and detailed analysis into the JFCOM decision was never conducted. It leads me also to believe that in 5 years the Pentagon will be asking Congress to set up a mechanism to ensure jointness among our services.

Capabilities exist under JFCOM that are vital to our national security and paramount to our success in the current wars the military is fighting. Without that analysis, we cannot know whether we are casting away years of joint experience that will be crucial to the future defense of this Nation.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the Congressman from the Second District of Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Forbes Joint Forces Command Amendment. The establishment of a combatant command requires a literal act of Congress. It follows, then, that the closure of a combatant command should involve thoughtful analysis that is shared with this body for comment. The closure of Joint Forces Command fails on that important count. Either no such analysis has been conducted or it is being withheld.

Mr. Chairman, the absence of data that supports the closure of a combatant command is simply unacceptable. Accordingly, this cost neutral amendment delays its closure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of the Forbes Joint Forces Command amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by division A of this Act for Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide may be used for official representation purposes, as defined by Department of Defense Instruction 7250.13, dated June 30, 2009.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, since 2006 the taxpayers have entrusted the Department of Defense with over $2.5 trillion, and the law has required that the Department of Defense make sure that they allow the taxpayers to know where that money is being spent by providing audited financial statements. Yet in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, it was established recently that no such audited financial statements were filed in 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010, and that none would be filed this year.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Defense testified that compliance with the law was, in fact, a priority and that they had had a plan at the Department of Defense. But when you put up the Web site just 2 days ago from the Department of Defense, it showed very clearly that the plan that they had 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 said that they would have completely filed clean audited statements by 2010.

They were only 100 percent off, because according to the testimony right now, the records at the Department of Defense are so bad that less than 5 percent of all of the monies given to the Department of Defense are in an audit-ready position.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have heard some draconian efforts to try to get them into compliance. This is no such effort.

What this simply does is to recognize that we give $2 million in the funds set forth in this amendment that are basically party funds. They are funds for dinners. They are funds for entertainment. They are funds that have no impact directly on our warfighter. And what this amendment simply does is to take away those funds, Mr. Chairman.

And our thought is that if we take away those funds until we have compliance with those audited financial statements that the taxpayers deserve, we will give a strong incentive to make sure that we get that compliance and we are not 100 percent off.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. This amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from spending any funds—any—for official representation due to a lack of auditable financial statements.

Now, I completely agree with the gentleman on the point that we need to get them to do this. I just think this approach is not the way to do it.

If authorizers could set a timeframe in statute—and that's the way to do it—without cutting out these funds when they are entertaining people from other countries around the world. I just think it's one of those things that sounds good, but it's going to have unintended consequences.

□ 1820

Auditable financial statements have long been a goal of the Department of Defense. The committee has long pressed DOD to improve the quality of its financial management, and will continue that effort in the coming year. However, eliminating official representation funds is not connected to that goal. And limiting these funds would have damaging consequences.

The amendment would preclude activities associated with hosting military to military contacts, both domestically and overseas. The activity extends official courtesies to guests of the United States and the Department of Defense, and upholds the prestige and standing of the United States. The amendment would also harm the military services' ability to conduct community relations activities.

The amendment hurts DOD's ability to represent itself to foreign Nations and to the communities in which DOD activities are located. And it does so with very little payback. The bill before the House cuts over $15 billion on a bipartisan basis from the Defense Department budget on careful analysis of DOD programs. The approach in this bill yields both a higher payback and does not have the drawback of unintended consequences.

Therefore, I urge rejection of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I rise in support of efforts to highlight the need for the Department of Defense to become audit ready.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense was instructed by Congress to provide taxpayers with audited financial statements for the first time in the 1990s. Now it's 2011, more than 20 years later, and we are still talking about the same issue while our country faces a grave economic downturn.

As a CPA, I understand the painfully difficult process that will go into auditing the largest enterprise on the face of the Earth. But as General Petraeus told us last year, hard is not impossible. The American people made a very clear statement last November that they're ready for their government to get its fiscal house in order. The Department of Defense cannot continue to get a pass on this issue. We cannot allow the status quo practices to hinder our ability to provide for the finest military the world has ever known.

This challenging goal will require buy-in from the top down, and it begins with the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We call on him for sound leadership to exercise fiscal responsibility. I will continue to press Defense officials across the river to get their fiscal house in order. We must not be having this conversation two decades from now. Support this amendment.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, my good friend mentioned that we need to put something in regulations or statutes to make the Department of Defense comply. We have done that. They have had it in statute. The law requires that they do it, and we have had it in there, and they have just failed to do it 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and they won't do it this year. And they admit that they are not a bit closer.

The second thing is, we mentioned unintended consequences. There are no unintended consequences with this amendment. We intend the consequences. You got to stop the partying until you do what the taxpayers are entitled to have required by the law, and that is just account for where the money is going. We can't determine how much we're going to spend on defense if we don't know where those dollars are going.

I hope we will adopt this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 333 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program is hereby reduced by 75 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I just want to begin with a map of Arizona, showing all of the colored areas of Arizona that are actually Federal property, over half of the State. My amendment deals with PILT and Federal payments to places like Arizona, which is on a continuing welfare system of government spending and has been for many, many decades.

Let me now show you the State of Ohio, where there are proposals that the Community Development Block Grant funds in the base bill are being cut. This is Ohio. We don't have much Federal property. We hardly have anything at all related to federal government. Ohioans have to make it in the free market. And yet what's happening in the bill is that more money is going to pay out for PILT than for places like I represent in the Midwest, where unemployment is so high. The bill actually cuts Community Development Block Grant dollars for cities and towns across this country to the tune of $2.95 billion. And yet, the base bill continues these PILT payments, which are really welfare payments to the West.

If this Congress is serious about cutting spending, we need to address some of the fundamental challenges contained in what I call megamarks. These aren't earmarks; these are big megamarks that benefit certain regions of the country at the expense of others.

Just to give you a sense of this, these subsidies have existed for generations. It's time that the West stood on its own two feet. These subsidies cannot be afforded by the other parts of the country that don't have that kind of Federal largesse. If we're going to have sacrifice in this legislation, then it needs to be shared. We need to reduce the payments in lieu of taxes called PILT by 75 percent. That's just the administrative costs that we're reducing. What's good for the cities of Toledo and Detroit, Boise, Dallas, Charlotte, Salt Lake City, and Reno is really good for the Western subsidized communities as well.

PILT is mandatory spending just like farm subsidies, and outside our annual appropriation bill's spending recommendations. My amendment targets the administration of those funds. Let me just put a couple figures on the record, and then I would like to yield 1½ minutes to my dear friend, the ranking member, Mr. MORAN.

For the PILT subsidy, the West has received over the last 10 years. Let's look at Arizona. Arizona has gotten an increase from $10.3 million in 1999 to $31.6 million in fiscal year 2009. Idaho has gone up three times, from $8.3 million to $26.4 million. Montana from $9.8 million to over $28 million. Nevada from $7.1 million to in excess of $23 million. New Mexico more than tripled from $11 million to over $37 million. And Texas has leapt from $1.3 million to $4.3 million. Utah from $9.7 million to over $33 million. And Wyoming, which has fewer people than the District of Columbia, which is going to lose funds under the Community Development Block Grant program, 10 years ago received $8 million annually, and now Wyoming will receive over $25 million. Come now. For empty property where the Federal resource is already located there and can serve as an economic engine?

To begin with, you can pivot so much development off of that federal presence. You can do economic development off of tourism. You can use those lands to attract investors who like to drill on those lands, and improve those lands. You can attract economic development around what I would call Federal encampments. My goodness, it's really amazing what can be accomplished with some creativity and vision.

You know how much my district gets for our thousands of acres of Federal wildlife refuges? Are you ready? $180. Yes. One hundred and eighty dollars compared to billions and billions and billions going out in these permanent PILT subsidies.

And you know what? PILT doesn't even begin to account for what the West gets for oil and gas leasing subsidies, livestock grazing, timber harvesting. I think one of the reasons our Midwestern taxpayers are feeling the tax load so heavily is some other parts of the country are really being lifted up by the federal government, and they don't even appreciate what they have.

For my colleagues, if you want to send the American people a message that you are serious about cutting spending, the place to begin is by cutting the administrative fees of PILT.

TOTAL STATE PAYMENT RESULTS

State	FY 2009 payment	FY 2010 payment	FY 2011 payment
Alabama	$685,234	$605,410	$0
Alaska	25,674,111	24,905,298	0
Arizona	31,662,123	27,823,593	0
Arkansas	3,917,683	4,463,032	0
California	34,397,858	36,766,468	0
Colorado	28,660,622	24,267,593	0
Connecticut	28,131	28,773	0
Delaware	17,354	17,750	0
District of Columbia	24,631	25,087	0
Florida	4,600,719	4,525,156	0
Georgia	2,397,205	1,938,517	0
Guam	2,185	2,235	0
Hawaii	323,801	326,064	0
Idaho	26,434,457	25,281,177	0
Illinois	1,058,185	1,099,777	0
Indiana	641,040	412,560	0
Iowa	434,023	450,820	0
Kansas	1,074,017	1,099,185	0
Kentucky	2,245,050	1,480,359	0
Louisiana	528,877	546,772	0
Maine	326,618	295,510	0
Maryland	99,913	103,643	0
Massachusetts	99,809	100,986	0
Michigan	4,336,151	3,830,742	0
Minnesota	2,736,684	2,538,098	0
Mississippi	1,469,166	1,488,198	0
Missouri	2,760,923	2,695,274	0
Montana	28,060,662	23,513,338	0
Nebraska	1,106,017	980,520	0
Nevada	23,269,350	22,753,204	0
New Hampshire	1,686,757	1,726,820	0
New Jersey	94,439	96,597	0
New Mexico	37,013,334	32,205,935	0

TOTAL STATE PAYMENT RESULTS—Continued

State	FY 2009 payment	FY 2010 payment	FY 2011 payment
New York	139,400	122,706	0
North Carolina	4,047,121	3,858,283	0
North Dakota	1,392,092	1,367,945	0
Ohio	730,179	485,605	0
Oklahoma	2,539,173	2,582,013	0
Oregon	14,963,789	12,651,531	0
Pennsylvania	514,117	527,493	0
Puerto Rico	20,893	9,983	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0
South Carolina	382,647	388,740	0
South Dakota	4,263,660	4,778,507	0
Tennessee	2,409,845	1,615,385	0
Texas	4,348,915	4,501,553	0
Utah	33,063,034	34,265,151	0
Vermont	879,257	896,432	0
Virgin Islands	37,575	33,171	0
Virginia	3,809,111	2,532,009	0
Washington	10,771,272	12,821,358	0
West Virginia	2,551,988	2,799,356	0
Wisconsin	1,355,170	741,498	0
Wyoming	25,561,575	22,705,431	0
Total	381,647,942	358,078,641	0

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a message amendment. We love our colleagues who represent the Western States, but many of them, particularly on the other side, don't seem to show much love for the Federal Government they represent. The payment in lieu of taxes program was created to compensate counties for lost taxes, since Federal lands don't pay taxes. That's fair. Western States with lots of Federal lands get most of the payments. That's fair.

□ 1830

But while the counties don't get any taxes from Federal lands, they don't have to provide services on those lands either. In fact the opposite occurs. The national parks, wildlife refuges, national forests and BLM lands and the staffs of all these provide very valuable services and substantial revenue and jobs to the western counties, and the public lands provide ecosystems that are worth billions.

Without clean water and open space, imagine. You wouldn't have the communities, the agriculture, that we seem to take for granted. In fact, the States get fully half the mineral receipts that come from the coal, oil and gas that is owned by the Federal taxpayer. The gentlelady makes a very important point that is worthy of consideration.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, this is such a bad amendment. It's one of the few amendments I've ever seen that actually leaves me speechless, so I'm going to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the map you see in front of you is not the coverage area for Verizon. Everything that is red on this map is land that is owned by the Federal Government. One in every 3 acres in America is owned by the Federal Government and as you can clearly see it is disproportionate here in the West.

This of course is the gentlewoman from Ohio's region. This is my district. And until such time as my district resembles her district, in the ability of us to control our future and our resources, payment in lieu of taxes is not welfare to the West, it is simply rent on the land that you control; until such time as the Secretary of the Interior's decision—which the Inspector General said was capricious and arbitrary—does not destroy 3,000 jobs in a county with only 31,000 inhabitants; until such time as $1.9 billion in investment leaves the West to go to the East where there are fewer regulations; until such time as somebody from the East who comes to frolic in the public lands of the West and consumes the entire county's search and rescue budget in 1 day, until that is changed, PILT is not welfare, it is rent on the land you control.

I want you to look carefully at this map. See where the red is. Then I also want you to look at this particular map. States in red are the States that have the hardest time funding their education system. That is the slowest growth in education. I hope you realize there is a similarity between the two particular maps. Because the bottom line is, individuals in the West pay more in State and Federal taxes than in the East. There are more kids in the West. We have larger class sizes in the West. Our education system has a harder time to fund itself in the West because this map prohibits us from developing our property taxes, developing our energy royalties, developing high-paying jobs with income taxes, so kids are hurt in the West. This map and this situation means that kids are underfunded.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Kids in the West, their education is underfunded, their teacher salaries are depressed, and my retirement is threatened because of this particular situation. When this changes, there will be no more need for PILT. But until that time comes, this is not welfare; this is rent on the land you control. To be honest, we'd rather have the land back, but until that time, pay for what you control.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the gentlewoman's time expired?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady from Ohio may actually have stumbled upon something, and if she's ready to actually help us, so a State like Arizona, we can actually own our land, great. But until that time, you've got to understand, only 18 percent of our State is privately owned. Tribal lands, Federal lands, BLM lands, other government lands. Are we ready to start paying the full property tax load? I was the county treasurer in Maricopa County and huge portions of our county, we can't even touch. If you want a sense of fairness, then we step up and we give the land back to the State. Until that time, this borders on silly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. There are over 20 million acres of Federal land in Colorado. I want to be clear with, of course, great respect to my colleague from Ohio. This is not in any way, shape or form a giveaway to our counties. This is land we cannot tax, we cannot develop, we cannot benefit from. In fact, PILT payments are insufficient. They're too low to compensate for the burden of having all this land that's not part of our local tax base. It is a burden. In fact many of our counties have to actually spend money maintaining this land because some of the Federal infrastructure isn't sufficient as well. There is nobody who's making out like a bandit from this and it's all we can do to justify the fact that the Federal Government owns a lot of land.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield—I think I just have 30 seconds left; is that correct?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 1 minute left.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I want to thank the chairman for yielding.

I have to remind my good friend from Ohio that as the West was settled, it was people from Ohio and Virginia and the Midwest that were making these laws that created most of the western States to be 80 percent, 70 percent, 90 percent Federal lands.

In order for us to be able to have somewhat of a tax base because of the limited private property we have, we need to ask the Federal Government to pay its share. You cannot in many cases develop economically these lands because people from the East prohibit us from developing these public lands. I just want to throw that out as a reminder.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to rise in very strong opposition. Being a westerner, I have counties in my district that receive these payments. I think it's justified. I appreciate the fact that the new majority has tried to protect these payments. It's very important in the West.

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me just conclude by saying I have one county that's 96 percent Federally owned. Ninety-six percent. That means 4 percent of the property is taxable in order to provide the services for all of you that come out and enjoy the beauty in the county.

Do you think PILT payments are appropriate? I think they are and I would hope that we overwhelmingly reject this amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to maintain an end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty in Europe in excess of 35,000 members and end strength levels for active duty members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of 565,275, 328,250, and 329,275, respectively, and the amounts otherwise provided by this Act for ''Military Personnel, Army'', ''Military Personnel, Navy'' and ''Military Personnel, Air Force'' in title I of division A are hereby reduced by $155,914,688, $18,047,700, and $118,488,825, respectively.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, we all share the goal of reducing the deficit. If we are serious about deficit reduction, we need to look at defense as one of the line items. My amendment would save hundreds of millions of dollars by reducing our troop count in Europe. Instead of having over 80,000 troops in Europe where they are no longer needed, we would reduce the amount of troops in Europe to 35,000. This would allow the Department of Defense to save money by closing bases in Europe that don't have any strategic rationale. Deploying our troops out of Europe and closing these bases is an excellent way to help reduce expenditures and save money.

My amendment would only cut 7,500 troops which would save $278 million. An additional 35,000 troops would be available for deployment to actual theaters where we have a strategic interest. So it would enhance our preparedness at the same time as saving money.

□ 1840

This step would save $278 million and improve our national security.

Reducing our troop levels would save money, personnel costs, housing expenses and the cost of stationing troops abroad. On top of these savings, my amendment will allow us to close bases across Europe that, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, are relics of a bygone era. Rather than fighting the demons of the past, we need to focus on the very real threats of the present and the future. We are no longer in a battle with the Nazis. We are no longer in a battle with the Soviets. The need for these bases was understandable in a different geopolitical context.

But what is their justification now? The U.S. taxpayer did not sign up to defend wealthy European democracies from imaginary threats forever. These bases cost U.S. taxpayers millions and millions of dollars. I fail to understand why we're wasting money to maintain bases where they aren't needed. Our European Allies are some of the richest countries in the world. Why are we subsidizing their defense spending? Our European allies have enjoyed a free ride on the American dime for years now. Today, they spend on average only 2 percent of GDP on defense, while we spend between 4 and 5 percent.

There's no reason for us to subsidize European defense while every other aspect of our government we are looking at for cuts.

I understand that many of the troops stationed in Europe have in the past been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. My amendment is consistent with that. Currently 13,000 troops stationed in Germany and Iraq are deployed in our theaters of operation. My amendment would allow for that to continue. It allows for 35,000 troops, well within the number that are currently deployed in actual theaters where we have a strategic interest.

Nor does my amendment signal any kind of weakening of our commitment to NATO. With modern technology, we can move troops and weapons quickly across the globe when needed. My amendment would still allow for 35,000 troops to remain in Europe so they can do joint exercises with NATO. It is time for us to rethink our defense spending. We are not under threat in Europe. Maintaining a network of bases in Europe is not a rational or effective response to the terrorist threat, nor is it fiscally responsible.

These cuts are not my idea. They are based on recommendations from the Sustainable Defense Task Force, a bipartisan project organized by Congressman FRANK, Congressman PAUL, Congressman JONES, and Senator WYDEN and backed by a number of credible organizations, CATO Institute, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Center for American Progress, Center for Defense Information, National Security Network and others.

Even Donald Rumsfeld believes it is time to change our policy. This is his quote from his recent book: ''Of the quarter million troops deployed abroad in 2011, more than 100,000 were in Europe, the vast majority stationed in Germany to fend off an invasion by a Soviet Union that no longer existed. I believed our troops had to do more than serve as security blankets for wealthy allied nations.''

When even Donald Rumsfeld admits that this policy doesn't make sense and isn't cost justified, we must seriously reconsider our policy maintaining bases in regions that are clearly peaceful and pose no threat.

Let's get serious about balancing the budget and find savings in every agency, including DOD. Reducing our military presence in Europe is low-hanging fruit. This will save money. The time is now. The time was last year. The time was 3 years ago. After the fall of the Soviet Union, there fails to be a strategic rationale to maintain our current troop levels or expenditure levels in the European theater.

My amendment will save taxpayer money and improve military preparedness for conflicts in zones where America has a strategic imperative to fight the global war on terrorism. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TURNER. The gentleman from Colorado says that there is no strategic rationale for these troops; but, in fact, there is no strategic rationale for this amendment. This amendment is completely arbitrary in the cuts that are proposed, and there is no basis for these levels of cuts that are proposed.

In fact, the strategic rationale is for the support of our troops that are currently serving in Europe. Secretary Gates just Wednesday appeared before the Armed Services Committee; and while he was there, he testified that it is the presence of our military on the ground in Europe and other places that assures our allies and provides a deterrent effect to would-be aggressors.

These troops are not just staring down a past Soviet Union. They are, in fact, providing wartime support currently. They are also providing an effective deterrent both for our allies and for the United States.

This amendment would reduce the Army by more than 5,000, the Navy by more than 500 and the Air Force by more than 5,000 from programmed end-strength levels for fiscal year 2011. These are planned troop deployments and presence. This is not something that was done 10 years ago.

The limits on this end strength would damage wartime operational capability. To reduce manpower halfway through the fiscal year would likely require the abrupt involuntary separation of many servicemembers, sending the message, thank you for your service, but now please leave. These troops are actively providing protection both to our allies and to the United States and play a vital role in what is wartime operational capability.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. Secretary Gates has worked out a reduction in the troop force that will occur later in the FYDP. I think under the circumstances with the troops in Afghanistan, we are bringing in troops out of Iraq. And one of the things that is very important about our European bases is we train with the Europeans. We work with the Europeans. When the flights come out of Iraq or Afghanistan with wounded troops, they come back to Landstuhl in Germany where the troops are taken care of in the hospital. There is a long-term relationship with NATO that is very critically important.

And just to do this off the back of the hand, I understand the gentleman has some other advisers on this amendment; I wouldn't exactly be touting Donald Rumsfeld myself. But anyway, I hope that we can defeat this amendment and let the Secretary of Defense and the joint chiefs make the decision in bringing down our troop forces. And I really do believe Europe is still important to the United States.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you. Although the gentleman from Colorado referenced I think what is an accurate quote to Donald Rumsfeld, I think that he, too, would have serious concerns about this amendment and its immediate effects.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Ohio mentioned that the troops are an effective deterrent. I would simply ask, who are we deterring from attacking Germany and Italy?

Might I inquire as to how much time remains on either side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Since he didn't want to answer on my time, I will be happy to yield my 20 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio, and again, who are we deterring from attacking Italy and Germany?

Mr. TURNER. I think it's important for us to understand who might attack us. And this is not an issue of these troops being a relic.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, again, the gentleman cited that they would be a deterrent, so I was just trying to clarify who we were attempting to deter.

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

Mr. TURNER. I think it's important for us to continue to honor our obligations to our allies and also to protect our country. Secretary Gates just as recently as this week on Wednesday reaffirmed the need for these troops so that we can continue to support our allies and the United States.

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. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 498 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by division B of this Act may be used to develop, carry out, implement, or otherwise enforce proposed regulations published June 18, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 34,667) by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would stop the Department of the Interior's Office of Surface Mining and Reclamation and Enforcement from going forward with a proposed revision to the stream buffer rule that could, according to the Obama administration's own analysis, eliminate up to 29,000 coal industry and industry-related jobs, cut coal mining production by 50 percent, and increase the cost of electricity for families and businesses.

In December 2008, OSM issued a clarification of the stream buffer zone rules after a 5-year process that included 40,000 public comments, two proposed rules, and 5,000 pages of environmental analysis from five different agencies.

The final rule clarified and codified coal surface mining practices that had been in effect for over 30 years, but an entry in the Federal Registry from June 2009 shows that early in the first days of the Obama administration, the decision was made to reopen the carefully crafted and properly vetted stream buffer zone rule. The proposed sweeping regulatory action would radically alter the definition of a stream as well as how the agency measures material damage outside of the permit area. To date, the agency has provided no studies, no data or support to justify these radical changes.

□ 1850

Given the complete lack of justification, analysis, or rationale for these proposed changes, it can be said that this is a political decision and not one based on science or fact, and this flies in the face of the administration's pledge to base rulemaking decisions on science and not on political factors.

Furthermore, several States have expressed serious concerns about the need and justification for the proposal. Mr. Chairman, the unemployment rate in my home State of Ohio is 9.6 percent. In parts of eastern and southeastern Ohio that I represent, we have double-digit unemployment. The average unemployment in the 12 counties I represent is 10.9 percent. There are entire communities that depend largely on the coal industry, both for direct and indirect jobs, and these jobs would be threatened by this proposed rules change.

To be clear, my amendment does not stop the issuance of permits nor does it prevent OSM, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the EPA from their regulatory responsibilities. My amendment would simply prohibit any funding to be spent on developing, carrying out, or implementing this ill-conceived proposed job-killing rule.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support my amendment to stop the Obama administration from going forward with a regulation that will result in thousands of hardworking Americans losing their jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment stops the Interior Department from protecting nearby streams and rivers from the toxic disposal of coal mine waste. So let me give you the top seven reasons why this amendment should be defeated.

One, it will allow for the continued destruction of America's forests and native vegetation contrary to the statutory requirement to protect that vegetation.

Two, it will interfere with the new requirement for the Clean Water Act and Surface Mining Act, preventing the updating of regulations based upon the best science available.

Three, it will perpetuate the uncertainties that citizens and industry and State regulators are currently experiencing under outdated regulations.

Four, it will continue to allow the worst of the coal mine operators to destroy and pollute America's streams and, by doing so, gain a competitive advantage over the responsible operators.

Five, it will deny the State regulatory officials the ability to issue permits that would withstand legal challenge.

Six, it will prevent the gathering of information needed to predict adverse impacts to land and water resources.

And seven, it will prevent the completion of the National Environmental Policy Act process which provides valuable information to enable an informed decision to be made as to the best alternatives to protect society and the environment while helping to meet America's energy needs.

So that's why I would oppose the Johnson amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman offering this much-needed amendment.

Almost immediately after taking office, Mr. Chairman, the administration put a bull's-eye on Appalachian coal from every angle, including from the OSM. As a representative of Appalachian Kentucky, like Ohio where the gentleman is from, we're losing thousands of jobs because of these policies. And now, by its own admission, the OSM and the U.S. Department of the Interior are placing 7,000 mining jobs across the country on the chopping block, representing 9 percent of the industry, by reopening the long-settled stream protection rule.

And so I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this to our attention with this amendment. A report that was leaked by OSM indicates amending this rule will cause coal production to drop drastically or remain stagnant in 22 States. So it comes as no surprise to me that officials from Kentucky, West Virginia, Utah, Wisconsin, Texas, and others have blasted this proposal as nonsensical and difficult to follow.

Mr. JOHNSON has the right idea with this amendment, which would prohibit OSM from moving forward with this rule during this fiscal year. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to take this opportunity to remind, the rule was reclarified in a 5-year process that ended back in 2008, and now the current administration wants to reopen that rule and redo it completely in just a matter of months, with no science, no data to support it and no justification. And I would remind my colleague that the only reason, the number one reason for passing this amendment is for the up to 29,000 jobs that it is potentially going to save.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) who worked in the Interior Department on this very issue and is quite expert on it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I'm from California so forgive me, but I also was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior in the mid-nineties, and we set up a program

called the Appalachia Clean Streams Program to deal precisely with the issues that have risen over the years from the pollution and contamination from the various coal mines, including mountaintop removal. This effort underway by the Department is to deal with the ongoing problem. The continuing problem, mountaintop removal in mining, does contaminate and does destroy streams.

I could not believe the clarity of the water in the streams when I visited West Virginia. They would make the swimming pools in Los Angeles envious. Nothing was alive, nothing at all, because of the contamination from the mines. I just ask for the opportunity to go ahead.

Mr. MORAN. I very much appreciate the insight from the gentleman from California.

At this point, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would essentially destroy efforts to put an end to the damage that is wrought by mountaintop removal.

Now, many of my colleagues who are not familiar with mountaintop removal, what happens is you take mountains that look like this, and then you turn them into this. This is what happens. And the consequence of doing that, you blow off the top of these beautiful mountains. You push all of the stuff that you've blown up into the valleys that surround it, poisoning streams, poisoning the people who live nearby, poisoning the water supply that feeds much of Appalachia. This is damage that is irreversible. It will never be like this again because nothing grows here.

Now, I know a lot of people try to justify mountaintop removal by saying this is an economic boon for the region. In fact, since mountaintop removal became a prevalent practice, mining jobs have actually declined by more than 50 percent. This is not good for the people of Kentucky and Appalachia. It's not good for the economy, and it's certainly not good for the environment.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have numerous efforts now in Federal Government finally trying to put an end to this destructive, immoral practice. Many in my State gathered in Frankfort just last week to protest what's happening here, to our State, to our children, and to our economy. We can do much better. The last thing we need to do right now is to say to our country and to the people of Appalachia, we're not going to try to preserve these beautiful mountains that God gave us. This is a tipping point in our history.

□ 1900

Generations from now our grandchildren will ask if we don't stop this practice now, if we don't give the government the resources, they will say: How could you let this become this?

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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 Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 583 OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to change any rate of salary or basic pay pursuant to section 1113 of Public Law 111–32.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that addresses pay for foreign service officers. It will ensure that the expected 24 percent pay raise does not go into effect in fiscal year 2011.

It is my understanding that we have an agreement between the majority and minority on this issue.

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. REED).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the Community Connect broadband grant program administered by the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment would eliminate funding for the community connect broadband grant program which is administered by the Department of Agriculture's Rural Utilities Service.

Now, eliminating this program would save over $13.4 million. This is endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste.

Look. We're all for broadband development, and we're all for rural broadband development. It turns out there are a lot of different Federal programs that try to do this. This is one in particular that does not have a good history. In fact, in 2005 and in 2009, Inspector General reports have raised questions about this specific grant program. And that is why I have raised this issue today.

As I said, I think as a supporter of rural broadband development, I want to see programs that work and are effective. This one has some serious questions about it. And that is the substance of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 496 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (other than for the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security) is hereby reduced by $600,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment addresses issues of nonessential travel by Federal employees that are not involved in the Department of Defense or Homeland Security.

Simply stated, the amendment says that appropriations made available by this act are hereby reduced by $600 million for all departments except for the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Defense.

I originally was going to do an amendment that specifically talked about reducing nonessential travel. I was concerned about a point of order. So this amendment does not specifically mention nonessential travel. However, based on advice of the fiscal commission, the travel cuts could be proposed. And both Democrats and Republicans on the fiscal commission thought that this was a productive area to look for savings.

I decided to structure this amendment in a way that would not be subject to a point of order. But its intent is to reduce nonessential travel by Federal employees in departments outside of the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security.

That is a description of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we in this bill made it a point of being very careful about the cuts to the DOD and Homeland Security. We think it's the reasonable approach that's in the base bill. We do not need this type of a heavy, deep cut in the defense of the country here and abroad.

So I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MATHESON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. My amendment affects departments other than Defense and Homeland Security. It's only for nonessential employees in other Federal departments outside of those two.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Is this an across-the-board cut of the other agencies?

Mr. MATHESON. It's a goal across all of the other departments, all of the other appropriations areas, except Defense and Homeland Security are excluded.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. But it's across the board?

Mr. MATHESON. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I'm in strong opposition to across-the-board cuts. We were elected to make choices. And on this bill we've made our choices, and we think we've done a fairly decent job of spreading the pain across the board.

But to have an across-the-board cut would mean putting our decision-making on automatic pilot, refusing to make decisions. And that's what we were elected to do.

So I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. I don't want to prolong this debate. I just want to point out, absent concerns of a point of order I would have prescriptively said this is specific to do with nonessential travel of Federal employees.

Due to concerns about a point of order, we structured this amendment where it says this is a cut of $600 million. However, the intent and hopefully the report language when folks in these agencies look at the debate that's taking place right here on the House floor is that it's addressing nonessential travel.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 274 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay any employee, contractor, or grantee of the Internal Revenue Service to implement or enforce the provisions of, or amendments made by, Public Laws 111–148 and 111–152.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

□ 1910

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and complements the amendments offered earlier by my friends, Congressman REHBERG and Congresswoman EMERSON. This amendment prevents the IRS from using any funds in fiscal year 2011 to pay any employee, contractor, or grantee to enforce the individual mandate, employer mandate, or any other part of the Health Care Reform Act, including tax increases.

It didn't take long for the IRS to move in after passage of the Health Care Reform Act to enforce all of these new tax provisions. Indoor tanning services saw taxes rise by 10 percent within 5 months of the bill's enactment. This year, brand name drug manufacturers will see their taxes go up. Next year, it's medical devices. And the list goes on. Yet, 2 weeks ago there was a glimmer of hope. Federal District Judge Roger Vinson became the second Federal judge to declare the health care law unconstitutional. But we know these rulings are not enough to keep the administration from moving forward with its takeover of our health care system. In fact, the headlines the day after Judge Vinson's decision read: ''White House: We won't compromise on the individual mandates.''

Just this week, the administration proposed to increase the IRS budget by 9 percent and expects to hire more than 5,100 employees to get the job done. In making its request, the IRS explained that the ''tax changes associated with the health care reform are huge. Implementation of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 presents a major challenge to the IRS. ACA (The Health Care Reform Act) represents the largest set of tax law changes in more than 20 years, with more than 40 provisions that amend the tax laws.''

Mr. Chairman, we've been forced to enter into a new era in our health care system, and it's one that is driven by the IRS. The Congressional Budget Office predicted last year that the IRS will need to hire 15,000 new employees and will need at least $10 billion in order to meet its responsibilities under the act. This is not what Americans expect or deserve. The only way to keep the IRS from intruding into our health care system is to take away its funding. This amendment is a step by prohibiting any funds from being used to hire anyone to enact this bill as we move forward.

I urge my colleagues to support individuals and families and our Nation's small businesses by supporting this amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in the budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5 of the 112th Congress which states, ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI. The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague alleges that my amendment would create a net increase in budget authority in the bill, thus giving rise to the point of order. I respectfully disagree for the following reasons:

Number one, the challenged provision in this point of order relates to the IRS's ability to ensure small business owners do not take advantage of the limited tax credit that currently exists. This tax credit is already in place. The IRS is already supposedly enforcing this provision. So I do not agree with the conclusion that this amendment, which simply limits the IRS from hiring more employees, would allow abuse of the tax credit.

Number two, I would remind my colleagues that last session, during our consideration of YouCut, CBO indicated that over the next 10 years the IRS will require between——

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I don't think the gentlelady is addressing the point of order. She is reiterating the argument.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would like to hear further remarks from the gentlewoman from Washington on this point of order.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Number two, CBO has indicated that over the next 10 years the IRS will require between $5 and $10 billion in funding to implement this law.

Number three, just last week the IRS said it will need at least 1,054 new employees and new facilities at a cost of

more than $359 million in fiscal year 2012. Eighty-one workers will be responsible for ensuring that tanning salons pay a new 10 percent excise tax that went into effect in 2010 and is enforceable in 2011; total cost, $11.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, with the points raised above and the established savings, it is clear that the offsets are not needed and my amendment is in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington violates section 3(j) (3) of House Resolution 5. Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the Chair of the Committee on Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 467 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, promulgate, evaluate, implement, provide oversight to, or backstop total maximum daily loads or watershed implementation plans for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

For the past 2 years, we've seen the administration and the Environmental Protection Agency take overzealous action in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, with the potential to dramatically affect jobs, the economy, and local government budgets throughout the six-State region.

The EPA has proposed arbitrary limits on the amounts of nutrients that can enter the Chesapeake Bay and how these nutrients enter the bay. At the same time, the EPA is seeking to expand their regulatory authority by seizing authority granted to the States and converting the bay's cleanup effort into a process that is a top-down approach with mandatory regulations.

These overzealous regulations will affect everyone who lives, works, and farms in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, and the cost of complying with these requirements will be devastating during our current economic downturn, resulting in many billions of dollars in economic losses to States, cities, towns, farms and other businesses, large and small.

The EPA's approach is far from the best approach to restore the Chesapeake Bay. I believe that each individual State and the localities in each State know better how to manage the State's water quality goals than the bureaucrats at the EPA.

I'm sure that there are some who wonder why what is happening in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed is important to their district. While EPA's unprecedented actions are starting in the Chesapeake Bay, they are coming to a watershed in your region of the country in your State. The EPA has stated in the document ''A Coming Together for Clean Water: EPA's Strategy for Achieving Clean Water'' that ''The EPA will use the Chesapeake Bay as a demonstration for strengthening total maximum daily load pollution-reduction plans. The Chesapeake Bay Watershed will be a model for watershed protection in other parts of the country.''

It is important that we in Congress tell the EPA to slow down. The EPA does not have the authority to micromanage States' water quality goals, and we must stop their power gap.

I want to be clear, we all agree more must be done to restore the bay, and this is not meant to cut off the good work that is happening in the bay watershed. We have made substantial investments to clean up the bay. This amendment will not stop work that is going on in the States or the voluntary programs managed by Federal agencies that work with those on the ground to restore water quality. What this amendment will do is stop the EPA's regulatory power grab. It will stop the EPA from taking over responsibilities that have traditionally been left to the States.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment forward. I think it's very worthwhile and I support him, and I appreciate him bringing the amendment forward.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, 6 weeks ago, the Environmental Protection Agency, six States, including Mr. GOODLATTE's own State of Virginia and the District of Columbia, ended years of stalling and released detailed plans to reduce Chesapeake Bay pollution to meet minimal water quality standards over the next 15 years. Meeting those science-based and legally required goals is going to require a significant and sometimes costly effort from all the citizens, towns, cities and States that are part of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

This year's Chesapeake Bay Foundation State of the Bay Report suggests that recent pollution-cutting measures are in fact beginning to show results.

□ 1920

We've seen increased crab and oyster populations and an increase in underwater grasses. The bay is coming back to life. The agreed-upon, negotiated, detailed, multistate plans have the potential to finally restore the Chesapeake Bay if everyone does his part.

The amendment, though, would block any Federal agency's ability to work with the States in meeting pollution reduction targets for the entire Chesapeake Bay watershed. If we don't meet this obligation, the farmers, municipalities, and businesses in all the States will be economically harmed.

If this amendment were to pass, it would not relieve the farms, businesses, and municipalities from their requirements in the court ordered settlement, but it would turn the pollution limits into an unfunded mandate since it would also block any Federal agency from providing technical and Federal assistance to bring farms, businesses, and municipalities into compliance with pollution reduction goals.

Clearly, this amendment is designed to and will unravel the current effort to finally put a limit on nutrient and sediment pollution in the Chesapeake Bay. Agriculture accounts for 42 percent of today's nitrogen, 46 percent of today's phosphorus, and 72 percent of the sediment entering the Chesapeake Bay.

This amendment would break up the existing Federal, State, local, and private partnership by prohibiting any Federal financial assistance to farmers, municipalities, and businesses that are working to improve the Chesapeake Bay watershed. It would set aside the tremendous progress this Congress has made in restoring the bay.

The pollution of the Chesapeake Bay is also a jobs killer for the citizens in its watershed. If this amendment passes, it will ultimately result in a loss of thousands of fishing, crabbing and tourism jobs.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, now is not the time to retreat on our commitment to restore this great estuary nor to kill the thousands of jobs that their survival depends upon. So I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Conservation Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Virginia's amendment.

The Total Maximum Daily Load is a mandatory diet to restrict nutrient and sediment runoff from point and nonpoint sources in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. EPA's proposed regulations will have a devastating economic impact on my constituents and throughout Pennsylvania. Unquestionably, the bay is in need and is truly worthy of our support, but this is just one more example of how EPA is trying to bypass congressional authority through backdoor regulations and unfunded mandates.

EPA has based the Chesapeake Bay TMDLs on its own model even though it is inconsistent with the models prepared by the Department of Agriculture. The head of USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service has recently gone so far as to say EPA's data on conservation practice is erroneous. Agriculture is not receiving the credit it deserves towards reducing nutrient and sediment runoff; yet EPA is forcing the bay States to move forward on unreasonable mandates, using the agency's flawed bay model. EPA will not even perform an economic analysis of the TMDL when the proposed unquestionability will have severe economic impacts on our Nation's farmers and rural communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to vote in its favor.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague that would prohibit the use of funds made available by this bill to "develop, promulgate, evaluate, implement, provide oversight to, or backstop total maximum daily loads or watershed implementation plans for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed." In essence, the amendment would prohibit the EPA from spending any funds on the Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load initiative in order to monitor and oversee pollution reduction into the Bay. It would result in rolling back the progress we have made on pollution reduction and restoring the Chesapeake over the decade. It would negatively impact not only the physical landscape of the Bay, but also the economic import and success of the Bay. And it would unfairly place the financial burden of reducing pollution squarely on the Chesapeake Bay states.

The Chesapeake Bay is North America's largest and most productive estuary, with thousands of tributaries and 64,000 square miles of watershed that includes six states and the District of Columbia. The Bay supports more than 3,600 species of plants, fish and animals, is home to 29 species of waterfowl, and is a major resting ground along the Atlantic Migratory Bird Flyway. In addition, the Chesapeake is a commercial and recreational resource for the more than 15 million people who live in its basin, as well as visitors and tourists. Taking care of the Chesapeake Bay is vital to the environment and the economy, for recreation and natural resources, and for wildlife and the way of life in the Bay area. We use the Bay for recreation, agriculture, industry and navigation.

Just to give you a sense of the economic importance of the Bay, the 2008 Fisheries Economics of the U.S. report by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration indicated that commercial seafood industry in Maryland and Virginia contributed $2 billion in sales, $1 billion in income, and more than 41,000 jobs to the local economy. The economic benefits of saltwater recreational fishing contributed $1.6 billion in sales which in turn contributed to more than $800 million of additional economic activity and roughly 13,000 jobs. The majority of this is from the Chesapeake Bay.

When we don't expend efforts to care for the Bay, that also has an economic impact. For example, in the area of commercial and recreational fisheries, the blue crab population continues to be threatened by poor water quality. When the broader impact on restaurants, crab processors, wholesalers, grocers, and watermen is added up, the decline of crabs in the Bay meant a cumulative loss to Maryland and Virginia of about $640 million between 1998 and 2006. Similarly, Oyster populations are threatened due to a combination of overharvesting, disease, and poor water quality. The decline of the Bay oyster over the last 30 years has meant a loss of more than $4 billion for Maryland and Virginia. In the area of public health, one study estimated the cost associated with exposure to polluted recreational marine waters to be $37 per gastrointestinal illness, $38 per ear ailment, and $27 per eye ailment due to lost wages and medical care. And with regard to clean water specifically, an EPA study indicated that clean water can increase the value of single family homes up to 4,000 feet from the water's edge by up to 25%. Perhaps most important, an EPA study of drinking water source protection efforts concluded that for every $1 spent on source water protection, an average of $27 is saved in water treatment costs.

Unfortunately, deterioration of the Bay and how to best address the problem has been a concern for more than two decades. When I served in the Virginia House of Delegates, I was part of a joint Virginia-Maryland legislative task force that first recommended the creation of a multi-state commission to address Bay issues. We filed a report in 1980 which recommended "the need for improved coordination of Bay-wide management to meet the long-term needs of the people of both Maryland and Virginia."

We have made great strides since then with the combined efforts of the federal government, state and local governments in the watershed, the Chesapeake Bay Commission, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, EPA, and all of their private partners over the last two decades. But we are far from done.

One of the most significant challenges facing the Bay today is pollution from wastewater treatment plants, development, transportation, stormwater runoff and runoff from agricultural lands. Prohibiting this funding would have a major impact on the water quality throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed states. It would significantly restrict efforts to reduce nutrient and sediment runoff as well as monitoring and oversight of these efforts, all necessary to help protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay.

The amendment is opposed by the Nature Conservancy, League of Conservation Voters, National Wildlife Federation, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Environmental Defense Fund, Greenpeace, National Audubon Society, National Marine Sanctuary Foundation, National Wildlife Refuge Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Ocean Conservancy, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Alaska Wilderness League, American Bird Conservancy, American Rivers, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Native Ecosystems, Center for Plant Conservation, Clean Water Action, Conservation Lands Foundation, Conservation Northwest, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environmental Working Group, Geos Institute, Marine Conservation Biology Institute, Marine Fish Conservation Network, Oceana, Oregon Wild, Population Action International, Southwest Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, The Wilderness Society, Trust for Public Land, Union of Concerned Scientists, World Wildlife Fund, and Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.

For the foregoing reasons, I oppose the amendment and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the Chesapeake Bay is a natural and national treasure. It is the largest estuary in the United States of America.

The health of the Chesapeake Bay is under constant assault from all sources of pollution: urban runoff, farm runoff, storm water runoff. We have been working for years and years, in fact decades, to try and clean up the bay, and it has been like running in place because, every time we take action, more pollution flows into the bay.

That's why, under the Obama administration, they've taken important action to try and finally get ahead of the curve and restore the health of the bay. Will Baker, who is the President of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, described the approach of the Obama administration as something that may well represent the bay's best and last chance for restoration. As Mr. MORAN pointed out, if we don't do that, the watermen, the sports fishermen, and the tourist industry will be badly hurt.

I'm not sure that the gentleman from Virginia, who introduced this amendment, recognizes the impact it might have on farmers, because none of the funds in this act, including from EPA and the Department of Agriculture, may be used for a number of purposes, including watershed implementation plans for the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Now, we spoke to USDA's general counsel. Their office told us that this could well deprive farmers of some of their valuable agricultural conservation funds. The last I checked, Maryland received in fiscal year 2009 $28 million. In the State of Virginia, the farmers received about $16 million to help them with their conservation efforts because, as good stewards of the land, they have been part of the team effort to protect the Chesapeake Bay.

As Mr. MORAN said, if you take these funds away, you are denying them some of the tools they have effectively used. So this won't only hurt the watermen and the sports fishermen; it is also going to hurt the farmers; and collectively it is going to hurt the largest estuary in the United States.

Let's work to save the bay, not undermine its health.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to make two points.

First of all, the gentleman from Virginia is quite correct. The Chesapeake Bay is getting healthier, and that's a very, very good thing, all of which is happening as a result of the voluntary, incentivized, State-controlled regulation of this process. None of it has occurred under this TMDL provision that the gentleman from Maryland referred to, because of the fact that it is only now being imposed on farmers. They are very concerned about it, as are small cities and towns, as are homebuilders and others. This will have a devastating economic impact on the entire bay region, small cities and large included.

The second point is that we checked with the Department of Agriculture, and we checked with counsel on the Agriculture Committee. They agree that this restricts only those purposes described in the legislation related to the implementation of this language related to what the EPA is trying to do with their TMDL.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This is very important. We talked to the general counsel at the Department of Agriculture. Mr. GOODLATTE is wrong on this.

He says—his amendment says none of the funds may be intended to fund EPA. But his amendment actually doesn't mention EPA. It says no Federal funds period. That means that the farmers, the agribusiness throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed, would lose about $100 million in conservation efforts if this amendment were to be approved.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that miles of the Chesapeake Bay have died, largely because of the fertilizer that washes into the bay. The vegetation at the bottom feeds on that nitrogen, and it grows like it's on steroids. When it decomposes, it sucks up all the oxygen in the water, and as a result, nothing can live in large areas of the Chesapeake Bay—no crabs, no oysters, no fish.

Nothing. It's dead, even the plant life can't survive when the oxygen has been so depleted in the process of decomposition.

This amendment needs to be defeated.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 497 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (other than for Department of Defense and the U.S. Postal Service) is hereby reduced by $280,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut funding in the CR, other than the Department of Defense and the U.S. Postal Service, other than those two, by $280 million. Now, $280 million is the amount of money that would be saved if Federal civilian agencies, except DOD and the Postal Service, were to reduce their vehicle fleet budgets by 20 percent.

If adopted, it is my intention that these Federal agencies determine where to cut their portion of the $280 million in cuts specifically towards finding savings in their vehicle fleet budgets.

This is a bipartisan idea supported by the chairs of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROYCE. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The bipartisan deficit reduction commission has looked at the work of the GAO on this issue. The GAO has tried to get Federal agencies to look at reducing their vehicle fleet. They have put out studies, and one of the interesting examples was where the GAO found automobiles in a parking lot that had not even been used for 3 years that had been purchased.

Their point is this: With 650,000 vehicles that the government uses now, there is a way to put in place, if you followed the recommendations of the GAO, a way to reduce that fleet and save money. And the Government Accountability Office has said that the government agencies are badly managing their vehicles.

Now, we know that with one government agency, the Department of Energy, that decided to put in place these recommendations, they reduced their fleet. In their budget going forward, they can reduce their fleet by 35 percent.

What we are saying with this amendment is we are following the recommendation of the GAO. The Heritage Foundation endorses this. It certainly was supported by the bipartisan deficit reduction commission.

We have got a deficit of $1.5 trillion and growing. This is a way to shut it down and a way that has been recommended to us by the GAO to move forward. We support this bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, here the gentleman goes again. He is attempting to cut without specifying where the cuts come from.

There's no tough choices identified in the amendment. All it says is just to reduce the appropriations by $280 million, exempting DOD and Postal Service. But across-the-board cuts is a way for us to escape responsibility for making choices that people elected us to do, and this amendment does not specify where the cuts come from or who is to make the cuts.

I guess he would leave it up to the bureaucrats to decide where to cut, but that's what we were elected to do, Mr. Chairman, and so I oppose the amendment. I sympathize with the desire to cut more spending, but I want it done in a judicious and specific way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Kentucky about the challenges of across-the-board cuts. I feel like I was elected to come up with suggestions. If I could draft an amendment that would be ruled in order, I would specifically say it should be about the spending cuts, but I can't legislate on an appropriations bill.

So I would hope that as we look at this amendment, we understand that people read the record of this conversation, it was the intent of Congress when I looked at this amendment that agencies are supposed to reduce their vehicle purchases by 20 percent as the best that Mr. ROYCE and I can do under the rules of the House. We are trying to offer a specific opportunity to cut spending. We think we have identified it well during this discussion. 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 gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services who develops or promulgates regulations or guidance with regard to Exchanges under subtitle D of title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18021 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply prevents the Department of Health and Human Services from implementing the exchange as created under ObamaCare.

The exchange does not allow the American people to choose the benefits in their health plans. Instead, it will force the American people into a one-size-fits-all program where government bureaucrats limit their health insurance options. The government will control which plans are allowed to be offered in each State. It will control which companies will be allowed to sell health insurance plans in each State and will control the benefits contained in those health insurance plans.

Exchanges, as they are being designed, will only serve to further strain cash-strapped States by forcing them to use their employees or hire new employees to create and run them.

Recently, several Republican Governors sent a letter to Secretary Sebelius criticizing the exchange and asking her to provide States with complete flexibility in operating the exchange—most importantly, the freedom to decide which licensed insurers are permitted to offer their products.

I urge adoption of amendment No. 79.

FEBRUARY 7, 2011.

Hon. KATHLEEN SEBELIUS,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SEBELIUS: Many of us believe the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) should be repealed by Congress if the courts do not strike it down first. But, with no assurance of either outcome, we face the decision of whether to participate in the bill by operating state exchanges, or to let the federal government take on that task, if the bill remains in effect in 2014.

In addition to its constitutional infringements, we believe the system proposed by the PPACA is seriously flawed, favors dependency over personal responsibility, and will ultimately destroy the private insurance market. Because of this, we do not wish to be the federal government's agents in this policy in its present form.

We wish states had been given more opportunity to provide input when the PPACA was being drafted. We believe in its current form the law will force our health care system down a path sure to lead to higher costs and the disruption or discontinuation of millions of Americans' insurance plans. Though we still have grave concerns with other provisions of the PPACA, we suggest the following improvements: provide states with complete flexibility on operating the exchange, most importantly the freedom to decide which licensed insurers are permitted to offer their products; waive the bill's costly mandates and grant states the authority to choose benefit rules that meet the specific needs of their citizens; waive the provisions that discriminate against consumer-driven health plans, such as health savings accounts (HSA's); provide blanket discretion to individual states if they chose to move non-disabled Medicaid beneficiaries into the exchanges for their insurance coverage without the need of further HHS approval; deliver a comprehensive plan for verifying incomes and subsidy amounts for exchange participants that is not an unfunded mandate but rather fully funded by the federal government and is certified as workable by an independent auditor; commission a new and objective assessment of how many people will end up in the exchanges and on Medicaid in every state as a result of the legislation (including those ''offloaded'' by employers), and at what potential cost to state governments. The study must be conducted by a neutral third-party research organization agreed to by the states represented in this letter.

We hope the Administration will accommodate our states' individual circumstances and needs, as we believe the PPACA in its current form threatens to destroy our budgets and perpetuate and magnify the most costly aspects of our health care system. While we hope for your endorsement, if you do not agree, we will move forward with our own efforts regardless and HHS should begin making plans to run exchanges under its own auspices.

Sincerely,

Governor Robert J. Bentley; Governor C.L. ''Butch'' Otter; Governor Nathan Deal; Governor Mitch Daniels; Governor Terry E. Branstad; Governor Bobby Jindal; Governor Haley Barbour; Governor Brian Sandoval; Governor John R. Kasich; Governor Tom Corbett; Governor Dennis Daugaard; Governor Sam Brownback; Governor Paul R. LePage; Governor David Heineman; Governor Susana Martinez; Governor Mary Fallin; Governor Nikki Haley; Governor Bill Haslam; Governor Rick Perry; Governor Scott Walker; Governor Gary R. Herbert.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Defunding the health insurance exchanges that we created in the Affordable Care Act will hurt small businesses, which are the driving force of our economy. It destroys jobs, takes away consumer choice and increases the deficit.

By gaining access to the exchanges, small businesses will prosper from what large employers have enjoyed for years: large group rates, lower administrative costs and greater transparency. The exchanges also give small businesses and their employees access to a fuller range of plans. They give families across America access to the information that they need in order to be able to buy the best plan at a competitive price that suits their needs.

The exchange has created a competitive marketplace for health insurance so that small businesses and middle class families across America can benefit from lower prices and more choices.

This is basic free market principles at work. One would think the majority would support any attempt to bring competition to health care but, instead, they are carrying the water for big insurance companies who do not want competition. They want to preserve their monopoly. They want a captive market, forced to pay whatever exorbitant rates they feel like charging. That will not bring down health care costs or cut the deficit. The health insurance exchanges help slow the surging cost of health care by introducing competition into the marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment which will threaten our economy, harm our small businesses and will destroy jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's leadership on this. If you notice the common theme, Mr. Chairman, it's that these folks want the government to be in charge of our health care, these folks over here want patients to be in charge of our health care, and it kind of runs throughout all of the issues as they relate to health care.

Now, the exchanges may seem like a great idea, but there's a big problem with the way that they are set up. They don't work. You don't have to believe us. Goodness gracious. Twenty-one Governors have sent a letter to Secretary Sebelius, and what did they say? They need complete flexibility on operating so that they have the freedom to decide which insurers offer the products in their State. If that weren't true, it would mean that the government, the Federal Government is offering it.

What they are asking for: waiving the costly mandates, which means, Mr. Chairman, that the mandates are crushing the States across this great land. They have asked for waiving the provisions that discriminate against all sorts of plans.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, that you won't be able to keep what you like. You won't be able to keep what you like.

So this is pretty simple. These folks want the government to be in charge of our health care. These folks want patients to be in charge of our health

care. We come down on the side of patients.

Support the amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, again, I would simply urge adoption of the amendment to defund the exchanges.

As a former State legislator, the legislators I have talked to in Colorado and around the country all urged the same thing that I have spoken to: Defund the exchanges; defund this bill.

Let's put real solutions in place that will actually decrease the cost of care, increase the quality of care, and we can begin that process tonight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1940

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, again, the question here is whose side are you on? The only people that I talk to who are against the exchanges are the big insurance companies and their representatives, because they are the only ones that stand to gain by keeping the status quo and not having the exchanges. The little guy, the consumer wants the exchange. Why? Because he can get affordable coverage, because he can get a good benefit package, because there is transparency, because he can find out what's being offered and how much it costs him. And the insurance companies don't want any of that because they want to continue with business as usual, keep raising rates.

Now, we all know how it works. The large employers, they can go out and get group coverage, but if you are an individual or you are a small business, it's very hard to do that. And that's why we set up the exchanges, because basically it's like a larger insurance pool. And now the small business, the individual can go on the exchange, they can find out what's going on, they can see what the rates are, and there's competition.

As the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, the Republicans always used to be for competition. This is the marketplace. This is capitalism. This is what we are providing here. It's a choice. More choices for the little guy. That's what this is all about. And I for the life of me do not understand again why the Republicans would not want to have the exchanges except for the same reason, they are siding with the big insurance companies. They are not worrying about the consumer and the average American.

It's also the fact that we're talking about portability. Right now, if you have a job and you're afraid to go to another job, and maybe a better job, or something that you'd like to do because you are afraid that you're going to lose your health insurance, well, now you don't do that. You can change your jobs. You can do something better. You can improve your life. You can live the American Dream because now you don't have to worry about not being able to find a good, affordable insurance policy. This is another aspect of the exchanges that are really so important.

Really, the exchanges are the heart of what we're trying to do, which is cover all Americans, provide access to good insurance coverage for all Americans, and make it at a reasonable cost. That is not the case now, and it will only be the case if these exchanges, as part of the larger health care reform, become law and continue to become law.

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

Ms. DELAURO. How much time is left on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

For 15 million Americans, this is another Friday night without a paycheck. And instead of working together to create jobs, here we are again relitigating the health care bill, the bill we talked about last year, last month, last week, yesterday, this morning. Here we are. We should be creating jobs, but here we are.

Now, the exchange does three things. It says that small businesses and families and individuals can get the same purchasing power that big corporations do when they buy their health insurance. It says you can choose among private competitors, insurance companies, and see who makes the best offer to you. And it says you make the choice that you want.

This should sound very familiar to the Members on the other side because it's exactly what they have as Members of Congress in the Federal health insurance program. So I would think that the Members on both sides would want their constituents to have the same health care opportunities that they do. If you believe that's the case, then the right vote on this amendment is ''no.''

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, do I have any time left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 13 seconds remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. In my 13 remaining seconds, to quote Mr. GARAMENDI here, What are the health insurance exchanges? It's called the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program. We in the Congress have the benefit of enjoying a health care exchange where we can have our choice, pick the plan that suits our needs, get it at competitive rates. Why do we not want to extend this for the rest of the country? It should not just be the purview of those who serve in the United States Congress.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleagues of testimony that was given before the House Budget Committee by Mr. Foster, the chief actuary of Medicare, who blew a hole in the two primary promises of ObamaCare. The first promise, that people get to keep the health care that they have if they liked it, he said that's not going to happen. The second promise, that it would lower the cost of health care, he said that's not going to happen. This is the chief actuary of Medicare.

I didn't have the opportunity to speak on this floor when this bill came through the House of Representatives, but I do now, because the people of Colorado spoke on November 2 when they said, enough is enough, let's get Congress doing the people's business, creating jobs, getting government out of the way.

Let's find real solutions for the health care bill, solutions that will actually bring commonsense reforms to lower the cost of health care, increase the quality of care, not result in 800,000 job losses, not result in promises made to the people that can't be kept. We have got to do something soon. And I hope it's voting. I urge the adoption 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 Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 329, 330 AND 331 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments 329, 330 and 331 be considered en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 329

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Department of Energy, Power Marketing Administrations, Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration'' is hereby reduced to $0.

AMENDMENT NO. 330

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Department of Energy, Power Marketing Administrations, Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration'' is hereby reduced to $0.

AMENDMENT NO. 331

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for ''Department of Energy, Power Marketing Administrations, Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration'' is hereby reduced to $0.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, these amendments eliminate as no longer necessary the Federal administrative subsidy for the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration and the Western Area Power Administration. These massive energy subsidies amount to what I call unauthorized megamarks. These energy subsidies, that began three decades ago to develop only the West and South, now cost the rest of America billions of dollars.

In fact, the Northeast, Florida, the Midwest, the Great Lakes States are heavily subsidizing the power systems of the West and South. I have a map here that kind of shows the parts of America that have a Federal power umbrella and those that don't. And it's really shocking to look at what the utility rates are. In Idaho, with federal energy subsidies, it costs residential consumers $7.98 per kilowatt hour. But guess what, in Ohio, that has no subsidy, it costs those residential consumers $11.34. In Wyoming, with power subsidies, it costs $8.39. But in Connecticut, with no subsidy, it costs those citizens $19.35 a kilowatt hour.

To achieve real budget savings, we must address megamark spending, not just district-targeted earmarks, but massive megamarks. These regional Federal power subsidies illustrate the problem. In fact, those subsidies, over only some regions, are privileges that the other regions of our country can't afford anymore. These regions have outlived their welcome in terms of subsidy. Those regions need to compete in the free market just like the rest of our regions do. No more free rides, because America can't afford it anymore.

My part of America can't afford the largesse given to the energy power marketing authorities in the other regions. The Southeastern Power Administration has never been operationally self-sufficient. It has cost the taxpayers $545 million, over half a billion dollars, since created in 1950.

Similarly, the Southwestern Power Administration has never been operationally self-sufficient, costing the taxpayers over $707 million since it was created in 1944. And WAPA, the Western Power Authority, has never been operationally self-sufficient. It has cost the taxpayers over $7 billion since being created in 1978.

Twenty-seven years of continued appropriations to only some regions seems like plenty of time for those agencies to have business plans in place to yield self-sufficiency and compete in the real marketplace like the rest of us are expected to do.

□ 1950

In my region of the Nation, we have no Federal power subsidy. Ohioans pay 11.3 cents per kilowatt hour, but Utah only pays 8.7 cents. Arkansas only pays 8.8 cents. But New York pays 18.6 cents. New York has no Federal power marketing subsidy. Citizens where I live tax themselves separately and locally through local tax levies for economic development. The Federal Government has never helped us on our power costs. Our energy is provided through investor-owned utilities, and we have no Federal cushion to depend on. That's the reason recession causes tremendous hardships in free market regions like our own. How are Federal power subsidies to just some regions fair to all our taxpayers? After three decades, it's time to let three unauthorized power marketing administrations stand on their own two feet and compete in the free market, just like our region does. Balance our budget, cut the subsidies, cut the Mega-marks, cut regional favoritism that benefits the few at the expense of the many.

I ask to include in the RECORD a full State-by-State power cost analysis so all Americans can know who is being subsidized and who is eking it out and trying to compete in the real marketplace, the free marketplace. I ask Members here to support the Kaptur amendment to eliminate the Federal administrative subsidies for power marketing authorities.

Now let me point out that some of our power marketing authorities are doing it right, paying their own way. Take Bonneville, they did it right. There's a way to do it right and a way to do it wrong, and we shouldn't reward inefficiency. We should allow these subsidized institutions to compete in the free market and not make the other parts of America that are burdened by high unemployment and high power costs, to be giving favored treatment to other parts of the country that are not carrying their own load forward. Again, take a look at the privileged parts of America and then ask yourself who's paying for it. It's pretty clear what's going on here.

The Southeastern Power Marketing Administration was budgeted to be zero funded in the President's FY11 budget. The amendment would allow this 2010 funding to go to zero. But under the continuing resolution, they will continue to be funded at their 2010 levels in spite of being eliminated in the budget. There is a lot of bookkeeping going on here that doesn't treat all parts of America fairly. I ask my colleagues to do what we've had to do in our region, compete in the real marketplace. Support the Kaptur amendments.

AVERAGE RETAIL PRICE OF ELECTRICITY

[Cents per kWh]

Rank (residential)	State	Residential	Commercial	Industrial
1	HI	28	25.86	21.87
2	CT	19.35	16.49	14.41
3	NY	18.66	16.05	9.73
4	NJ	16.61	13.98	11.68
5	AK	16.44	14.12	13.99
6	NH	16.31	14.22	12.77
7	VT	15.96	13.42	9.46
8	RI	15.94	12.88	12.89
9	ME	15.73	12.41	8.72
10	*CA*	15.23	14.21	11.05
11	MA	15.18	15.28	13.19
12	MA	14.54	11.64	9.45
13	DE	13.84	11.38	9.61
14	PA	12.84	10.24	7.61
15	WI	12.57	9.96	6.81
16	MI	12.51	10.12	7.19
17	*NV*	12.42	9.94	7.5
18	*TX*	11.61	9.19	6.31
19	IL	11.6	8.84	6.72
20	FL	11.5	9.77	8.84
21	OH	11.34	9.78	6.32
22	*CO*	11.12	9.13	6.96
23	*AZ*	11.05	9.52	6.75
24	*AL*	10.87	10.28	6.04
25	*NM*	10.63	8.72	6.07
26	*SC*	10.56	8.88	5.67
27	*VA*	10.55	7.68	6.74
28	IA	10.46	7.91	5.38
29	MN	10.46	8.37	6.31
30	*NC*	10.28	8.19	6.15
31	*GA*	10.26	9.06	6.18
32	*MS*	9.98	9.33	6.36
33	*TN*	9.98	9.66	6.63
34	*KS*	9.97	8.15	6.15
35	IN	9.61	8.4	5.96
36	*MO*	9.22	7.54	5.56
37	*MT*	9.18	8.5	5.58
38	*OK*	9.17	7.42	5.2
39	*NE*	9.02	7.66	5.96
40	*LA*	8.97	8.53	5.9
41	*SD*	8.94	7.58	5.89
42	*OR*	8.86	7.66	5.47
43	*AR*	8.82	7.25	5.42
44	*WY*	8.79	7.48	4.98
45	WV	8.78	7.66	5.86
46	*UT*	8.77	7.23	4.99
47	*KT*	8.59	7.86	5.06
48	*ND*	8.15	7.19	5.67
49	*ID*	7.98	6.69	5.18
50	*WA*	7.97	7.31	3.96

States in italic are located in Power Marketing Administrations (PMA) States.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the amendments propose a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendments are not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress which states, ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease of such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendments propose a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section. I ask for a ruling.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky makes a point of order that the amendments offered en bloc by the gentlewoman from Ohio violate section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, only in Washington would they say that if you ask organizations to compete in the free market, it costs more money to the Federal Government. Only in Washington would that kind of bookkeeping exist. So I am troubled by the

point of order, but I would just say that I thank the gentleman for expressing his point of view. This will not be the last time we hear about power marketing authorities and their inability to compete in the private marketplace this year.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendments propose a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendments are not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to Saudi Arabia.

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act for ''International Military Education and Training'' may be used for assistance to Saudi Arabia.

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act for ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'' may be used for assistance to Saudi Arabia.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, to the great relief, I'm sure, of all those assembled, I don't intend to take the full 5 minutes.

The amendment I propose is one that I think that both sides of the aisle will rally around. It's very simple. It limits any aid in this bill going to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Why we would be providing any aid to Saudi Arabia at all has been an eternal mystery to me, given their propensity to exporting terrorists, given that they had exported 15 of the 19 homicide bombers on September 11, given that just in December when the WikiLeaks came out, it was learned in a quote from the Secretary of State, ''It has been an ongoing challenge to persuade Saudi officials to treat terrorist funding as an important priority.'' Given that the Saudis have textbooks that say things like this in them. This is what they teach to their children:

''The Prophet said, The hour of judgment will not come until Muslims fight the Jews and kill them. O Muslim. O Servant of God. There is a Jew behind me. Come and kill him.'' They have textbooks that also lash out at Christians.

It is also important to note that in this House year after year, we've eliminated aid to the Saudis, only to have it come back. As you see on this chart, 2005—it was actually defeated that year—but every subsequent year, this House voted to ban aid to Saudi Arabia, and it comes rising back up like a Shakespearean specter. This language strikes the Presidential waiver, and says no more aid to Saudi Arabia.

I reserve the balance of my time

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. The underlying FY10 bill already prohibits assistance to Saudi Arabia, unless the Secretary of State determines that it is in our U.S. national interest. Maintaining a relationship with Saudi Arabia is critical to our national security, and I am concerned this amendment could jeopardize that relationship.

Our two countries enjoy robust counterterrorism intelligence sharing. Saudi-U.S. collaboration helped thwart the package bomb from Yemen. Saudi Arabia is a critical strategic ally with whom we share mutual enemies and mutual threats. I believe this amendment goes too far, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEINER. I simply say, with the greatest respect to Madam Chair, that we have spoken in this body repeatedly. The Saudis don't need our money. They've got plenty of their own money. It's the money that they use when they jack up gas prices and give us no help in trying to deal with them. It's the money that they use to export terrorism. They don't need any of our money.

I understand there is a Presidential waiver. This may come as a surprise that my friends now want to give the President that authority to override Congress. I think we should take it away and say no aid to Saudi Arabia.

I ask for a ''yes'' vote.

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. WEINER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2000

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The Acting CHAIR. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. WEINER. The gentleman from New York is on a roll, so he'll ask for Weiner amendment 101.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for mohair under section 1201 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8731).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you.

Once again, I have no intention of taking the full measure of my time. This is an amendment that has been discussed on this floor many times. Unfortunately, it keeps coming back. We provide subsidies believe it or not——

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

When the gentleman is ready to yield, I want to say we support the amendment.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you. I appreciate it. I'm going to be very brief. Just let me explain. This is an amendment that——

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield? What are the names?

Mr. WEINER. Now I would say to the ranking member, I'm from Queens. I'm from New York City. So I thought mohair was a guy named Moe who had long hair. But I now know that it is a subsidy that dates back to World War I when our uniforms were made with mohair and there was a strategic imperative to make sure we had enough. We provide a subsidy. This has not been used in military uniforms now for about 55 years.

Congressman CHAFFETZ and I have been agitating to try to eliminate this subsidy. There's still $1 million of funding going to about 12 farmers. No goats lost anything for the purpose of this picture. This is what a mohair looks like.

I would urge my colleagues to end this wasteful subsidy.

I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I have to ask my friend from New York if sheep are carnivorous. Do they bite human beings? That's my question. I understand that they can be carnivorous.

Mr. WEINER. Reclaiming my time, first of all, show some respect. They're goats. Second of all, and if you are referring to a press conference that went awry that I had where I perhaps might have been bitten by a goat, I will say this: I believe that there is nothing wrong with these animals. We want them to have as much hair as they need. And if you want to give them a haircut, you should do it with your own money. It shouldn't be on the taxpayers' dime.

So I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Wiener amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. So there's not a feed subsidy for them. I just want to make sure, Mr. Chairman, because I understand there was an incident. We do support the amendment.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you.

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. WEINER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for repair, alteration, or improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, this discussion we have been having for the last 3 or 4 days is really about what the American people said on November 2. They said that these huge deficits are unacceptable. The fact is that we're going to run a $1.6 trillion deficit this year and our debt is almost $14.1 trillion. Projections are that if we continue on this pace, that will double in the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, the American people said this is unacceptable. And so what are the American people doing in their own lives at home? Well, they're addressing needs versus wants. And what they're saying is there are some things that they need, and then there's some things that they want. But what they understand in these tough economic times, where we have a number of our American citizens unemployed, is that a lot of people are having to prioritize how they spend. And maybe there's a fence in the backyard that needs replacing, or maybe the deck in the backyard needs new boards, but they're postponing those.

And so basically this is a very simple amendment. Basically, the White House has two accounts: one for basically daily maintenance. That account has $13 million, and this amendment does not address that account. But as they do in Washington, do you know what happens if you want to get more money? You add more accounts, and you just rename them. And there is another account called renovations and upgrades. And so what we're saying is that there's $2 million worth of upgrades that the White House would like to do. It includes things like doing a plumbing survey and some things like computer system upgrades. We think that possibly those are items that can wait until our economy gets rolling again, until we quit having these record deficits.

And so it is a very simple amendment, Mr. Chairman. We just think that the White House can postpone those expenses, things that they would like but not necessarily need. This will still allow the White House to mow the yard, do the painting, do the maintenance at the White House; but it says these capital expenditures of over $2 million should be postponed for another year or two until we get our deficit spending down.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I would like to say that there is an account in our financial services bill for repair and restoration at the White House, and the funding for that is $495,000, or 20 percent less than the fiscal year 2010 levels. And these requested funds would provide for an alternate electric feed, which we understand is because the power there fails occasionally, computer system upgrades, a plumbing system survey to begin addressing their leaky plumbing.

However, the language of Mr. NEUGEBAUER's amendment doesn't just strike funding in this account. This amendment actually states that none of the funds made available by this act may be used for repair, alteration or improvement of the executive residence at the White House.

And this is really a sweeping prohibition because it prohibits all repairs at the White House. So what happens if a pipe bursts? What happens if there is a hole in the drywall or the plaster? What if there's an electrical fire or a broken window? What if a safety or security issue needs to be addressed? And I dare say that most people, most everybody, even if they were tightening their belts, they would still have to deal with those emergency issues.

And at the end of the day, the White House is the most visited residence in the country. It's an office, it's a museum, and it's a home. And regardless of who occupies the White House, the building needs to be maintained.

We have already reduced the account that pays for repairs and alterations by 20 percent. Do we really, really want to prohibit all repairs and all alterations at the White House, which is our house?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Well, I would say to the gentlewoman that there is ample money for maintenance involved in the White House. As I said, in section 1519, there is $13 million available for electrical issues, for painting issues, for maintenance issues.

I think what we are saying, and I would be glad to work with the gentlewoman in the conference report if she wants to be more specific, but the three projects that this administration requested actually totaled $2 million: $1.5 million for an electrical system, computer system upgrades of $255,000 and a plumbing system survey. This is a set of drawings for $250,000.

I would submit to you that the American people are making some pretty tough choices and that certainly the White House is a treasure of this country; but, Mr. Chairman, so are our children and our grandchildren a treasure. And if we don't start making some tough choices here, then we are not going to have a future for our children, which should be one of our more treasured assets.

I would be glad to work with the gentlewoman in a conference report. But this amendment has merits because basically it says to the President—and I think the President would agree—you know what, if other American families are not making improvements to their house right now that aren't necessarily necessary this year, I don't think the President would want his either.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2010

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas has no other speakers, let me say one thing—that this amendment doesn't specify the account being reduced. It cuts all repairs and alterations.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), my brother.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank you for the time. I recognize that you do not support the amendment, but some folks still cannot help themselves.

This is not about the White House; it's about who lives in the White House. First, there was an amendment to cut his staff. Then there was an amendment that was taken away about not allowing him a teleprompter, and now there's an amendment that says you can't fix the leaks in the White House. You know, we have a plumbing system at the White House that hasn't been repaired since Harry Truman. That's a long, long time.

So, yes, there are difficult times in this country, but when you have a house visited by many, many tourists throughout the year, you should be careful as to the wiring, about the kind of things that could happen with water, about the kind of things that could happen with safety. And after all, whether we like this President or not, this is the residential place and the office space for our President, for the next one, and the ones to follow.

I think this is a proper investment, and personally, I think it gets pretty petty when we don't even allow this President to have leaks fixed in the White House.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, do I have any time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Missouri has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentlelady. I won't take but 30 seconds. Just to mention the fact, I've been around long enough to recall when money was requested for the Vice President's mansion when Dick Cheney was living

there. That money was provided. This side didn't object when money was put into the White House when George Bush was the resident. This is kind of mean-spirited games. It's really beneath us. Let's not do this kind of stuff.

Mrs. EMERSON. I urge opposition to this amendment, as well-intentioned as it may be, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I kind of resent the insinuation that my amendment is addressed to this President. It's not addressed to this President. It's addressed to this country, and by the way, I was over at the White House during the White House Christmas party. The White House looked like it was in pretty good shape, and I can attest that the plumbing was actually working as well.

But what I would say, Mr. Chairman, is there's a lot of people that would want to come to this floor tonight and make excuses why we can't begin to cut spending in this country. You know what—the American people are tired of our excuses. This is a good amendment. There's been a lot of good amendments. Yes, these are difficult choices, but these are the kind of choices that we're going to have to make if we're going to ensure that our American families have a future, that we get this economy back going, that we create jobs, and we do not leave a legacy of debt for our children and our grandchildren

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled ''Water Quality Standards for the State of Florida's Lakes and Flowing Waters'' published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency on December 6, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 75762 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits any funding in this bill to be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled Water Quality Standards for the State of Florida's lakes and flowing waters. Like all Floridians, I want clean and safe water, but this debate is not over whether we want clean water for Florida; it is over how we reach that goal and at what cost.

This EPA mandate, which singles out Florida, will drive up the cost of doing business, double water bills for all Floridian families, and destroy jobs. By some estimates, this will cost our States an estimated approximately $2 billion. At a time when we should be attracting new companies in Florida, we cannot afford new regulations which will drive businesses out of our State and destroy jobs.

Our unemployment rate is over 12 percent and at 15 percent in some parts of my district. New, costly regulations are not going to improve those numbers. The EPA has repeatedly refused to allow third-party review of the science behind the proposed mandate, and they have failed to complete an economic analysis. This regulation is not grounded in science, and all Florida should not have to serve as the guinea pig in this radical experiment.

That's right, Mr. Chairman, Florida is the first State being required to comply with this Washington, D.C., mandate, and according to a recent New York Times article, an EPA official said they have no plans to implement the regulation in any other State. So I ask you, how is that fair?

But during the upcoming months I will be working with our agriculture commissioner, a former colleague here, Adam Putnam, who says that this will impact 14,000 jobs in Florida.

I'd also be willing to work with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and other concerned State and Federal agencies to develop a plan that can be agreed upon by all parties. We cannot allow an unaccountable EPA to act dictatorial in this issue that affects every Floridian.

Until the EPA is willing to consider Florida's unique needs and economy, this regulation must not go into effect. A recent poll shows that 68 percent of Floridians do not want this Washington, D.C., mandate. Dozens of Florida job creators and associations, as well as 60 national companies, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the American Farm Bureau, have sent letters to Congress to oppose this mandate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES,
Tallahassee, FL, February 17, 2011.

Hon. THOMAS J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives, Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY: I am writing in strong support of your amendment to H.R. 1, the 2011 Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act that will prevent the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from implementing, administering, or enforcing the proposed numeric nutrient criteria for Florida.

For several years now, Florida has been working to improve its water quality and, in many respects, our efforts have been a model for other states. Until 2009, Florida was working cooperatively with EPA to improve our water quality standards. In 2009, in an attempt to settle a lawsuit brought by environmental groups, EPA decided to abandon that cooperative approach, federally preempt our state water quality standards, and impose new criteria on the state. Many are concerned that these new criteria are not based on sound science, including EPA's own Science Advisory Board, which has expressed serious concerns about the science used by EPA to support the regulation.

This issue is particularly important given the economic impacts of the proposed regulation. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection estimates that this federal mandate may force municipal wastewater and stormwater utilities to spend as much as $26 billion in capital improvements to upgrade their facilities. The Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services has estimated that the regulation will impact over 14,000 jobs. Given the reality of Florida's economic situation, these estimates are of great concern.

Given all of this, I was proud to join Florida's Attorney General Pam Bondi in filing a lawsuit against EPA over these rules. EPA's flawed regulation must be set aside so that we can return to an effort to improve Florida's water quality that is cooperative, economically feasible, and based on sound science. I am deeply grateful for your leadership in offering this amendment and strongly encourage your colleagues to support it.

Sincerely,

ADAM H. PUTNAM,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the equivalent of sticking your head in the sand—I use that analogy because we're talking about Florida—hoping that a growing problem somehow will miraculously go away.

Back in 2009, a consent decree was reached in Federal court between EPA and numerous Florida environmental groups to set numeric limits for nutrients in the State's lakes, rivers, and streams. Such numeric standards are the only way to make progress correcting ecological problems. The need for the standards contained in this consent decree was demonstrated repeatedly by Florida's Department of Environmental Protection. They pointed out that 1,000 miles of the State's rivers and streams, 350,000 acres of Florida's lakes, and 900 square miles of its estuaries were contaminated by nutrient pollution from sewage discharges and fertilizer or manure runoff.

But this amendment would block these standards from being used. I fail to understand how the supporters of this amendment think that it's okay for folks to dump manure, fertilizer,

and sewage into lakes and rivers without regard to the health of these waters or to the health of the people who depend upon these waters.

This water quality rule was published last November, but the regulations don't go into effect until March of next year. The major activity by EPA that this amendment would prevent is an education effort to help the communities, businesses, and the public meet these new standards.

The amendment also would block EPA from improving the regulations to meet the legitimate concerns of the public. That's what EPA is trying to do, reach out, get their ideas. There's a good question as to how much longer tourists will keep flocking to Florida if its lakes, streams, and rivers are in a death spiral, flushed with the water quality of cesspools.

□ 2020

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. MORAN. May I inquire how much time we have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 3 minutes. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to finish on this amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has the right to close.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would yield the remaining 3 minutes to the very distinguished lady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to amendment 13, which would defund Florida's new clean water rules. This amendment will harm Florida's economy and threaten the natural ecosystems on which we rely.

This past November, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency approved a final regulation setting new water quality standards for Florida's lakes and streams. This clean water rule is desperately needed to address the nutrient pollution contaminating more than 1,000 miles of State rivers and streams, 350,000 acres of lakes, and 900 square miles of estuaries.

Potential tourists to Florida often envision images of pristine beaches, beautiful waterways, and vibrant coastal ecosystems with great fishing and recreational opportunities. That is why so many people flock to our State. Florida's waterways, beaches, and coastal ecosystems are critical parts of the economic engine that drive Florida's $65 billion a year tourism industry.

But without the new clean water standards, this could all evaporate. Already algae outbreaks plague many of our lakes and rivers, depleting oxygen levels and suffocating living organisms. Nutrient pollution results in massive fish kills, waterways clogged with toxic green slime, beach closures, and reduced waterfront property values.

We need these new clean water standards because the current standards for determining when someone is polluting is vague, and therefore unenforceable. Waiting until the waterway is choked with sewage, fertilizer, or manure is simply no way to manage our water.

For over 10 years the State of Florida labored to produce a clean water rule but never quite got there. In the absence of State action, EPA had to act to protect Florida's waters. EPA produced a rule built on years of data collected by the State and based on the best science available.

The clean water rule is also the product of tens of thousands of public comments, numerous public meetings and workshops, and years of consultations between the State of Florida's Department of Environmental Protection and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

While EPA took over finalizing new standards, they did not take a ''my way or highway'' approach. They listened to Florida's citizens and regulated entities, made many adjustments, and included plenty of flexibility.

To begin with, the final nutrient standards are comparable to the State's own draft standards. In some areas they are more stringent, but in other areas, they are less stringent. The major difference between the State and Federal rule is that the EPA actually finalized it rather than continuing the foot-dragging.

And as a practical matter, all this amendment will really do is hurt the very stakeholders its proponents say they want to help.

EPA built in a 15-month delayed implementation to allow it to provide technical assistance to stakeholders and ensure compliance is achieved in the most efficient, cost-effective way possible. EPA is using this time to hold workshops, seminars, and other meetings of regulated entities to achieve this end. But with this amendment, that all goes away. These regulated entities will still have to comply with the law, but now they'll be on their own.

Perhaps even worse for the regulated entities, this amendment will prevent State water managers from utilizing the flexibilities of the rule. It would prevent the EPA from working with the State to develop and implement a process to review and approve site-specific alternative criteria proposed by regulated entities. This makes no sense.

This rule provides flexibility to regulated entities and to the State. If the amendment passes, it would be devastating to Florida's economy.

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

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment, my colleagues, is simply to say that the United Nations is a very valuable building and the renovations that are occurring right now are necessary, but—

Now, the renovations that are occurring on the U.N. ultimately are necessary, but the cost that is occurring is not. There's a huge overrun.

I want to be clear that the opposition I have with this amendment is not to obstruct the U.N. from making a safe environment for the workers and the visitors that come there but to encourage reform and use best business practices considering that the taxpayers are funding about a quarter of the amount of money they're spending for renovations.

You know, we had a hearing here in Congress looking at what it would cost to build and renovate the United Nations. And they presented a figure. Well, Donald Trump, who's built a lot of hotels, a lot of apartment houses, came in and he said, ''I could do the same thing for half the money.'' That was half the money back when he offered that. So he said using better business practices, he could do it for a lot less money.

So I believe my colleagues that the U.N. has had a history of wasting money.

Let me give you one example.

In 2003, in the Secretary General's bulletin, he banned all smoking in the U.N. Well, the U.N. spent $130,000 on a ventilation system to accommodate smokers in the cafeteria. Well, I'm not clear why they did that.

The architect was starting to get into so many problems, they terminated him. By so doing, they paid him $44 million after the termination.

So these are the kinds of things that I am worrying about, and I think the

U.N. auditors have expressed the same concern that I have in the whole process of procurement and contract management on the U.N. renovations and building construction programs.

The GAO expressed their concern regarding the U.N.'s weakness in existing internal oversight and procurement.

So all I'm asking simply is in this time of a weak economy, we should hold off continuing to renovate the U.N. until we practice best business practices and we make sure that they're not continuing to have overruns.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Stearns amendment because it would exacerbate security vulnerabilities at the United Nations headquarters in New York City.

The United Nations Capital Master Plan addresses a number of serious life safety and security concerns to staff, diplomats, and visitors. The U.N. receives approximately 5,000 accredited delegates annually from around the world and 300,000 tourists, about 40 percent of whom are Americans. Almost 4,300 people work at the U.N. headquarters complex, including 1,280 Americans.

The U.N. headquarters complex, the majority of which is 55 years old, is not compliant with New York City building and life safety codes or modern security requirements.

□ 2030

The major building systems are inefficient, beyond their useful life, increasingly difficult to maintain and repair. For example, the life safety systems are a great concern, including inadequate sprinkler and alarm systems and the lack of an automatic shutdown of ventilation systems in the event of a fire. Hazardous materials, such as asbestos, are still present in the facilities.

Providing the U.N. with safe and functional headquarter facilities will enable the organization to operate more effectively is what we all want.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEARNS. Let me just mention a little thing more about my amendment.

Basically, as I've told my colleagues, this is a cost overrun on renovations in the U.N., and more importantly, with this huge economic downturn that we've had, I think we need to go back and look at the procurement process at the U.N.

I want to say something that's different from the U.N. amendment. I had an amendment, 429, dealing with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. This amendment was ruled out of order, and it was because the amendment basically did not specify the individuals whose defense by the United States taxpayers has been supported, would be stopped payment by my amendment 429.

To put it into perspective, the amendment I had was saying that people like Franklin Raines, who was the CEO of Fannie Mae, and these other executives, while they were hiding huge amounts of debt, were collecting huge bonuses, including the board of directors of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; and at the same time, the inspector general found that these people were hiding this debt, and now taxpayers have to pay for their defense and bail them out. But the ironic thing and the tragic thing is that taxpayers have to pay the lawyers to defend all these people that actually were hiding the debt and looting these companies.

So my amendment is basically saying that taxpayers should stop paying the legal fees for these executives that were hiding the debt and acted illegally. But understanding that this is out of order, I'm not going to offer this amendment. I will look for another opportunity to make my case.

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

My amendment would prohibit funds from the United States from being used for the design, renovation, or construction of any headquarters of the United Nations located in the United States.

The U.N. headquarters will undergo renovations, as planned, with an estimated cost of more than double the original amount expected. The renovations are necessary, but the cost to do so is not. I want to be clear that my opposition is not to obstruct the U.N. from making a safe environment for their workers and visitors, but to encourage reform through better business practices—considering taxpayers are responsible for 22% of the U.N.'s budget.

Time after time, we have asked American families to tighten their belts and exercise fiscal restraint. Why should they do with less and not the U.N.? It is time that this Congress lead by example. Our constituents deserve more than the perceived normal rhetoric of ''Do as we say, not as we do.''

Congress held a full-scale hearing to determine if the U.N. estimates in fact reflected the lowest cost option. According to Donald Trump's testimony at the U.S. Senate hearing, the costs associated with the renovations would be overwhelmingly more than the U.N.'s estimate. Trump who has experience in these matters, testified he could complete the project for $700 million. That's nearly half the amount than the U.N. projected they needed. The U.N. has a proven history of wasting hard-earned taxpayer's dollars and I am certainly not surprised to expect anything less from the U.N. when discussing the expenditures spent for their headquarters. The architect, that was later terminated, was given $44 million. To me, this does not reflect the lowest cost option. Furthermore, the U.N. spent $130,000 on a ventilation system to accommodate smokers in the cafeteria. Why would you spend so much to ventilate smoke in a cafeteria despite a 2003 Secretary General's Bulletin banning smoking in the U.N.? What's even more alarming is that even the U.N.'s own auditors had concerns regarding the possible inaccuracy of the project's estimated calculations and weaknesses in procurement and contract management. Moreover, in 2006 the GAO expressed their concerns regarding the U.N.'s weaknesses in existing internal oversight and procurement. It seems to me that this issue deserves more attention than the hearing conducted 5 years ago.

Without proper planning and oversight, I fear that these funds would just be wasted. More hearings and further investigations need to be conducted before irresponsibly spending funds from this bill. With my amendment, the U.N. will be prohibited from continuing this gross disregard of hard-earned taxpayer dollars. Due to these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

It is my understanding that the Appropriations Committee never intended for any of the funds included in the continuing resolution be used for legal expenses defending Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's former senior executives. My amendment is a certainty in an uncertain world. An assurance to our constituents that this gross abuse of taxpayer funds ends today.

The amendment I offer would prohibit funds made available by this act to be used for the payment of attorneys' fees or other legal expenses of any former senior executive officer of the Federal National Mortgage Corporation or Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation.

In response to the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression, America hastily engaged, with my strong opposition, in a strategy of multiple bailouts to avoid the complete collapse of our financial system. We now know, as I believed then, that this strategy was no cure to our financial crisis and would leave taxpayers exposed to vast financial risk.

When the Government took over Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae in September 2008, taxpayers unknowingly inherited $160 million in defending the failed firms. Of the $160 million in taxpayer dollars spent, $24.2 million was spent in defense of Fannie Mae's top senior executives. According to an in-depth report from the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, these Fannie Mae executives were accused of taking action to manipulate profits, generating $115 million in improper bonuses. Two years before this report was published, Fannie was found to have overstated its preceding six years of past earnings by $6.3 billion.

Currently, employment contracts protect executives when sued and the company pays for legal defense. Some believe there should be no government liability to these legal fees because of the executives' breach of responsibility to the company and its stockholders. I agree responsible Americans should not have to pay for the irresponsibility of others and that is why I offered this amendment.

As you may recall, the 1,900 page legislation placing these GSEs under conservatorship failed to address a resolution to these entities, allowing the Federal Housing and Finance Agency (FHFA) to continue paying the legal fees of their executives. Poor crafted legislation is the reason this injustice has been allowed to carry on. When asked why funding

of legal defense has not been cut off, the acting director of the FHFA, said: "I understand the frustration regarding the advancement of certain legal fees associated with ongoing litigation involving Fannie Mae and certain former employees. It is my responsibility to follow applicable Federal and State law."

I am outraged that billions of dollars have gone to benefit an indiscriminate number of private financial institutions that utilized reckless investment strategies. American's deserve more than for us to just "understand" their frustration; our responsibility to the taxpayers is much more than that. We must be diligent in ensuring the investigation of these issue's are a top priority for the 112th Congress. The time has come to make sure that we are doing everything we can to minimize any further taxpayer exposure to the irresponsible behavior of these companies.

The nationalization of private assets was clearly un-American and, as free-enterprising Americans, we needed to let our markets determine the winners and the losers. Unfortunately, the winners were not the American taxpayers of this country and, after billions spent and much debate, we are left with unanswered questions and unpaid legal fees showing no sign of ending.

This financial crisis affects every hardworking, taxpaying American. We should not be paying for the legal defense of the people whose reckless actions forced this economic crisis on us. I hope that members of this 112th Congress recognize the dire importance of this issue and vote in favor for the American taxpayer.

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

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

Mr. STEARNS. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 414 by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Amendment No. 519 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 246 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 263 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 526 by Mr. WU of Oregon.

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 409 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 296 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. MCDERMOTT of Washington.

Amendment No. 177 by Mr. HERGER of California.

Amendment No. 323 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 566 by Mr. BOREN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 146 by Mr. FORBES of Virginia.

Amendment No. 333 by Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 498 by Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 467 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 79 by Mr. GARDNER of Colorado.

Amendment No. 151 by Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 414 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 269, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

AYES—156

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Canseco
Capps
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wilson (FL)
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—269

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clarke (MI)
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton

Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Culberson
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

□ 2056

Messrs. ROYCE, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, ALTMIRE, CAMPBELL, McINTYRE, BECERRA and MACK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. WU, INSLEE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. SCHIFF, GUTIERREZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. WATT and COSTELLO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 519 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 68, noes 357, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

AYES—68

Amash
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Blumenauer
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
Chabot
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Duncan (TN)
Eshoo
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Graves (GA)
Gutierrez
Heller
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Kaptur
Kucinich
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lummis
Lynch
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Neal
Olver
Payne
Peterson
Petri
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Royce
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Stearns
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Welch
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—357

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Culberson
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2100

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 246 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 74, noes 348, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

AYES—74

Alexander
Amash
Berg
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Canseco
Carnahan
Cassidy
Chabot
Cohen
Cooper
DeFazio
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Fincher
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hall
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Inslee
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kind
King (IA)
Labrador
Lamborn
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
McClintock
McHenry
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Olver
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Rehberg
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Smith (NE)
Stutzman
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walsh (IL)
Woodall
Young (IN)

NOES—348

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Bonner
Boren
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor

Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Courtney
Ellmers
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Schock

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 2103

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 106, in the fury of 2-minute votes, I mistakenly missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 263 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

AYES—177

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berkley
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boren
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Critz
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rehberg
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—243

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko

Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Bilirakis
Dicks
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
Hirono
Lewis (CA)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Rogers (KY)
Schock

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2106

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, during the rollcall vote on the Broun Amendment No. 263 to H.R. 1, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted in favor of prohibiting funds in H.R. 1 from being used to pay dues to the United Nations.

AMENDMENT NO. 526 OFFERED BY MR. WU

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 338, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

AYES—87

Ackerman
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Cicilline
Clay
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Garrett
Gohmert
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Honda
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schrader
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—338

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Coble
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 2109

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 251, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

AYES—174

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud

Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—251

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stearns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 2113

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 109, I was unavoidably detained. I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 409 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 185, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—185

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 2116

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 296 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 210, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

AYES—215

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—210

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunnelee
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Olver
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 2119

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. MCDERMOTT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 91, noes 333, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

AYES—91

Adams
Bachus
Bass (CA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brady (PA)
Burgess
Butterfield
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Critz
Crowley
Davis (IL)
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Ellison
Ellmers
Filner
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Honda
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Stark
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Webster
Weiner
West
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—333

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek

Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Quayle
Richardson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains on this vote.

□ 2122

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. HERGER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 197, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

AYES—227

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—197

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Garrett
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Sánchez, Linda T.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains on this vote.

□ 2126

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 323 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 241, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

AYES—185

Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Campbell
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cravaack
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOES—241

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Hirono
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains on this vote.

□ 2129

Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. INSLEE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 566 OFFERED BY MR. BOREN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 277, noes 149, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

AYES—277

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline

Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—149

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2132

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 184, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

AYES—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cravaack
Critz
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Doggett
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kissell
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—184

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peterson
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining to vote.

□ 2135

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 116, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 333 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 32, noes 394, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

AYES—32

Brady (PA)
Clay
Cleaver
Cooper
Critz
Davis (IL)
Dingell
Fattah
Fudge
Gutierrez
Himes
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Kaptur
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Long
McDermott
Moran
Mulvaney
Petri
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sutton
Tonko
Upton
Velázquez

NOES—394

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2138

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 74, noes 351, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

AYES—74

Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Deutch
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Filner
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jones
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Maloney
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—351

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
Hanna
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 2141

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 118 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 498 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 186, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

AYES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—186

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
LaTourette
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2144

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 467 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 195, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

AYES—230

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—195

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Bachus
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2147

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 184, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

AYES—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan

Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—184

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Franks (AZ)
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

□ 2150

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 63, noes 362, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

AYES—63

Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Canseco
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Ellmers
Farenthold
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Granger
Hall
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Huelskamp
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kingston
Lamborn
Landry
Long
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McKinley
Mica
Miller (FL)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Olson
Pearce
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Renacci
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Thornberry
Walberg
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—362

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Camp
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2153

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) 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 237, noes 189, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

AYES—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 2156

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) 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 231, noes 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

AYES—231

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—191

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Castor (FL)
Cleaver
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
Landry
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Roby

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2159

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 124, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend, the majority leader, to inform us of the planned schedule for the evening.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland, as he and I have discussed throughout the day, we have asked Members to continue to be judicious in their remarks if we want to get out of here at a reasonable hour, that we have been at this for at least 90 hours, and we continue to debate these amendments. We will anticipate votes again within 2 hours, and we will continue the votes throughout the evening.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. As I understand what the gentleman just said, we will probably have the next series of votes at approximately midnight.

Would the gentleman have in mind when the next series of votes would be after that?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, again, it depends on how Members feel, on the other side of the aisle as well as ours, as to how expeditious they want their remarks to be. We've been at this, again, for 90 hours. We intend to have votes again probably within a couple of hours after midnight, and we will proceed along those lines.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information.

I will tell him that I believe, on my side, we have three, perhaps, four amendments—one we think is subject to a point of order. So we have three amendments left on this side. I'm not sure how many you will have on your side.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, the gentleman understands and knows that we have throughout the day offered to reduce debate time; and the gentleman also knows that the majority of the amendments on his side have been debated. If the gentleman is prepared at this point to accept our offer to reduce the amount of time from 10 minutes per amendment down to 6 or 5, I think we could get that done as well.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I gather unanimous consent may be propounded to reduce debate time. I just want to stress we were told yesterday we were debating the whole government. We were then going to debate important public policy questions for 10 minutes. We're now going to get the privilege of debating important public policy questions for 6 minutes.

If this is open government, I think I'm going to have to look for something else because, I think it is, as I said yesterday, a travesty. I do think we ought to make clear what we are talking about. Important public policy questions being debated for 3 minutes on each side. That, as I said, is a travesty.

Mr. CANTOR. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't hear objection on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CANTOR. Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts may have somewhat of a short memory given that, in December, we had a vote on a CR for 1 hour under a closed rule. So, with that, just a little reminder.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, I didn't know how long it was going to take my Republican friends to going from talking about their superior virtue to saying they were just like us. It took less time than I thought.

But I would also say that, in the bills that came out of the committee that I chaired, we always had debate, and we always had open rules. But if the gentleman is saying that he now understands why the people on our side did what we did—and I often disagreed, as I said—he got there more quickly than I thought he would, and that may be the only thing about the way they're running the House that has happened more quickly than we thought it would.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I will tell my friend, the majority leader, I still do not hear objection on our side.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. Let me ask: Do we know how many amendments are left on your side, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Less than 50, 18 of which, I think, are subject to a point of order.

Mr. DICKS. We understand that you have 50 amendments left, 18 of which are subject to a point of order. One of ours is. We have three and we have one colloquy. You asked us for a colloquy; we got you a colloquy, okay?

Now, just in the spirit of cooperation, I hope some of you might think about doing what a lot of our Members have done and decide not to offer your amendments so we can get the hell out of here.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Before the gentleman yields back, Mr. Chairman, I think all of us understands how important it is that we finish this bill tonight. Therefore, the shorter we can make our speeches, the better off we all are.

So we hope to ask each one of you, as you offer your amendments and the rebuttals, to be brief, understanding that the rest of us would like to leave here just as quickly as we can.

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

□ 2210

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PITTS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, 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. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MAKING IN ORDER FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to applicable previous orders of the House, each amendment otherwise debatable for 10 minutes instead be debatable for 6 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 92 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 2213

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 8, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 359, line 22.

AMENDMENT NO. 377 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the construction of an ethanol blender pump or an ethanol storage facility.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers have subsidized ethanol for far too long. This amendment will simply bring that slowly to a stop.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clearly limits consumer choice, and is yet another attack on our Nation's progress to try and achieve energy security. The technology that he is trying to prohibit basically would allow individuals to have a choice as to whether, what percentage plan they would want, whether E–10, E–30, E–50 or E–85, whatever suits their best needs, their affordability and their performance and gas mileage.

It would actually make us much more dependent long term on foreign oil because you are going to limit the choices that are there. And without the blender pumps that he wants to prohibit, most Americans are left with just one option, and that's the E–10.

If we continue to limit the amount of U.S.-produced ethanol we can use in our vehicles, we will be continuing to be beholden to foreign sources of energy, and we will be importing more oil every year.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this is not a choice at all. It's a mandate. That's why we've got to end it. It's been a boondoggle for 30 years. It remains so. Let's vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. This is limiting consumer choice; it's going to increase our dependence on foreign oil.

I would again ask my colleagues to vote against this ill-founded amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 367 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk, No. 367.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide any benefit described in section 1001D(b)(1)(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(b)(1)(C) to a person or legal entity if the average adjusted gross income of the person or legal entity exceeds $250,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment would be to save the taxpayers roughly $30.5 million by preventing the funding of Radio and TV Marti.

I have decided to withdraw this amendment in the interest of time and also to work on it in committee with the gentleman from Florida. So we will enter into a colloquy for just 1 minute and go from there.

I happen to feel that we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on Radio and TV Marti over the past 20, 25 years. TV Marti is seen by very few. The gentleman from Florida has a different view. We have agreed to scuttle the debate here and take it up in committee.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

We do have a disagreement here, as I think most of us know. I obviously will continue to work on this issue.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Did the gentleman from Arizona say he was going to withdraw his amendment on Marti?

Mr. FLAKE. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. I was just curious to hear that. Thank you.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Again I will continue to work on this issue. Obviously the issue of freedom is something that I think is cherished by this House. There is a history of supporting freedom, and I know we will continue to support freedom. But we will have ample opportunity to debate this and discuss this and other opportunities.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available for this Act may be used to enter into, after the date of the enactment of this Act, a Government contract that requires a project labor agreement.

□ 2220

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011,

the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, a proposed ban on Project Labor Agreements, also known as PLAs.

President Obama signed an Executive order nearly 2 years ago imposing PLAs on Federal construction projects. A PLA mandates that whenever the government pays for a project, union workers must be hired for the job. This stifles competition and inflates the project's cost by steering scarce tax dollars straight into directly union pockets. The previous administration banned PLAs. And according to a study cited by the Cato Institute, the ban saved taxpayers as much as $2.6 billion in 2008 alone.

Mr. Chairman, this is a spending reduction bill focused on saving taxpayer dollars to the tune of $2.6 billion annually. My amendment simply states no government money can be used to pay for any project that requires a PLA. This solves a significant problem. This is not against our unions. It is about providing equal footing between union and nonunion contractors.

Considering the massive debt and deficit we are now struggling under, I feel we can't afford at this point to waste more taxpayer dollars. My goal here is to get more effective and efficient government. This amendment creates a level playing field that encourages fair and open competition for Federal construction contracts funded by this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself 1 minute.

This amendment prohibits use of funds in this act for any government contract that includes a Project Labor Agreement. The amendment is nothing more than another example of a union-busting Republican agenda.

Project Labor Agreements contribute to the economy and efficiency of Federal construction projects, help keep them on time and on budget. They bring all the contractors and subcontractors to agree to a standard set of conditions from the beginning of the project. And despite all the rhetoric on the other side that PLAs increase the cost of construction projects, there is no evidence for that.

Two years ago, the Economic Policy Institute reviewed a series of studies for and against prevailing wage laws and concluded that there was no adverse impact on government contract costs.

Mr. Chairman, this is nothing else but a distraction. PLAs are nothing new. They have been used on some of the most famous consequential construction projects in our history: the Hoover dam bypass bridge and the projects under the Tennessee Valley Authority just to name a few.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chair, I would add that currently in New Hampshire, my home State, we have a Job Corps center that is slated to be built, $35 million project, which is going to help up to 500 youth annually in the State of New Hampshire. The PLA is exactly what is stopping this project from occurring. We would like to not only expand the opportunity here in New Hampshire but across the country to get these projects moved forward, do them in a fair and equitable way.

And I also note that our friends from the Associated Builders and Contractors support this amendment, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, as well as the National Black Chamber of Commerce.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Contrary to what the author of the amendment has said, there is no requirement in a PLA that you have only union contractors at that. This is a time when you come together pre-project to decide how this project shall be developed, whether there will be a training project involved in this, whether there will be local hires, whether there will be participation by minority and women subcontractors and others on this.

In my area, some of the largest energy projects in the Nation are being built by worldwide companies and being built with Project Labor Agreements. In our cities Project Labor Agreements are used, and the record continues over and over again, on time, done right the first time, and it's a mix of contractors that get accepted.

There is nothing in the Executive order that requires union contractors. There is nothing in the Executive order that requires a PLA. I know, because I tried to get a few, and the administration didn't go there.

So let's not overstate the case here. It encourages them. But the fact is PLAs have worked both on public projects and on private projects very, very well.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I would simply reiterate that the study pointing to 2008 shows the ban on PLAs saved taxpayers $2.6 billion. Let's allow all small business owners throughout our country to go after these types of projects. It's fair and it's equitable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because I believe it's based upon two false premises. The first is that evidence shows that contracts performed under PLAs are not as efficient. The data simply don't exist that show that. And second is the implication that this is somehow a politically connected decision by governments to reward building trades unions.

First of all, it doesn't have to be a union contractor. And second, and I think most importantly, all kinds of nongovernmental users use PLAs: the Disney Corporation, Inland Steel, ARCO, Boeing, Harvard University. These are all institutions and companies that use PLAs because they believe they are a good, sound business judgment.

Why should the Federal Government of the United States be precluded from exercising a similar sound business judgment? This is a poorly thought-out amendment, and the right vote is ''no.''

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I finally reiterate this proposal is a spending reduction bill to the tune of approximately $2.6 billion annually in savings. It allows our small business owners and subcontractors to bid on projects across our Nation, get them back to work. I would ask my colleagues to vote in favor of the Guinta amendment.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Guinta Amendment (#166), which prohibits the government from entering into any contract that requires a project labor agreement (PLA). I oppose the amendment because prohibiting the use of PLA's cannot assure savings to the taxpayers.

Project labor agreements, also known as Community Workforce Agreements are not new and contain several benefits: PLA's normally include a local hire component; PLA's establish and set a fair wage; PLA's avoid labor disputes and construction delays; under PLA's, workers are trained to perform required work safely and correctly.

Mister Chair, a project labor agreement establishes the terms, conditions, and safety standards for workers on construction projects. One of the major advantages of a PLA is that because it is an agreement negotiated prior to construction, there is minimal, if any, disruption in the construction schedule arising from contract disputes. This saves taxpayers money and at the same time providing jobs offering steady employment at livable wages to local communities where the need is greatest.

PLA's establish rigorous safety standards that save time and save lives. There is absolutely no evidence that PLA's increase the cost of construction projects; instead properly trained workers improve product quality which saves taxpayers money.

Finally, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Guinta amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

I stand here today to discuss the Yellow Ribbon Program, which is critical in my home State of Vermont, but it's critical in every State that has returning soldiers from Afghanistan and Iraq.

In Vermont, we have recently welcomed home 1,500 National Guard men and women from a year-long deployment in Afghanistan. The Yellow Ribbon Program, as you know, Mr. Ranking Member, helps deploying and redeploying National Guard and Reserve members and their families when they get home.

Prior to deployment, they educate members and their families in affected communities on what to expect while their loved ones are gone. After deployment, they focus on reconnecting members and their families with service providers such as TRICARE, the Department of Veterans Affairs and Judge Advocate Generals to ensure a clear understanding of the benefits they are entitled to and they need. In addition, combat stress and transition and how members and their families can address these issues are integral to the post-deployment phase.

In Vermont, we have the fourth highest per capita participation rate in the Nation in the National Guard. These are very valuable services that get to the heart of supporting our troops and their families. I hope to work with the subcommittee to ensure that any unmet needs of this program are addressed as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman from Vermont.

I yield to the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, our good friend, Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I will simply say we support this program. The former chairman, Mr. DICKS, supports it. The present chairman, Mr. YOUNG, supports it.

The committee added additional funding for the program. Florida National Guard had an extremely large return home from the 53rd Combat Brigade Team. We understand the importance of the program. We support what the gentleman is asking and will continue to work with the gentleman.

□ 2230

Mr. DICKS. I thank the chairman.

I agree that the Yellow Ribbon Program has been a top priority of the subcommittee. We have worked tirelessly to ensure our brave men and women and their families are taken care of when they are serving the Nation. I too will work with the gentleman from Vermont and the gentleman from Florida to ensure the needs of our troops and their families are met.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 495 OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. 4002. ''None of the funds made available by this act may be used to implement, establish, or create a NOAA Climate Service (NCS) as described in the 'Draft NOAA Climate Service Strategic Vision and Framework' published at 75 Fed. Reg. 57739 (September 22, 2010) and updated on 12/20/2010.''

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL. My amendment would prohibit the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, as we call them, from creating or implementing a National Climate Service. The release of the President's FY 2012 budget request this week included a significant reorganization of NOAA, the largest since it became an agency in 1970. This is an action that they took, ignoring congressional requests to cease and desist. The new line office will take vital resources from the Oceanic and Atmospheric Research Office, essentially gutting fundamental research at NOAA and shifting the main focus of the agency to climate. This shift threatens to harm important NOAA activities, such as helping with the restoration of the Gulf of Mexico to pre-spill conditions.

These present day concerns require attention and focus. As it is, this continuing resolution is going to force NOAA to make some official and very difficult decisions with respect to priorities. As a matter of policy, NOAA has not even requested funding for the Climate Service in FY 2011. However, we are aware that implementation of the Climate Service is already underway in the form of significant planning, transitioning, and reorganization of resources. My amendment would ensure that NOAA does not move forward with this reorganization without congressional consideration and approval, specifically from the authorizing as well as the appropriating committees.

My amendment does not cut NOAA's budget and is not an attempt to hinder the agency from providing useful and authoritative information but, rather, to communicate congressional priorities when it comes to public safety and economic prosperity. And they're not above complying with congressional requests. I urge Members to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. One, this is a budget-neutral reorganization of NOAA. Two, a third of our gross domestic product requires accurate information in terms of climate and weather conditions. And the third and most important point, this reorganization, this Climate Service would allow the private sector to get data that NOAA is already collecting and use it to better forecast for their activities.

I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of California, the ranking member on the Agriculture Subcommittee, Mr. FARR.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition.

If any of you live in coastal communities, you want to oppose this bill. Ocean acidification is a real threat to this Nation. Climate change is happening, and the ocean is where climate is born. The coast of California is seriously considering all of what the rising oceans will do to the economic value of the most valuable coastal property in the United States.

So you don't want to take out the partner in working with State and local governments on these issues. If tourism is in your community, if fishing is in your community and, in fact, educational institutions. Yesterday, hundreds of high school students from all over the United States were here working, showing their science projects on ocean acidification. They won awards from government entities and nonprofit entities. Their future is about studying these issues. This is the kind of program that we want to invest in. Smart technology, smart energy, that is the way we are going to handle this problem in the future. Those are jobs.

''No'' on this amendment.

Mr. HALL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the chairman.

This is a half-baked idea. The chairman and I have written NOAA over and over again trying to get information. It has not come before our Science Committee. It has not been vetted. It may be a good idea; it may not be.

I ask that Members of this body vote ''yes'' so that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee can look at this issue, can talk to NOAA, can find out all about it. It's not going to prevent people from getting climate information or weather information. We should not launch out into something when we don't know what the consequences, or even what may be bad consequences, of this might be.

So we need to support this amendment. Please vote ''yes'' so that the

Science Committee can come and totally vet it, find out what NOAA's doing, as we should. We have the jurisdiction in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, so it's absolutely important for us to do this without NOAA just launching off on its own.

Mr. FATTAH. How much time do I have left?

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

Mr. FATTAH. Thank you.

This is a budget-neutral reorganization that will allow private business to get data that NOAA has already collected. That's all it is. It's critically important information for those businesses. And a third of our gross domestic product is reliant on good information about climate so that they can have it. It's transparency, it makes sense, and it's budget neutral.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chair, I respect the gentleman's interest in the issues before NOAA.

But I will have to oppose this effort.

Representative HALL's amendment sends the wrong message about the need to meet the growing demands of our nation's businesses and communities for reliable and relevant climate information.

Some of us might disagree on the extent climate change is taking place.

But to discourage research is a big mistake.

Regardless of your opinion, timely and relevant climate information benefits communities, local governments, and businesses.

A significant portion of the success of the U.S. economy depends on accurate weather and climate information.

Local governments in my home region of San Diego are planning for future trends or changes to sea levels—and NOAA' s research is critical to their work.

This amendment also sets poor precedent and policy.

NOAA is implementing an internal, budget-neutral organizational structure with the Climate Service office.

Using a budget CR to restructure an agency without input or sufficient debate is questionable.

Major restructuring efforts should be well thought out and involve study.

Let the scientists and the researchers decide what's worthy of their attention.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 233 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by division A of this Act may be used for the missile defense program of the Department of Defense.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds authorized in H.R. 1 to be used for the missile defense program at the Department of Defense. The amendment does not cut overall defense spending but merely places a limitation on spending on the hapless and hopeless missile defense system.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the U.S. has spent over $150 billion on ballistic missile defense since 1985, and there is no working, reliable missile defense system to show for all that investment. H.R. 1 dedicates approximately $10 billion more for ballistic missile defense.

Some have argued that such systems are necessary for national security. In fact, no missile defense system under development has ever passed an unrigged test. According to experts at CRS, the performance in wartime for our newest capabilities is unknown. In December of last year, our ground-based interceptors known as GMDs failed the test again, a test that cost $100 million.

According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, the United States ''is no closer today to being able to effectively defend against long-range ballistic missiles than it was 25 years ago.'' Missile defense systems are unproven and unworkable. They are worthless as national security.

But even though we have never in 25 years created a missile defense system that worked, our misguided commitment to spending billions on this failed program is having a counterproductive effort with other countries. Both the Bush administration and the Obama administration have mistakenly argued and insisted that the ballistic missile defense system is solely for deterrence and protection against potential future threats. This argument contradicts logic. Missile defense concepts are perceived by both our foes and allies as defensive threats. If we increase our arsenal, we encourage other countries to increase theirs.

I want to conclude by saying that when will Congress act appropriately in response to the record of failure in missile defense? Shouldn't we apply the same standard to missile defense as we apply to our schools and No Child Left Behind? If you can't pass the test, then you lose your funding.

□ 2240

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Kucinich amendment totally ignores the reality of the real threat against our troops, our allies and our deployed forces. It basically destroys our missile system. And as we know, the enemies and the potential enemies have continued to develop their offensive missiles. We just cannot do this. This is one of those amendments you just can't do.

I would like to yield at this time 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. This amendment is so 1980s. It's when Ronald Reagan proposed STAR Wars and the Democrats were opposed, and we're well past that. Missile defense now has total bipartisan support. President Clinton pursued it, President Obama pursued it and both of the Presidents Bush pursued it. We know two things—the threat is real, and the system works. The gentleman from Ohio said this hasn't passed 100 tests. Well, we haven't funded 100 tests. It is absolutely a system that works and is needed.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Could I ask the Chair how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would just like to say in response to my friends that my amendment will correct a bipartisan error and, second, that you can't destroy a missile system that doesn't work.

I will just conclude by saying that Philip Coyle, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, has said the national missile defense system has become a theology in the United States, not a technology. We may have faith that it works, but we are taught that we have to justify our faith by good works. They don't have any good works connected to this.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we're talking about the Patriot missile system, we're talking about the Aegis missile system, and we're talking the Arrow system that we cooperate with Israel for their protection. We're talking about basic defense of our troops in the field who are in harm's way anyway. You just can't do this.

Mr. KUCINICH is my friend. He is not always right. He is not always wrong, but he is wrong tonight. And this is just not something that we can tolerate. Our military would never stand for this. We're not going to approve this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available by division A of this Act for any account of the Department of Defense (other than accounts listed in subsection (b)) may be used in excess of the amount made available for such account for fiscal year 2008.

(b) The accounts exempted pursuant to this subsection are the following accounts in division A:

(1) Military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Defense Health Program account.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today along with Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, Mr. NADLER and Mr. POLIS.

Our amendment would reduce appropriations for the Department of Defense in this bill to fiscal year 2008 levels. If you want to cut domestic spending to 2008 levels, you can't exempt defense.

I want to thank Representative STARK for this amendment and for his leadership in promoting an end to the era of unlimited spending and no accountability at the Pentagon. Unfortunately, this week my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are proposing an economic blueprint that would slash Federal investment in our Nation's infrastructure, education system, health care and programs to meet basic human needs and to create jobs. These cuts, trumpeted as a means of long-term deficit reduction, come at a time of severe economic distress for American families.

Earlier this year, the House passed a resolution to reduce non-security domestic spending to 2008 levels. This amendment gives us a chance to put our money where our mouths are. It simply says that defense spending should be reduced to 2008 levels. If we are serious about getting our fiscal house in order, then we need to apply the same rules, mind you, to defense as non-defense discretionary spending.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this year we have already done something unusual. We have reduced the defense budget by $14.8 billion already in this bill. To reduce the defense funding to 2008 levels would cut over $50 billion from the DOD—severely impacting both our troops on the ground and jeopardizing national security.

Now, if you want to reduce or cancel training for our troops that are coming home from the war, then you would vote for this amendment. If you want to cancel Navy training exercises, then you would vote for it. If you want to reduce Air Force flight training hours, you would vote for this. If you want to delay or cancel maintenance of aircraft, ships and vehicles, then you would vote for this. If you want to delay important safety and quality-of-life repairs to facilities and barracks, then you would vote for this.

But I don't support any of that. And I don't think most of our colleagues support any of that. And a time of war is not the time to be withdrawing from our national defense capability, the readiness and security of our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have to express my absolute bafflement at the debate we've been having all week in this Chamber.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle wax on and on about how we have to restore fiscal discipline and cut all kinds of very necessary programs to the bone. Yet they won't even bring to our debate one of the most costly expenses we have in this country, and that's Afghanistan. This war in Afghanistan has cost us nearly 1,500 American lives and the taxpayers a staggering $379 billion and counting.

Yet during this debate, the majority, which is enthusiastic in its support for more and more Afghanistan war spending, wants to eliminate a homeless veterans initiative. That's their approach. Send our brave men and women halfway around the world to be chewed up and traumatized, then pull the plug on the support they need when they get home. That's what they call supporting the troops.

We need to cut that expense.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1¾ minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the former chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to rise in strong opposition to this amendment. First of all, working together on a bipartisan basis for the first time, we cut nearly $15 billion from the Obama budget request in 2011 for defense, and we did it on a very careful basis.

This amendment would add another $56 billion to that cut. It would do damage to all of our acquisition programs. It would threaten the people in Iraq and Afghanistan and our efforts to conduct the global war on terrorism. So, again, I hope that on a very strong bipartisan basis we can reject this amendment.

□ 2250

Ms. LEE. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. LEE. Let me just say in closing that the bipartisan sustainable defense task force report released last year identified at least $1 trillion in cuts over the next 10 years without sacrificing our strategic capabilities.

According to the GAO, major weapons programs have suffered from $300 billion in cost overruns, and in fact, it's time to end this war in Afghanistan. These wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are costing the taxpayers $1 trillion. We know al Qaeda is not in Afghanistan, and we need to put our money where our mouth is. Cut the defense budget the same way we're talking about cutting non-discretionary.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act to the Environmental Protection Agency, the Corps of Engineers, or the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement may be used to carry out, implement, administer, or enforce any policy or procedure set forth in—

(1) the memorandum issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and Department of the Army entitled ''Enhanced Surface Coal Mining Pending Permit Coordination Procedures'', dated June 11, 2009; or

(2) the guidance (or any revised version thereof) issued by the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Improving EPA Review of Appalachian Surface Coal Mining Operations under the Clean Water Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and the Environmental Justice Executive Order'', dated April 1, 2010.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, amendment 109 is a timeout on the EPA. The EPA and its guidelines for the water quality coming out of mines issued on April 1, 2010, came up with a conductivity test, a test which did not go through the Administrative Procedures Act, a test which is relying on science which is not yet fully accounted for or reliable. In fact, in the document, in 31 pages, they use words like ''expect'' and ''anticipate'' what the science will be on 27 of those 31 pages.

Mr. Chairman, President Johnson had a war on poverty. There are some in my district and in Appalachia who believe that President Obama and his EPA have a war for poverty in the Appalachian region.

That conductivity test is so severe that the distilled water would pass, the Deer Park would pass, the Fiji is just barely going to make it outside of the zone of question, but Evian water that you purchase to drink would not pass. Perrier water that you purchase to drink would not pass. It's not good enough. And Pellegrino is not good enough either.

There is a bumper sticker that is very popular now in my district. It says if you think coal is ugly, wait until you see poverty. There are some who believe—and I think that there are some in Washington who think—that southwest Virginia and other parts of Appalachia should just be a giant park for rich folks to visit, and that those of us who live there, the folks in Washington think, ought to be happy to have the jobs changing the sheets for the rich folks.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is not good enough and this amendment should pass, and we should put a stop to this regulation.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I want to congratulate the gentleman. This amendment is well-deserved, and it's exactly the right thing to do. I appreciate the gentleman taking up the fight to save the jobs in Appalachia—in Virginia and Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio, and the other States where coal is mined. This administration declared war on coal when they took office and they're trying to carry it out. I appreciate the gentleman carrying the fight.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Thank you.

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the second of three amendments designed to kill regulation of mountaintop mining. The amendment would prevent EPA from working with other Federal agencies and mining companies to ensure that mountaintop mining is carried out in a manner that protects public health, the environment, and the economy using the best available science.

Mountaintop surface mining removes entire mountaintops to access the coal underneath but then deposits toxic mining waste in nearby streams. Practices not carried out carefully and responsibly can be devastating to the environment and to local economies.

There's been longtime uncertainty regarding what laws applied, uncertainty about which Federal agencies to work with, and uncertainty about potential liability. This uncertainty was eliminated when Interior, EPA, and the Corps of Engineers agreed to work with mining companies and implement a common procedure for reviewing permits. And it was with the goal of—and I quote—to strengthen the Appalachian regional economy and to lay out common procedures on mountaintop mining.

This memorandum of understanding brought clarity for all the parties—States, mining companies, environmentalists, and Federal agencies—so that mining could move forward. But what we have here is an effort at good government punished by legislators with an ax to grind. Agencies are punished for not working together. Then when they do, we punish them for working together.

Permit reviews will just take longer and the process will be more confusing to companies because this amendment won't change the law. This amendment could extend the mining company's permit process for years and cost them hundreds of thousands of dollars in delays. That's why this amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not bring jobs. It will take our $60,000-a-year-plus jobs and give us either unemployment or part-time jobs at minimum wage, and what's interesting is, the data that we do have shows that there's a greater biodiversity after mountaintop mining than there was before.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORAN. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. MORAN. Well, the point is we have three agencies responsible for this permitting function. They weren't necessarily working together. Now, they're working together. We have a memorandum of understanding. They know that their goal is to strengthen the Appalachian regional economy, and to work with all the parties to bring them together. That's what memorandum of understanding says.

This amendment eliminates all the progress that has been achieved. They were attempting to promote good government and a good relationship with the mining companies. It's not going to happen. If this amendment goes through, this amendment kills that memorandum of understanding. The law remains, but they can't cooperate now if this amendment was to pass.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, again, this, if not passed, will bring us unemployment, not a good economy. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 548 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop or approve a new limited access privilege program (as that term is used in section 303A the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a) for any fishery under the jurisdiction of the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, New England, or Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the Federal Government from spending millions of taxpayers dollars expanding job-destroying catch shares programs in fisheries along the Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I have two cosponsors of this legislation. I yield 1 minute to Mr. PALLONE from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the fishing industry is a crucial part of our Nation's economy, and catch shares pose a serious threat to the vitality of the fishing industry. Catch shares is a system where fishermen have to buy the right to fish, and only those who buy this right are given the opportunity to catch a portion of fish. I don't believe any fisherman should have to buy the right to go fishing.

□ 2300

What is perhaps most concerning is NOAA's use of important cooperative

research and monitoring funds in a carrot-and-stick operation that pressures regional fisheries management councils to adopt catch share programs.

Mr. JONES' amendment would simply prevent NOAA from spending funds to push another restrictive management system before they get the current system right. Despite our calls on NOAA to make programs that gather scientific data and keep fisheries open their priority, NOAA has failed to listen. And that is why I urge my colleagues to support this amendment by Mr. JONES.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), also a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in the Magnuson Act renewal of 2006, we set up a procedure whereby there can be a referendum in each fishery to do the equivalent of catch shares. NOAA's getting around that. There are some places I'm told where people like that.

The procedure under the Magnuson Act whereby they can, by referendum, impose that remains available but it would require the approval of the men and women in the fishery. In much of the east coast, people don't like that. And what NOAA is doing is going around that referendum requirement by a new thing which they call catch shares. They can do the equivalent in another way.

I am particularly puzzled to have in the Obama administration people tell us, Well, it's okay. What it does, of course, is to lead to consolidation. They say it's the same amount of income, but it goes to a small number of larger entities, and the smaller individuals are frozen out. And in the area that I represent, the fishing industry doesn't want it.

So what I hope we would do is—and the gentleman's amendment does not affect that part of the Magnuson Act that would allow referenda, so that when the fishery, where the fishermen like it, they can get a system of quotas, and they can get a system of the transferable quotas. And that's what's in the Magnuson Act, transferable quotas with a referendum because they couldn't—NOAA was insisting on imposing that over the objection of fishermen. They've come up with a new system called catch shares. That's what we're banning. We leave the referendum process in place.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, these programs put together by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are designed to replenish diminishing fish stocks. They assign shares to individuals, cooperatives, other fishing communities, because what we have seen that has resulted in depleted fish stocks and overfishing is a race to fish where the concern is that the stock is being depleted. And so they run out to get what's left.

NOAA is trying to intervene and equitably divide up what's left, what we scientifically understand is left, and try to cooperate.

Now, I can understand there are many fishing communities that don't want NOAA's intervention. But NOAA has been successful in ensuring sustainable fisheries and preventing overfishing and creating more stable and lucrative fishing jobs in communities from Alaska to Florida. And they bring a lot of economic and biological benefits. They eliminate what many think are dangerous races to fish, or what are called ''derby'' conditions, and they improve safety for fishermen.

NOAA seems to know what they're doing. Where they've done it, it's been successful. I think we should look to the experts and understand that we've got to have greater sustainability of our fishing stock.

How much time do I have at this point, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you for yielding.

I represent a lot of fishermen in the west coast in California and up the west coast all the way up to Alaska. The catch share program has worked very well.

The reason you have it is, one, you only have two systems in fishing—you have a season and you have a limit or quota. The pounding of all of the boats going at the same time regardless of weather is a very risky thing. Now we've given that up to share. We give shares to boats.

So what happens if you're a small fisherman in a small boat, you've got a share. You've got your right. You can go out when you want to. Not just when the weather is really foul and may be dangerous. People like this. It's sustainable. They can get loans on their boats. They know they've got all kinds of certainty that they've never had before.

To wipe this out, it may be uncomfortable in some other communities, but if you'd much rather direct it, if you want to get mad, do it to those communities because wiping it out this way, you're going to really hurt where it works. And where it works, it works really well. So please oppose this amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I must say this is an east coast issue. That's why you have Mr. PALLONE and Mr. FRANK and myself speaking.

And with that, the fishermen on the east coast need fairness from their government, and this amendment will help give fairness to the commercial and recreational fishermen on the east coast of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I can understand where my very good friends are coming from. They represent a lot of professional and very responsible fishermen. And I know they know what they're talking about. On the other hand, NOAA does, too.

And NOAA has been successful. They have been successful from Alaska to Florida in allocating assigned limits to various fishing entities that were at serious risk of losing their fishing stock.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. When you get from Alaska to Florida, don't you have to pass Massachusetts, New Jersey, and North Carolina? Because the three of us think it's a terrible idea.

Mr. MORAN. Reclaiming my time, the point is, NOAA's objective is to sustain the fish supply so that these fishermen will continue to have jobs—not just now but in the future and for their children and grandchildren. That's NOAA's objective. That's why I think we should reject the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

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

Mr. JONES. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the study of the Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 111–8).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment would eliminate funding for the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, also known as MRAPS.

This $25 million study was originally earmarked under the guise of a review of the 1944 Flood Control Act and relevant court rulings to determine if current authorized project purposes are contemporary.

MRAPS comes on the heels of another comprehensive $35 million, 17-year study completed in 2004 that showed that the current authorized purposes are appropriate and do not need to be altered.

For river communities, few issues are as important as water supply, power, and navigation. This study puts in jeopardy the flow of the lower Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, which would have devastating consequences for navigation and transportation along those rivers and result in barriers for agriculture, waterways operations, and every product that depends on the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers to get to market.

MRAPS is duplicative and wasteful of taxpayer dollars. We've already spent $35 million to examine the Missouri River Master Manual. After 17 years, hundreds of public meetings, and countless lawsuits, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concluded that the current uses of the river are appropriate.

It is careless and irresponsible to conduct another multiyear, multimillion dollar study at taxpayers' expense, particularly given the dire state of our Nation's economy.

□ 2310

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this amendment, which saves taxpayers from funding a duplicate study which is unnecessary, wasteful, and ill-advised.

The Corps of Engineers just completed a 15-year study at a cost of $35 million. The Missouri River Master Water Control Manual has been published, and businesses, municipalities and utilities have been planning accordingly. There is no need to restudy the issue of the Missouri River again at an additional cost of $25 million.

Farmers, businesses and cities in Missouri's Fourth Congressional District support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense proposal.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. To my colleague from Missouri, I would tell him that the objective of this amendment has pretty much been accomplished. The last funding that occurred for this study was in, I think, 2009, which was an earmark. So now that earmarks have been eliminated in the CR and eliminated for the future, you would not have that funding as a possibility for this study. Also, the administration has not put any money in its budget, so therefore there is no money in the budget. So for all practical purposes, the funding for the study is not going to continue. So therefore, it's very unlikely that the funding level provided in the bill will receive anything more than the amount to close the study.

And I would tell my friend that the reason I oppose it is that this language I think may be unnecessary because it may impact the orderly termination of the study. And that's why I rise in opposition, because I believe since this study, at least in my opinion, has been terminated, that we at least go through an orderly order with the funding that's available so we can have an orderly termination.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. With all due respect to the gentleman, I would appreciate some certainty, and I think that's what the purpose of this amendment is all about.

You indicate that it's still in existence; it's still being funded. We want it out. We don't want it funded any longer. The purpose of it is duplicative. The study has been done before. And I think it's time that we called a stop to it.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Well, I think I heard the gentleman tell me that the last time the study occurred was in 1944. And because earmarks are no longer the practice and the administration is not providing any funding, it's my belief and my opinion that this study will not go further, and the few dollars that may be left from the former earmark will be used to terminate the study in an orderly fashion.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, the last study was done, completed in 2004 at a cost of $35 million. It took 17 years, and now we want to do it again. I don't believe it's appropriate for our taxpayer dollars to be used in this manner.

And with that, I ask for the support of the body.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Again, I would ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment because the objective of the amendment has pretty much been met. There is no funding available to continue it. The few dollars that remain will only be used to terminate the study in an orderly manner. That's the proper way of doing it, and I would ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for contributions to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit U.S. contributions to the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, an entity that is fraught with waste and engaged in dubious science. The IPCC advises governments around the world on climate change, and supporters of cap-and-trade legislation have used the questionable science, the findings of the IPCC, as reasons to support onerous legislation.

Criticism of this science intensified over the last 2 years when emails publicly released from a university in England showed that leading global scientists intentionally manipulated climate data and suppressed legitimate arguments in peer-reviewed journals. Researchers were asked to delete and destroy emails so that a small number of climate alarmists could continue to advance their environmental agenda.

Since then, more than 700 acclaimed international scientists have challenged the claims made by the IPCC in this comprehensive, independent 740-page report. These 700 dissenting scientists represent some of the most respected scientific institutions at home and around the world, including U.S. Departments of Energy and Defense, U.S. Air Force and Navy, NASA, and even the Environmental Protection Agency.

Take, for example, famed Princeton University physicist Dr. Robert Austin, who has published 170 scientific papers and was elected a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. Dr. Austin told a Senate committee that ''unfortunately climate science has become political science. It is tragic that some perhaps well-meaning but politically motivated scientists who should know better have whipped up a global frenzy about a phenomena which is statistically questionable at best.''

Mr. Chairman, if the families in my district have been able to tighten their belts, then surely the Federal Government can do the same and stop funding an organization that is fraught with waste and abuse. My amendment simply says that no funds in this bill can

go toward the IPCC. This would save taxpayers millions of dollars this year and millions of dollars in years to come. In fact, the President has requested an additional $13 million for the IPCC in his fiscal year 2012 budget request. Our constituents should not have to continue to foot the bill for an organization to keep producing corrupt findings that were used as justification to impose a massive new tax on every American. They deserve better.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, this amendment would eliminate funding to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or the IPCC.

The U.S. contributes only $2.3 million to the IPCC, and our $2.3 million contribution leverages a global science assessment institution with global outreach and global technical input, a process we could not carry out alone and one that could come to a halt without U.S. support.

Their work on climate change is unparalleled. In its four assessment reports to date, they have brought together thousands of scientists around the world in disciplines ranging from atmospheric science, to forest ecology, to economics to provide objective and policy neutral information. The panel has attracted hundreds of the best U.S. scientists. In fact, a majority of the research that's reviewed is undertaken in U.S. institutions.

The IPCC's work has been lauded by the U.S. Academy of Sciences and by the InterAcademy Council, a body comprised of the national academies of the world. In fact, in 2007 that organization won the Nobel Prize for its assessment work. This institution is a nonpartisan and technically extraordinarily sound organization.

The Republican majority has already voted to prevent the EPA from using funds to regulate greenhouse gases. Now we're being asked to defund the work of international scientists to learn about the threat.

Now, the assumption, I assume, is that there is no threat and, therefore, let's not study it. I think that is not a wise assumption. This is a very shortsighted proposal to cut these funds. It's like putting our heads in the sand, denying the science, and then stopping the scientists from working because they might come to a different conclusion than the Republican majority's ideology in believing that there is no such problem and therefore we don't need to know about it or do anything about it. If we're not going to do anything here at home, let's at least work internationally to understand the threat and to deal with other countries to combat it.

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

□ 2320

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. For the last year or two, the International Panel has been funded at the rate of about $12.5 million per year. The President has it in his FY12 budget at $13 million. This group has been in the headlines for their activities with regard to how they are trying to tinker with the data that they put out.

Why would we want to fund a group of folks who is nefarious and gives us incorrect information? It's beyond me.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I don't understand how the gentleman from Missouri can say that this is a nefarious group of people. After all, these are people who are scientists, who've won the Nobel Prize for their scientific activities.

I used to think that people from Missouri were from the Show-Me State. Now I gather what this gentleman from Missouri is suggesting is ''I don't want to know about it.'' I don't think that is what the position ought to be of the United States Congress. Let's learn the facts and then decide what to do about it but not stop trying to know what the science is behind the global threats.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 569 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund periodic step increases described in Section 5335 of Title V of the United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, President Obama announced a pay freeze. Within his Executive order, he froze all pay he could freeze. The one he could not freeze was step increases. This simple amendment adds to President Obama's 2-year freeze a 7-month freeze for the period he was unable to cover of step increases. Step increases are simply pay increases because you're on the job, period.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. We all agree that we all need to be financially responsible with regard to the Federal budget, but this continuing resolution already substantially reduces funds for every single agency of the government. A freeze in civilian pay for Federal employees is already in effect for 2 years. It prevents cost of living and locality pay increases for the entire Federal workforce, including civilian employees of the Defense Department, although uniformed employees can get raises. If you're a political appointee you can get an increase but not if you're a civil service employee.

Mr. Chairman, a little over a majority of the Federal workforce is eligible for retirement over the next 5 years. We are going to make their lives far more difficult with the restraints on program funding we're putting in this bill, and then we're going to say they're not going to be able to get compensated when we tell them they have to do more with less funding for their agencies? We are going to lose our best and brightest people in the government, and as a result, the American people are going to lose the quality of service they've come to trust and expect.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. How much time is remaining, Mr. Chairman?

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

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Timothy McCarthy, who was the Secret Service agent who stopped the bullet that would have killed one of the greatest Presidents we've ever had, Ronald Reagan, would have deserved a step increase.

Dr. Collins, who has mapped the human genome system to be able to deal with pancreatic cancer and breast cancer and who could go outside and get a job anywhere, would deserve a step increase.

The FBI agent who is tracking down and working to find al Qaeda and terrorism and radicalization would deserve a step increase.

Lastly—lastly—some Members of this Congress have employees who have done such a good job—many of them are perhaps on the Appropriations Committee—they would deserve a step increase. If you vote for this, you can never give any of your employees a step increase for the rest of this year.

This is a bad amendment. I urge its defeat.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to clear up some facts because I believe, in the effort to try to make a point, people have failed to be quite as accurate as they should be. First of all, as for political appointees, the President has already frozen their pay. Second of all, awards, raises, and bonuses are not limited by this freeze. The fact is, if somebody is meritorious of a raise, award or bonus, he will still be able to get it.

When they say that budgets have been cut, if budgets have been cut, not having this $500 million in the first year and another $500 million in the second year will, in fact, allow those budgets to go further.

When they say that these are effectively meritorious, from the Office of Management and Budget of the Obama administration, we have received the figure. It is 99.94 percent of all eligible Federal employees, meaning only six out of every 10,000 employees, failed to get this automatic increase.

This saves over $500 million in 7 months and over $700 million the next year. It is consistent with President Obama's freeze, and the freeze is exactly what we're trying to do—give the President what he said in the spirit in which he said it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. With 30 seconds remaining, I think I should let the gentleman from California conclude his remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. I won't use it all.

It has been a long night, and the American people are hopefully still watching. As they watch what we are doing here and as they see people coming and crying for the Federal worker, I hope what they realize is that the Federal worker is not losing a day's pay. We are not eliminating Federal workers, and Federal workers will be able to get awards, bonuses, any meritorious increase or promotion. We are simply saying that, for 99.94 percent of all non-uniformed Federal workers, to simply get longevity increases after the President has ordered a pay freeze is disingenuous to the process. We want to be genuine to the President's Executive order and genuine to the process here. The House of Representatives rolled back our funding by 5 percent, and that was a good start; but if we don't do this, we're not even genuinely freezing the pay of our own Federal workforce.

I strongly urge support for this amendment in keeping the promise of the President and the promise to the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. I rise in strong support of the position of our committee in opposition to this amendment, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, we are the world's superpower, and much of the responsibility for maintaining the status of being that superpower falls on the shoulders of our Federal civil service.

Already, they get about a third less than what they would be getting in the private sector for the same responsibilities. We desperately need the best and the brightest, from all over this country, to serve the American people. If we punish them by limiting their salaries, by making them scapegoats, we are doing a disservice to the American people. Let's not do this. Defeat the amendment.

□ 2330

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

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

Mr. ISSA. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. SULLIVAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to implement—

(1) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Partial Grant and Partial Denial of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent'' published in the Federal Register on November 4, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 68093 et seq.); or

(2) the decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Partial Grant of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent'' published in the Federal Register on January 26, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 4662 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply delay the implementation of the EPA's E15 waivers for the remainder of the fiscal year, which would allow Congress time to address safety concerns related to the higher blend of ethanol gasoline before the EPA puts it in our general fuel supply.

Despite alarming consumer, environmental and economic concerns, the Environmental Protection Agency has approved a 50 percent increase in the amount of corn-based ethanol allowed in gasoline used by cars and light trucks manufactured in the 2001 model year and newer.

This is simply another attempt by the EPA to engineer ethanol mandates and drive ethanol subsidies forward. And, yes, this is a mandate.

The EPA has mandated that we use 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels, like ethanol, annually in our motor engines by 2022 and through incremental steps and backhanded attempts just like this, the EPA is mandating.

The EPA's move from E10 to E15 fuel over the next several months is in effect a backhanded 50 percent increase in the corn ethanol mandate putting consumers, engine makers and gasoline retailers at risk. Gasoline station owners are terrified of how they will comply with this E15 mandate because not all of the existing infrastructure is certified for the fuel. Under the EPA waiver, they will have no liability protections.

Quik Trip, a major gasoline retailer across the Midwest, which is headquartered in my hometown of Tulsa, Oklahoma, offers an unconditional guarantee on every drop of gasoline they sell. Because of the lack of liability protection, they will be left on the hook if someone puts the wrong blend of gas in the wrong kind of car. That will open up a litigation nightmare.

Why do we want to further mandate a fuel consumers don't want and retailers are afraid to sell? This is a major consumer safety issue that could adversely impact up to 60 percent of cars on the road today.

It is also important to point out the environmental impacts of this as well. The higher a fuel blend like E15, the higher the toxic air pollutant emissions. Since ethanol contains just 66 percent of the energy that gasoline does, E15 will lead to an actual drop in gasoline mileage. The EPA has even said you get 5 percent less fuel economy with E15 than clear gasoline.

The EPA has completely ignored calls from lawmakers, industry, environmental and consumer groups to address important safety issues raised by the 50 percent increase in the ethanol mandate waivers. Putting the brakes on E15 is the right thing to do for the people that we represent.

I ask my colleagues to join me in passing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to a very thoughtful and informed expert on this issue, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I understand the gentleman from Oklahoma represents oil and the reason that he is doing this, but current

government regulations restrict the ethanol blend to 10 percent by volume. Meanwhile, ethanol producers have hit the 10 percent cap and are producing more ethanol than can be used under current restrictions that are in place.

I have to correct the gentleman when he said EPA mandates this. It's Congress, us, that mandated the 36 billion gallons of renewable fuel by 2022. And it's essential, with that mandate from Congress, this is not EPA, that we increase E10 to E15 to continue our investment in renewable fuel for the economy.

Raising the limit will accelerate the use of renewable fuels made in the U.S. We are not importing this oil, Mr. Chairman. We are lessening our dependence on foreign sources of oil and encouraging continued investment and research for advanced biofuels like cellulosic ethanol.

As importantly, raising the limit will grow our economy here in the U.S., create about 136,000 jobs in the United States. This is oil that we are not importing from oversees and spending billions and billions of dollars with our military to defend the oil coming into this country.

These are good-paying jobs; they are very excellent as far as jobs in rural America. They cannot be outsourced overseas. Science supports E15. It's the most tested fuel in history, with the EPA and the Department of Energy stating that the higher ethanol blend does not harm engine durability nor emissions equipment for vehicles aged 2001 and newer, which represents more than 70 percent of the vehicles on the road today in the United States.

It's clear that science supports the decision. There's no doubt that the E15 blend limit is good for our economy, it's good for our energy independence and everybody talks about all of the above.

This is part of all of the above of energy independence for the United States. It's good for continuing investment in the renewable fuels, energy and for the rural parts of this country that need an awful lot of help these days.

I certainly oppose this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I want to thank my colleague from Virginia.

For 15 seconds, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague and member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. SULLIVAN. I think we need to think how we are doing this with ethanol. It costs more. I don't want to import oil either. That's why we need to produce it in our own country.

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

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 216 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(c)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, we all should be concerned about the recent actions by the EPA and how it continues to destroy jobs by exceeding its statutory authority as envisioned by Congress. In West Virginia, our State's economy is highly dependent upon the coal and natural gas industries.

On January 13, 2011, the EPA took an unprecedented action by retroactively revoking a lawfully issued 4-year-old permit for the Spruce No. 1 surface mine in Logan County, West Virginia. This permit had been issued by the Secretary of the Army under the Clean Water Act and was approved by the Corps of Engineers in January 2007.

For nearly a decade, the Corps of Engineers worked with the EPA to rigorously review this Spruce mine project before it was approved. The permit was issued after this extensive environmental review, which included a 1,600-page Environmental Impact Statement in which the EPA fully participated and agreed to all terms and conditions included in the authorized permit.

□ 2340

Just to be clear, the EPA had every opportunity to address any concerns and work together with the Corps of Engineers prior to the permit being issued. By giving the EPA the funds to retroactively veto this permit, a dangerous precedent is being set for future job-producing ventures by businesses and industries throughout this country.

These actions by the EPA continue to justify why so many Americans worry about the EPA's relentless war on coal. If the EPA can be allowed to retroactively revoke a permit in West Virginia, they can continue this onslaught wherever water permits exist throughout America. Any entity discharging water is vulnerable to having their permits pulled and will put at risk city sewage treatment plans, farms, mines, steel mills, and chemical plants.

EPA's veto at Spruce mine caused the loss of 253 mining jobs and 298 indirect jobs in West Virginia. In addition, it prevented the investment of nearly $250 million. The EPA's action has had a chilling effect on many types of companies, all of which rely on the certainty of the permitting process in order to make crucial business planning decisions. It's virtually impossible for companies to take the necessary steps to obtain financing and create jobs if they must endure the threat of retroactive revocation of the very permits that allow them to do business.

Today, this injustice happened at Spruce mine in West Virginia. Tomorrow, the EPA could very well pull an existing water permit at a steel mill in Indiana, a chemical plant in Texas, a sewage plant in Iowa.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia's amendment tries to prohibit EPA from carrying out section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act. It's one more effort to deregulate all aspects of mountaintop mining. Section 404(c) authorizes EPA under especially serious circumstances to pull back permits for dredging and filling with toxic material if they would have a substantially adverse effect upon the quality of water, wildlife, and fishery areas. EPA has only used this 404(c) authority 13 times in the 39 years of the Clean Water Act.

But this amendment and its backers don't want EPA using that authority to prevent the coal industry from polluting the contiguous waters to their mountaintop mining. We know that mountaintop surface mining removes entire mountaintops so that they can get to the coal underneath, but then in the process invariably deposits toxic mining waste in the nearby streams. And then that gets into the public's water supply. It costs substantial sums of money to subsequently clean it, and toxically polluted can be not only devastating to the environment, but devastating to local economies.

Only in the most egregious instances has EPA used this authority. They should have the right to pull permits when companies carelessly and seriously harm the environment. That's EPA's responsibility. It's understandable that mining companies don't want any restriction on their mining, but it's not excusable for this Congress to prevent the EPA from carrying out its lawful responsibilities and not to heed the long-term health impacts on the American people and of the quality of the water in these regions. So I urge

the defeat of this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the body knows where we stand, on the side of responsible environmental preservation and clean water for our children to drink.

At this point, in deference to the chairman of the full committee, I yield what time remains to the gentleman from Kentucky, because I see him standing, and I suspect he wants to be heard on this.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for offering this amendment. This retroactive veto of the Spruce mine is the poster child for EPA's regulatory overreach, but there are thousands more permits like this throughout Appalachia that the EPA could put on notice. But coal is not the only industry relying on these 404 permits.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The EPA's action at Spruce will have severe implications for the agriculture, construction, and transportation sectors because it sets a dangerous precedent that EPA can revoke any permit at any time for any reason, or for no reason.

Mr. Chairman, we need these jobs. And our job-creating industries need regulatory certainty, not more of the same regulatory roulette from the EPA. The gentleman from West Virginia's amendment would inject some certainty into the regulatory environment by stripping the EPA of its authority to retroactively veto existing permits at their whim, with no appeal.

We in Congress need to keep our hand on the reins of this EPA, which is running roughshod over small businesses, family farms, even the constitutional authority of this Congress. I want to thank again the gentleman from West Virginia for offering this amendment, and I hope that we can have the support of all Members of this body.

I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for yielding, and I rise in support of my colleague from West Virginia's amendment, Mr. MCKINLEY. This particular action in regard to the Spruce permit is an insult to the integrity of the mine-permitting process.

The particular mine in question is located in my congressional district. The permit was negotiated with the EPA in good faith by the coal company over a space of 10 years. The permit was then granted 3 years ago and just recently was revoked by the EPA. It goes against the grain of what I think should be good-faith efforts by coal companies to negotiate with the EPA, recognizing that they can't get all they want in a permit application and therefore some withdrawal, some compromise is necessary. That was done in this particular case in a painstaking process over 10 years, and the permit was granted. Now to have it revoked is indeed an insult to the integrity of the mine permitting process.

The EPA was given authority in the Clean Water Act to weigh in on permitting decisions of the Corps of Engineers to help ensure a balance between environmental protection and activities like energy development.

In that regard, the EPA could and should be a positive, constructive force. But its methods over the last two years have reformulated the permitting process in ways never envisioned under the law.

It has used its limited legal role to wrest control of the process from the Corps of Engineers where the chief responsibility for 404 permitting legally lies.

Nowhere is this more evident than in EPA's veto of the Mingo-Logan Coal Company's Section 404 permit for its Spruce Fork No. 1 mine.

In 1998, the operator of that mine applied for a permit to construct what was, at the time, the largest surface mine ever attempted. The mine was immediately the target of a lawsuit, of legislative debate, and federal regulatory action.

Over the course of the next several years, the company, the Corps, and the EPA engaged in intensive negotiations. The mine became the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement—the first ever written for a surface mine.

In the end, in January of 2007, as a result of much compromise and revision, an Individual 404 permit was awarded by the Army Corps. That was nearly ten years from the date the company first made application.

But on September 3, 2009, the EPA reneged. It sent a letter to the Corps of Engineers asking that the Corps suspend, revoke, or modify that 2-year-old permit—a request the Corps flatly refused. Then the EPA took the further, ground-breaking step of issuing its own veto.

So, under one EPA Administrator, the 404 permit for this mine was approved. Under another Administrator, it was vetoed.

If the EPA can veto this permit—a permit 10 years in the making—not a single, solitary thing stands in the way of this EPA, or some future EPA, should it decide—for whatever reason—to reach back and veto a previously granted permit for coal mining or any other activity. Without some degree of finality, permitting is worthless.

I still believe that achieving balance between energy development and environmental protection is a goal we can and must achieve.

But the EPA must not be allowed to dwell in the mindset that job losses are an inevitable result of protecting the environment. The coal miners of the Appalachian region deserve a fair, clear, and consistent regulatory process.

Toward that end, Mr. Chairman, I join in urging my colleagues to support this amendment to rein in an EPA gone too far.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. Chairman, let us work. Give us the jobs. Give us the jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. 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 West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 217 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to develop, propose, finalize, implement, administer, or enforce any regulation that identifies or lists fossil fuel combustion waste as hazardous waste subject to regulation under subtitle C of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq.) or otherwise makes fossil fuel combustion waste subject to regulation under such subtitle.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank my colleague and fellow committee member, CLIFF STEARNS from Florida, for offering a similar amendment. This amendment will specifically bar the use of funds to carry out the regulation of fossil fuel combustion wastes under subtitle C of the Solid Waste Disposal Act. In 2010, the EPA proposed this regulation, and here we are today standing against this emotional reaction triggered by a structurally unstable dam in Tennessee.

What happened there is tragic and should be dealt with by the proper agency regarding the dam's integrity. It should not be used to advance an ideologically motivated agenda regarding the environment.

Let me frame the issue. Fly ash is an unavoidable byproduct of electric power generation using coal. It is captured before being emitted into the atmosphere. The fine grain, dust-like particles are then recycled into concrete mixtures for our roads, our bridges, and buildings. It's an additive in masonry production of concrete blocks and bricks. It's been widely used in drywall panels used in houses, schools, and offices.

□ 2350

The fly ash is even used in agricultural fertilizers and soil amendments. If the EPA were allowed to continue

with their plan to designate fly ash as a hazardous material, all of these time-tested energy-saving uses would come to a halt.

The expense of handling the product would increase logarithmically, and so would our electric prices. By increasing the cost of power, it understandably causes the cost of producing American-made products to increase and put American businesses at another disadvantage against our foreign competition. This EPA rule will be an unmitigated job-killer.

Coal ash use and disposal has been studied by the EPA for over 20 years. The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act directed the EPA to study the ''adverse effects on human health and the environment, if any,'' of current practices for disposal and utilization of fossil fuel combustion wastes. The EPA's conclusion was that these wastes do not warrant regulation under subtitle C. How many more reports need to be conducted by the EPA to show that fly ash is nonhazardous? Enough is enough.

According to various environmental groups, for every ton of cement manufactured, about 6.5 million BTUs of energy are consumed and about 1 ton of carbon dioxide is replaced. If we can replace that 1 ton with fly ash, we could save enough electricity to power an average American home for 24 days and reduce carbon dioxide emissions equal to a 2-month use of an automobile.

What's ironic to me is that even the EPA's headquarters right down the street from us was built with a significant amount of fly ash mixed into the concrete matrix.

The use of fly ash in concrete creates a stronger, lasting product by using less water. In using less water, we further reduce our environmental footprint.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in supporting my amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would stop EPA from identifying coal ash as hazardous waste and, therefore, prevent any regulation of that waste. The fact is that coal ash contains dangerous contaminants, such as mercury, cadmium, and arsenic, and we know those can be dangerous to public health. Without further guidance by EPA, this ash will continue to be stored onsite at many large power plants, where it leaches into the groundwater and into nearby streams. EPA has found a number of communities across the country where coal ash has contaminated drinking water sources poisoning people and wildlife.

Through its public rulemaking process, it's been developing a rule. In fact, it has received more than 450,000 public comments. It's had Web-based seminars. It's done everything to get opinion on both sides of this issue. It's currently conducting risk and economic analyses of the options available.

Suspending work on a final regulation isn't going to satisfy anybody. But it will ensure that you're going to continue to have the coal ash at risk of contaminating drinking water, you are going to create uncertainty for power companies that burn coal, and you are going to eliminate potential markets for coal ash reuse. Potential users are not going to buy it if they think some day it might cause liability. The final EPA rule would eliminate that uncertainty, allow for coal ash to be properly stored and used, and eliminate the risk for health and the environment. That's why the amendment should be defeated.

At this point, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I want to tell you a story. On December 22, 2008, in Kingston, Tennessee, a coal ash impoundment structurally failed, and they released 5.4 million cubic yards of toxic sludge. This sludge blanketed the Emory River and 300 acres of surrounding land, creating a Superfund site that could cost up to $825 million to remediate. If this coal ash had been stored safely, this tragedy would never have happened. The wastes are dangerous. What EPA has tried to do is to make sure that the hazardous waste is disposed of safely to protect the health of communities.

And I find it somewhat amazing to hear the author of this amendment say that EPA is acting on an ideological agenda. How ideological do you have to be to act when you have an example of a terrible amount of coal ash poisoning areas and threatening drinking water? Is that ideological when they want to make sure that it's safeguarded and disposed of in a proper way? That's not ideological. That's the kind of thing we want EPA to do. So I would urge opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. 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 West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 545 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any of the activities described in section 6A of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2055a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment is actually pretty straightforward. It's pretty simple. The Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 called for the creation of a public consumer information database. And last year, the agency adopted a database rule that fails to uphold the statute. The statute required that the agency not allow materially inaccurate information to be on the publicly available database, and yet the rule, as promulgated, actually requires the agency to post materially inaccurate information. Indeed, it requires the agency to post that material and accurate information within 10 days. This will drive jobs overseas. It will increase the cost for manufacturers and consumers. The National Association of Manufacturers has announced its support for this amendment. The Home Appliance Manufacturers, the American Home Furnishings Alliance, the Consumer Specialty Products Associations all have recognized that this regulation is terribly onerous.

The request of this amendment is very modest. It does not ask that this go away. It just asks for a delay in implementation. It asks for some time for the committee to review this regulation and come up with a regulation that makes sense and is consistent with the statute. So I would urge the support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment would deny the Consumer Product Safety Commission the implementation of a searchable public consumer safety information database. Now this database was part of a bill that passed this House by 424–1. We required a database, and CPSC is ready to release this database. It's based on similar successful databases run at the present time by the Food and Drug Administration and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. It would allow consumers to report harms associated with consumer products and then to research risks associated with these particular products.

This is exactly what the American people want. They want information. They have a right to know. And, in fact, every opinion poll indicates this.

This amendment is a ''keep the consumers in the dark'' amendment. Parents want to know if a toy is dangerous. This amendment would take away their right to go to a database that would give them this information.

Now the claims against the database are pretty shocking. The manufacturers say, Well, this is going to be a problem because they're going to put things on the database that are trade secrets or inaccurate.

□ 0000

This is simply not the case. There is a safeguard. In fact, there are safeguards after safeguards to protect manufacturers.

The statute provides more procedural safeguards than any other public database at a Federal agency. Anonymous complaints are not allowed, only safety-related information will be included. Businesses get to see every report of harm before it is placed in the database. They have an opportunity to correct inaccurate information and to provide their own comments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Having voted for the NHTSA Act, I want to say that the intent of this database was to provide consumers with information on dangerous products. Some people have compared the database to the one operated by the National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration. However, the two are very different because NHTSA's database requires much more information about the actual product and is therefore much more reliable.

From a government perspective, we should be concerned that there will be inaccurate information on a ''.gov'' Web site. And at the end of the day, the most important factor is this: If the database isn't accurate or reliable, it is going to be totally useless for consumers looking to avoid unreliable or dangerous products. It has already cost $29 million. And I say, if you're going to set up a database, do it right.

We, as a Congress, have a duty to fund things that are in the best interests of the American people, and the CPSC database is not. It should not go live next month with inaccurate information.

I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over this issue, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As part of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, the Consumer Product Safety Commission was charged with creating a publicly available, searchable database for complaints regarding consumer products. The amendment offered by the gentleman aims to bar the Commission from moving forward with this database.

The Food and Drug Administration and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration both have publicly available databases for consumers to report harms or potential safety problems about cars and medical products. Those databases don't provide any due process to manufacturers to contest those claims. However, this database provides exhaustive due process, including allowing manufacturers to refute ''materially inaccurate'' claims and, if found to be inaccurate, have the complaint removed. The Commission database also allows manufacturers to issue a response and have those responses appear along with the consumer complaint.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to my colleague from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to put in the RECORD a letter dated November 23, 2010, on this issue that I sent to the chairman of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Honorable Inez Tenenbaum.

I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Kansas' amendment. He is exactly right on this, and we should support him.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, November 23, 2010.

Hon. INEZ TENENBAUM,
Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Bethesda, MD.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TENENBAUM: I am pleased the Commission delayed consideration of a proposed final rule on implementing the Publicly Available Consumer Product Safety Information Database. Implementing this database properly is very important and I write to clarify the intent of Congress when we passed the relevant provisions of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–314). Several provisions of the staff-proposed final rule run contrary to the intent of Congress and the clear and unambiguous language of the Act.

By way of background, the House-passed version (H.R. 4040) of the database provision reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee by a 51–0 vote did not authorize implementation of a database remotely similar to the one set forth in either the Public Law or the proposed final rule. We had bipartisan agreement to evaluate the efficacy of, and only then improve, the Commission's legacy Injury Information Clearinghouse database based on this evaluation. We provided first for an evaluation of the Commission's current injury databases. Following this evaluation, the bill directed the Commission to submit a plan to Congress on the best way to maintain the publicly available information in a searchable Internet database. The bill also directed the Commission to provide its views on whether the database should include additional information, such as consumer complaints. The bill thus provided for evaluation and another opportunity for Congress to consider the best way of addressing the database. We clearly could have gone further and drafted the bill to require that the database include such information, but we rejected that approach. In fact, the then Committee Chairman and I both opposed—and the Committee rejected—amendments during Committee consideration that would have mandated specific reporting requirements. We shared serious concerns that innocent companies should not suffer reputational harm from slanderous or inaccurate information in the publicly accessible database before the Commission verifies the accuracy of the information. Due process is important and we did not believe the amendment afforded adequate protection to those who could suffer harm from the disclosure of slanderous or inaccurate information.

Similarly, after the Senate passed its bill, the conferees reached a compromise between narrow House and the broader Senate database provisions to specifically balance the interests of consumers and companies. The approach we agreed upon carefully balanced the objectives of making reports of harm available to the public, ensuring the accuracy of the information, and preventing the disclosure of confidential information. The Commission staff proposal does not properly balance these interests and therefore does not comport with the intent of Congress. The proposal provides that the Commission would submit information where a specific product and manufacturer is identified to that manufacturer for review of potentially confidential information and to ascertain the material accuracy of the information. If a company provides evidence proving that either a breach of trade secrets would result from disclosure of the information or that the information is materially inaccurate, the Commission staff would review the evidence. According to the staff proposal, if the Commission cannot complete its review within 10 days, it would publish the information and remove it at a later date if warranted at the conclusion of its investigation. This process would provide little or no protection for confidential information and will encourage the publication of inaccurate and misleading information. Once the information is public, competitors can learn trade secrets and media can disseminate materially inaccurate information with little hope that the error could be rectified in the future. Congress did not intend such a result, and we went to great lengths to provide reasonable protection to manufacturers from the harm that such publication could entail. The Commission must follow the intent of Congress and allow such information to be withheld pending the completion of its investigation into confidentiality and accuracy.

I am also troubled by the proposed final rule's expansion of the list of entities that may submit reports of harm to the database beyond those specifically enumerated in the law. Congress included an exhaustive and exclusive list of those who may submit reports for the database in section 6A(b)(1)(A) of the Act. Specifically, that section provides that the database shall include ''Reports of harm relating to the use of consumer products, and other products or substances regulated by the Commission, that are received by the Commission from (i) consumers; (ii) local, State, or Federal government agencies; (iii) health care professionals; (iv) child service providers; and (v) public safety entities.''

In its first draft, the Commission staff sought to create a new category of ''others'' not contemplated by Congress, which included but was not limited to attorneys, professional engineers, investigators, non-government organizations (NGOs), consumer advocates, consumer advocacy organizations, and trade associations. In its most recent draft, the staff accepts that Congress enacted an exhaustive and exclusive list of reporters and removed the category of ''others.'' However, the proposal now simply redefines the term ''consumers'' to include attorneys, investigators, professional engineers,

agents of a user of a consumer product, and observers of the consumer products being used. Congress did not anticipate that the Commission would propose a definition of ''consumer'' that so radically departs from the common definition of consumer. If Congress had intended to expand the universe of reporters to include all of the entities identified in the most recent proposal, we would have made it explicit in the Act.

Finally, the proposal also expands the definition of ''public safety entity'' to extend beyond federal, state and local law enforcement entities, police, fire, ambulance, emergency medical services, and other public safety officials to now include consumer advocates, NGOs, consumer advocacy organizations and trade associations. Congress did not intend to include these additional entities as is clear by the plain meaning of the text. Accordingly, to comport with Congressional intent, the Commission must strike the expanded definitions of ''consumers'' and ''public safety entity'' before it finalizes the rule.

Thank you for the opportunity to clarify the intent of Congress in these matters. I look forward to working with you and the Commission on implementation of the CPSIA.

Sincerely,

JOE BARTON,
Ranking Member.

Mr. WAXMAN. May I inquire of the Chair how much time each side has left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kansas has 7¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) who authored this particular provision in the consumer product safety legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from California.

This language is going to destroy the early warning system that has been put in place in order to give parents the information they need in order to protect their children. If this amendment passes, it will grant industry's wish to once again make the government its secret partner in crime by keeping reports of serious injury or even death hidden from public view.

In 2000 and again in 2003, the Consumer Product Safety Commission documented cases of children suffering intestinal injuries after swallowing small but powerful magnets that had fallen out of toys. The public didn't know, and the CPSC did nothing. By mid-2005, after more reports of safety concerns associated with the magnets and two reports of serious, life-threatening injuries, the public still didn't know, and the CPSC still did nothing.

On Thanksgiving Day 2005, 22-month-old Kenny Sweet of Redmond, Washington, died after swallowing magnets that had fallen out of Magnetix toys. It was only after Kenny's death and an additional four hospitalizations that the CPSC finally gave the public an inkling of what was going on. But it actually took until April of 2007—after 7 years of reports of risks, numerous serious injuries and a death—before a full recall of all the products was undertaken. And that is not the only example of deaths and injuries that could have been avoided had parents known the risks to their children.

In all of these cases, we heard the same story. There simply aren't enough resources for the CPSC to quickly and fully investigate every complaint. In 2005, the CPSC investigated only 1 percent.

This is a ''no'' vote. Otherwise, we are going to see that choking hazards and cribs that kill are once again hidden from public view.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I urge regulatory sensibility in the support of this amendment, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, in my last 30 seconds, let me just say this is an issue of the public's right to know. Let this database be available to them so they don't go buy a toy that they could have checked out on a Web site and found out that it was poisonous.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. POMPEO. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 515 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Landscape Conservation System.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Utah and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the NLCS, which is a redundant administrative system, was codified by legislation. In the 110th session of Congress, the House passed an amended bill which went over to the Senate and died. In the 111th session, the Senate picked up that bill, stripped all the House amendments off and put it into the omnibus lands bill where, without any hearing or debate, it was hidden in the bowels and sent over to us where, once again, we had no hearings, limited debate, none of which was on this particular system.

This redundant system, since I have introduced a resolution to try and streamline the Department of the Interior by streamlining those functions, I have heard some of the most amazing accusations of what would happen if we were to indeed do that, everything from having the sun come up in the west to the immediate beginning of the Mayan calendar.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to the Bishop amendment. As is the case with many of the cuts in this bill, and with many of the amendments offered, the goal seems to be to cut just for the sake of cutting. COPS funding? Cut it. Title Ten services for low-income women? Cut it. Head Start? Cut it. The list goes on and on.

I support efforts to reduce the deficit, and in that effort I have voted for some of the amendments offered this week. But the Bishop amendment goes too far, and in fact will have a devastating impact on Southern Nevada and many other communities across the nation that will cost us far more in the long run.

As an example, defunding the entire National Landscape Conservation System will require shutting down the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area, the stunningly beautiful natural wonder just outside of Las Vegas. More than one million local families and tourists visit this unique national treasure each year, taking advantage of the 13-mile scenic drive, visitor center, hiking trails, rock climbing, horseback riding, mountain biking and other recreational activities, and bringing valuable tourist revenue to our community as we work to recover from the economic downturn. Funding from the National Landscape Conservation System allows BLM to maintain the roads, trails and visitor center that make Red Rock accessible and that enable people of all ages and abilities to enjoy its beauty year-round. Passage of this amendment would eliminate this essential funding and force the shutdown of this jewel in the Nevada desert.

I strongly encourage the defeat of this short-sighted amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With the time that we are at right now and with the further indication that during this session our committee will definitely review this particular administrative system for further investigation, I would ask, with permission of the Chair, to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 0010

AMENDMENT NO. 200 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight in the Department of Health and Human Services.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. This amendment would allow that no funding made available in this continuing resolution is to be used to pay for the salary of any officer or employee at the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight within the Department of Health and Human Services.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act never mentions, never authorizes, never appropriates money to the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, formerly known as the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight. So, without congressional authorization, OCIIO, or now CCIIO, proceeded to hire staff, estimated to be 200 people by the end of last year. They have rented office space in Bethesda.

Tasked with implementing some of the largest and most expensive sections of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, this agency began issuing regulations, including those related to State exchanges, medical loss ratio, grandfathered plans, and the granting of waivers to businesses on meeting the requirements of the Affordable Care Act.

Currently, this agency has granted 915 waivers accounting for 2.5 million Americans representing about 1 percent of Americans who have private health insurance.

This agency's operation is outside any definitive boundaries, and eventually drew some criticism, forcing them to be brought back under the jurisdiction of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, effectively making CMS the most powerful health care agency in the universe with jurisdiction over Medicare, Medicaid, the State children's health plan, and now private insurance. This center has been allowed, without congressional authorization, without congressional oversight, to make the decisions that will affect all sectors of the American population.

Without any due diligence or any congressional oversight, no agency or center should be able to obtain funding, carry out their own agenda, implement policy, write regulation, and remain largely unchecked. Before any further funding is allowed to be provided by this body, we need to know where the previous funds came from, how the money was spent and fully review their operations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Before we passed the Affordable Care Act, countless Americans would buy coverage they thought was comprehensive only to realize that it had huge gaps once they actually got sick. Even when the plans look similar from the outside, with comparable deductibles, copays, and so-called out-of-pocket limits, they can result in drastically different levels of out-of-pocket medical expenses, which is probably why more than 50 percent of bankruptcies in this country are because of medical debt.

The Affordable Care Act created the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight to provide better information to consumers, to hold insurers accountable at the Federal level, and help States with oversight responsibility. It requires insurance to provide clear information to consumers on what is really in their policy, such as standard definitions of medical and insurance terms, because hospitalization should mean hospitalization. It requires insurance to disclose data on claims payment policies and practices, claims denial rates, medical loss ratio, and other information so that consumers can make informed choices and so regulators can make sure the rules are followed.

It's also responsible for confirming that the insurance companies get approval to raise rates by more than medical inflation. In short, it dramatically increases transparency and accountability in the health insurance market.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Why wouldn't we want consumers to know what they are buying so that they don't go broke, that they get the health care that they need when they are sick?

Quite frankly, what this does is to help keep the big insurers honest, and that's probably why the majority has put the desires of the insurance companies and the interests of the insurance companies before the well-being of the American public.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, what the gentlelady asserts may or may not be true. The fact is we don't know. We never authorized this agency. In a 2,700 page bill, passed in the dead of night on March 23, no authorization for this agency existed, but curiously enough, the head of this agency was actually hired a year ago last Wednesday. The administration knew what they were doing, they bowled right ahead and did it, but they didn't want Congress to know. The authorization language was left out of the bill, and then we forward funded it with direct appropriation. That is why this amendment is necessary. Pull that funding out. Keep those foot soldiers under wraps because in CMS, they are under direct control of a man who has never been confirmed by the United States Senate.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the balance of my time to Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I respect Dr. BURGESS a great deal, but I have no idea why he would be opposed to having an agency that is essentially putting a check on the insurance companies. The problem is that the insurance companies keep raising rates, they don't show the consumer what the real benefits that they're receiving are, and what we need is more transparency and some way to review these insurance premium rates so that they don't get out of hand.

The fact of the matter is that this agency, working with States, has already had great success. In Connecticut, regulators recently rejected a proposed 20 percent rate increase by Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield. In Maine, the State superintendent rejected WellPoint's Empire Blue Cross request to raise rates by 23 percent. Colorado, also, and in California, the review prompted Anthem Blue Cross to withdraw its request for a 39 percent premium increase.

Why are you objecting to us trying to put a check on these insurance companies that keep raising their rates at outrageous levels? That's what this is all about. I oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 482 OFFERED BY MR. HELLER

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 482.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to designate monuments under the Act of June 8, 1906, (commonly known as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906''; 16 U.S.C. 431, et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment with my friend from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) to prohibit funds from being used to designate national monuments under the Antiquities Act. Roughly 85 percent of Nevada is federally controlled.

□ 0020

So I am sensitive to any actions that could close access to public lands. New

national monuments would limit access, threaten grazing rights, end mineral exploration of mining, and even impact private property. And this is the last thing we need in this dire economy.

A transparent public process that includes input from local officials, communities, and stakeholders for any new Federal land designation is in the best interest of the residents of our public lands communities. That is why I support efforts to require any Antiquities Act actions to have congressional approval. Government that works in the best interest of the people ensures that all stakeholders have a seat at the table.

Examples, such as the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument, which in the waning days of the Clinton administration literally obliterated massive economic development with a stroke of a pen, are why I am standing here today. I don't want this to happen in Nevada or anywhere else.

I urge my colleagues to join us to protect communities from the heavy hand of the Federal Government and support our amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment. Presidents of both parties have used this act to increase protection to lands and waters that are already U.S. Government controlled. The act has no impact on private lands. It's a law that was passed by a Republican-led Congress and signed by a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt.

Since then, 15 U.S. Presidents have declared 131 national monuments under the act—eight Republican Presidents, seven Democratic Presidents.

It must be remembered that the lands withdrawn are Federal lands owned by all Americans—not just the residents of certain States or localities in which they happen to be located. The Nation, not just a single State, has a vital interest in the future of these lands and their unique qualities.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you for yielding.

This is a bad amendment, and I urge all of my friends to carefully consider it.

Mr. HELLER may have an issue in Nevada, and he says he wants to have legislation to require Congress to make these designations, but that's not what's here today. He's wiping out the money to give the President the ability to make these monuments.

Look it. We just made one in California on the entire coast of California for all the rocks and islands and is probably the largest monument in the United States. It was overwhelmingly endorsed by all of the communities along the coast. Let local governments be involved in these things so they can petition the President.

More Republican Presidents have used this than Democratic Presidents. It affects all of your States. The Grand Canyon was originally a monument before Congress made it a national park.

Taking away this tool in the tool box would just leave these lands fallow. They're BLM lands. They're already owned by the Federal Government. They'd have no use. You can't get into the other activities that the others have.

This is a great tool. Don't throw it away.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I would yield the remaining 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Thank you.

Monument designations do not take non-Federal land. The Antiquities Act only allows monument designations on land the Federal Government already owns.

There is nothing improper about these designations. This authority has been upheld by every court which has reviewed it since 1906.

Monument designations do not lock up resources. Monument designations under the Antiquities Act grandfather valid, existing rights so any mining or other claim existing before the designation can still move forward.

If Members object to the Antiquities Act of 1906, they should file legislation amending the act and then come on over to the Natural Resources Committee. DOC HASTINGS and I will be sitting there waiting for you to testify to make your case to amend the Antiquities Act.

This amendment is based on an extreme ideology that the Federal Government should divest itself of the stunning national treasures managed by the Department of Interior and enjoyed by millions each year.

Vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with my friend, Mr. HELLER, to join in this great amendment.

Last year an internal document was leaked from the Department of Interior. This document described the administration plans to lock up more than 140 million acres of public lands and designate 14 new national monuments.

It also proposed using its land management authority to sidestep prohibitions on monument designations. When the secret plan was brought to light, the administration backtracked and quickly claimed it had no plans to lock up millions of acres of public lands.

The administration essentially wanted us to forget about how President Clinton used his authority in the dark of the night to lock up millions of acres of land. I can't say for sure that the administration will follow through with that commitment, but I already know that they have betrayed us, and they have betrayed our trust.

Once again, they acted to restrict public land use when Secretary Salazar rolled out a new plan, cooked up in secret, to create a new category of off-limit lands called ''Wild Lands.''

The actions of this administration have proven to me that it cannot be trusted to possess the authority to designate monuments without congressional oversight, which is why I have joined my friend, Congressman HELLER, in offering this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. 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 NO. 174 OFFERED BY MR. HELLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, after the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 4002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yucca Mountain as a storage location for the Nation's nuclear waste is dead. Even the administration understands that transporting the nuclear waste to a State with no nuclear activity jeopardizes the security of our Nation and is a bad investment of precious taxpayer dollars.

Unfortunately, this bill not only tries to keep the Yucca Mountain project in regulatory limbo, it seeks to block information regarding viable alternatives to Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste dump.

Yucca Mountain is in my district, and our State has been dealing with this boondoggle project for literally decades. According to the Government Accountability Office, over the past 20

years the proposed site has suffered from gross mismanagement, faulty science and research, contract mismanagement, and, most alarmingly, questions about safety and design of the site and its impacts on its surrounding environment and people.

I am a strong supporter of the need to responsibly develop all of our Nation's energy resources, including nuclear energy. However, the key to my position is the need to be responsible, and continued investment in the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain does not meet this litmus test.

I continue to be disappointed at the House's insistence of reviving the Yucca Mountain boondoggle. Most recent estimates place the cost of the Yucca Mountain facility at nearly $100 billion.

□ 0030

Not surprisingly, this estimate seems to increase with each passing year.

Given our current economic climate and our serious debt problems, our Nation cannot afford to continue with this poorly managed project. Congress needs to have a serious discussion about studying reasonable alternatives to Yucca Mountain. If you're concerned about the safety of American citizens and the wise stewardship of tax dollars, then join with me to keep this project out of limbo, acknowledge reality, and move forward on a responsible solution to our Nation's nuclear waste storage issue.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would forbid funds for Yucca Mountain, but its most damaging effect is to stop the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from moving ahead with the Yucca Mountain license, application and review process.

Mr. Chairman, the House has overwhelmingly voted multiple times over the last several years to reject the administration's closure of Yucca. The gentleman's amendment would do nothing but support the administration's political manipulations and it will waste over $12 billion of ratepayers' money.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 15 seconds to my ranking member, Mr. PASTOR.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to my good friend, Mr. HELLER's, amendment. U.S. taxpayers and electric ratepayers have spent billions of dollars on this project. It is my assumption and my opinion that the Obama administration has acted without authority to close it down. They've certainly acted outside the confines of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

I support the opposition of my good friend from New Jersey and would urge a strong ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I understand why my good friend from Nevada is offering this; he's representing what he thinks is right for his constituents, and I commend him for that. But the fact of the matter is this is the law of the country, this is the repository, period; yet the Department of Energy, in my view, has been operating outside the law for the last year.

Ratepayers have already spent $10 billion on this. If we terminate this site, we will have other liabilities—in fact, there are already contractual liabilities of $2 billion that have been let already—plus the expense, if we have to find another repository, will cost taxpayers further billions of dollars.

So I understand why the gentleman is doing this, I think he is incorrect, and I urge that Members vote against his amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman.

My good friend from Nevada does a wonderful job of representing his district and his State. I believe this, however, is a misguided amendment, respectfully.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALTMIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to this amendment. The fact is there is an appeal taking place before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. A number of States have filed suit, those suits are going to be in court this spring. This is not an issue we should be deciding tonight. I am strongly opposed to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote against Mr. HELLER's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I'm just going to take a minute here.

I want to say to my colleagues here, I completely agree with my friend from Washington State, Mr. HASTINGS, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, that this violates the law of the land. There is no scientific basis for what is happening here. We have submarines and nuclear power carriers that are offloading waste in Burlington, Washington that go to Idaho that are supposed to go to Yucca Mountain. We made a commitment to the people of Idaho that we would move that waste out of here in the 2025 time frame.

Now this project is being stopped without Congress—I was here when we passed the law, and this is being stopped without Congress changing the law. I think it's a travesty, and we're wasting billions of dollars. We should go ahead and finish this project.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to Mr. HELLER's amendment to divert federal funding from the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository.

Expanding America's nuclear energy industry is vital to strengthening our energy independence and meeting the growing demand of electricity across the country.

While I understand the intent behind the Congressman's amendment, and I respect Mr. HELLER's defense of his district's interests, I do think it is misguided.

Despite your views on the nuclear repository at Yucca Mountain, it is the law of the land and has been congressionally approved. It would be a mistake to zero out the funding that has been authorized and allocated by Congress for this project.

The Department of Energy is currently litigating Yucca Mountain's license application. The funding in this bill is reserved to answer questions about the merits of the project and will help both sides—those who support the repository as well as those who oppose—make their case.

I look forward to working with the gentleman to advance our mutual interest of advancing new and innovative domestic energy production and research and development on advanced energy technologies.

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

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

The agreement was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 563 OFFERED BY MRS. NOEM

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to modify the national primary ambient air quality standard or the national secondary ambient air quality standard applicable to coarse particulate matter under section 109 of the Clean Air Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I'm concerned about an EPA rule on the National Primary or Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards that would make the standard for the amount of coarse particulate matter in the air more stringent.

Last summer, the EPA laid the groundwork to regulate dust at an unprecedented level. We must stop the EPA from any regulation of farm dust.

Anyone who has driven a combine through a field or a pickup down a gravel road knows that dust is a part of rural living. Potentially fining farmers and livestock producers who practice good management with new dust regulations would be excessive and extremely detrimental to our Nation's vital agriculture industry.

Mr. Chairman, it's hard to think of something more emblematic of Washington's regulatory overreach than the potential punishment of farmers and livestock producers for kicking up a little dust. Expanding the coarse particulate matter standard on dust would be a burdensome regulation for farmers and ranchers. My amendment would prohibit the EPA from using any of the funds made available under this act to modify the standard for coarse particulate matter under the Clean Air Act. There is enough uncertainty in farming in rural America. We do not need to add to that uncertainty with the threat of more strict EPA regulations on farm dust.

Farmers are certainly looking for certainty about the future. Burdening them with greater regulations on dust is excessive and unreasonable. For this reason, my amendment is supported by the American Farm Bureau and the National Cattlemen's Beef Association. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the Noem amendment would prevent the EPA from updating air pollution standards for dangerous soot pollution. The Clean Air Act requires that EPA revise the limits on this type of harmful pollution when new science tells us it's necessary to protect human health. EPA hasn't changed this standard since 1987. The amendment would tell EPA though—it would require EPA—to ignore the science. If new science has emerged in the last 24 years that shows that soot pollution is more dangerous than we knew 24 years ago, EPA would have to ignore any new scientific findings.

This amendment applies to one dangerous pollutant, coarse materials. They're so small that they get past the respiratory system's natural defenses and they lodge in our lungs. Scientific studies have linked these particles to a variety of serious health problems, including increased respiratory symptoms in children and premature death in people with heart and lung disease.

Why is the majority party so afraid of science? I don't know as much about particulate matter as the scientists at EPA, but I don't really think you do either. It seems to me we ought to defer to the scientists and respect the public's health.

EPA is charged with protecting the public health. They're doing a pretty good job and we ought to let them do it.

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

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

□ 0040

Mr. CRAWFORD. Like many of my colleagues, I represent a largely rural district. Agriculture is the number one industry in the First District of Arkansas. Farmers there—and across the country, I might add—are facing tough economic challenges like many other businesses today.

Regardless of the production they are engaged in—poultry, cattle, cotton, rice, soybeans, whatever—the chief complaint of farmers in my district is the continued pressure placed on them by the onerous regulatory burdens of the Environmental Protection Agency. Now under the auspices of ''clean air,'' the EPA wants to regulate dust.

American farmers produce the safest, cheapest, and most abundant food supply on the planet. There are over 300 million mouths to feed in our country, and less than a million farmers engaged in the process of meeting that demand. Not to mention, global demand is growing exponentially where by the year 2050 there will be a total population of over 9 billion people.

Folks, for centuries, America has led the way in agricultural production, and we will continue to be the leading producers of commodities so long as farmers aren't being stifled by crippling regulations and EPA overreach. Government should be aiding our efforts to lead the way in agricultural production, not hindering them. The regulatory regime must come to realize that our food is grown in the dirt and that, in the process of the production of that food, farmers are going to stir up a little dust.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. SIMPSON. How much?

The Acting CHAIR. Thirteen seconds.

Mr. SIMPSON. This is a dang good amendment, and it should pass.

The EPA continually claims that they want certainty, but what they are creating is uncertainty. I can tell you that every rancher and every farmer in Idaho and across this Nation is concerned about what the EPA is trying to do with dust regulations and the impact it is going to have on food production.

Pass this amendment regardless of what they say.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 1½ minutes to the very distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, you would think that EPA is about to regulate these fine particulate matter for the very first time, but that's not accurate.

PM10 is already regulated because EPA had to set a standard to protect the public health. These small particulates can get into your lungs, and they can cause increased respiratory symptoms in children, and can cause premature death in people with heart and lung disease, so EPA sets a standard to protect the public health.

What this amendment would do would be to stop EPA from setting a standard that might be tighter if the science dictates it.

Once they set a standard, EPA does not regulate. EPA leaves it to the States to decide how they will meet that standard. EPA is already talking to the stakeholders in the agricultural communities.

In the past, the vast majority of States has not required farms to take any action that would require reductions of this pollution. Instead, States have typically reduced particles from industrial processes. California and Arizona are addressing agricultural pollution by incorporating USDA-approved conservation measures in some areas.

EPA does not target monitoring in rural areas. They are reaching out to their stakeholders. EPA should not be stopped by this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 430 OFFERED BY MR. PITTS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, or the Department of the Treasury who takes any action to specify or define, through regulations, guidelines, or otherwise, essential benefits under section 1302 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, straightforward amendment. This amendment prevents funds from being used by the Department of Health and Human Services to implement rules regarding ObamaCare's essential benefits package.

As if ObamaCare's mandate that everyone must purchase health insurance wasn't enough, the law went one step further. The Federal Government will now tell every single American and business what their health plans must cover. To make matters worse, ObamaCare grants this unprecedented power to a single person. ObamaCare gives this power to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to determine which benefits are essential for patients, affecting every man, woman and child in America—not to mention that, the more benefits that HHS determines to be essential, the higher the premiums will be for coverage, thus increasing the overall cost for small businesses and families across America.

Behind me is a chart of all the new powers granted to the Secretary under ObamaCare. It was meant to be printed on a 5-foot-by-10-foot chart. Even at this size it's difficult to read, but if you have a magnifying glass, you can actually read this.

ObamaCare has nearly 2,000 of the Secretary's shell statements. The new powers of the Secretary are symptomatic of the vast expansion of Federal control that in many cases usurps State authority and limits private sector autonomy, innovations and its ability to function.

This is bureaucracy at its finest, and it is most destructive. The ability to define minimum benefits is just one of many of the new powers, but it is one of the pivotal ones, and it is precisely why we have pointed out that this is a government takeover of the health industry. I believe patients are capable of deciding which health insurance plans best fit their needs, not a government bureaucrat.

For example, the Federal Government shouldn't tell Mormons in Utah that they need to buy coverage for alcohol counseling. Yet Secretary Sebelius is now in a position to do just that—and there are many other ridiculous examples like this.

Former HHS Secretary Leavitt's writing today in the Washington Post perfectly describes the outcome of ObamaCare. He wrote: It puts more power than is prudent into the hands of one person, and it is not an answer to our national health care crisis.

There is too much power in one office.

I urge the House to adopt my amendment and to stop the Federal takeover of personal health care decisions.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I must say that I think I'm in the movie ''Groundhog Day.'' How many times do we have to vote to defund the Affordable Care Act in one day?

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will stop the implementation of essential health benefits. These rules will ensure that a minimum level of quality health coverage will be covered by plans available on the exchanges. We are talking about benefits related to things like hospitalization, emergency services, maternity care, newborn care, mental health care. This ensures that every plan on the exchange meets minimum standards. It protects individuals and small businesses. It allows them to pick out their plans with the confidence that they will be able to get the adequate kinds of coverage that they need.

Why does the majority want to stand between consumers and the information they need?

I urge my colleagues to please oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. The problem for American consumers is that the insurance company gouges them with high premiums and gives them lousy benefits. So all we've been trying to do with health care reform is make it possible for a consumer to get an affordable policy and to have a decent benefits package.

I, for the life of me, don't understand why the Republicans don't want that to happen. Why do they want the consumer not to be able to get affordable insurance or to be able to get decent benefits?

□ 0050

People are amazed because they expect that their insurance policy is going to provide physician care, hospital care, emergency care, prescription drugs, and oftentimes it doesn't even provide all these things. So there should be an essential benefit package.

If you're a big corporation, you can go out and get a nice benefit package for employees, and you can get an affordable policy. But if you're a small business or you're an individual, you can't do it. So all we're doing is trying to level the playing field so that the little guy can get the good benefit package and get the affordable insurance just like the big corporation.

Again, I don't understand why our Republican friends would not want that to happen. And it's just practical. It's just a practical solution here.

If you pass this amendment, then we're going to go back to the same thing again where that average American can't get the good policy and can't get affordable insurance. It's not fair. It's an issue of fairness. So oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 241 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Oil and Gas Research and Development Program of the Department of Energy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It would eliminate funding for the $50 million oil and gas research and development program funded through the Department of Energy's fossil energy R&D account.

This cut, which the President also proposed in his FY12 budget, would save the taxpayers money and end an unnecessary subsidy to the oil and gas industry.

I am proposing elimination of this R&D program because the research is being done and should be done by the industry itself.

Don't just take my word for it. The industry itself is doing the job and says so. There is an ad in today's edition of The Hill newspaper on the back which says, in part, this is placed here by the people of America's oil and natural gas industry; that oil and natural gas companies are leading innovators investing hundreds of billions of dollars in innovative technology and capital projects over the past decade.

We should be using our scarce Federal dollars on clean energy innovation that we need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, create jobs, and to stay competitive globally.

This continuing resolution would cut over $2 billion in renewable energy research and development. At a time when we are looking to cut unnecessary spending, the oil and gas R&D program should be on the chopping block as well.

The oil and gas industry has ample resources to develop these technologies without this Federal subsidy. A recent GAO report found that the industry spends over $2 billion of its own money annually on R&D.

This $50 million cut to an R&D program for the oil and gas industry is the right way to cut spending, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment uses a heavy-handed approach in order to shut down important programs at the Department of Energy.

Fossil energy sources supply more than 80 percent of our Nation's total energy. Using these resources more efficiently and more cleanly and developing technologies that can access new domestic sources are extremely important when so much of our energy depends on fossil fuels.

This amendment would stop programs that do just that. For example, it would prevent work like the development of ultra-clean fuels.

There may be some areas of research in which the private sector does not need help, but there are other areas of research which are too risky for industry to take on.

I oppose the amendment.

I am pleased to yield to my ranking, Mr. PASTOR, for any comments he may wish to make.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise to oppose the amendment.

The amendment prohibits funds from being used for oil and gas research. Without this amendment, the Department of Energy would spend $38 million during the year. As my chairman points out, fossil fuel sources are and will continue to be a large part of our energy mix.

Given the importance of research and development in this area, it is necessary to improve the efficiency in the environmental cost of fossil fuels. Further, stopping programs mid year, which this would do, results in costs associated with terminating ongoing work.

I am committed to working with the gentleman to review the balance of funding as we move forward, but I cannot support the amendment at this time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, my point is that the industry itself is doing this research and development and should do it without a Federal subsidy. I mentioned the full-page ad in today's edition of The Hill newspaper, which says that they are doing this.

We shouldn't be subsidizing an industry that's mature and profitable. We need to be spending money on renewable energy sources so that we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Instead, in this continuing resolution, we're cutting $2 billion out of research and development for new energy sources.

I don't object to research and development going on for traditional oil and gas industry, but the industry itself ought to be doing that research.

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

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

Mr. CARNEY. 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 Delaware will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 164 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act for any account may be used in excess of the amount available for such account during fiscal year 2006.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to funds made available—

(1) by division A;

(2) by section 1101(a)(3) and title VI of division B;

(3) by section 1101(a)(6) (with respect to division E of Public Law 111–117) and title X of division B; or

(4) for Israel, by section 1101(a)(6) (with respect to division F of Public Law 111–117) and title XI of division B.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. I want to briefly begin by thanking the Appropriations Committee. I understand the nature of what has been happening here, the size of the taxpayer savings that we have seen over the last 3 days.

But I rise because the debt and the deficit problem facing our Nation are greater than I think most people in this room understand, and certainly most people back home understand. The circumstances demand that we go just a little bit further than we have and that's what this amendment does. It goes just a little bit further.

It takes non-defense discretionary spending back to 2006 levels instead of 2008. That represents an additional 3 percent savings, which on the one hand doesn't sound like that much, but on the other hand actually saves $134 billion of the $900 billion worth of deficits that we will incur between tomorrow and the rest of this year.

Folks have asked me why I have done this, why I have waited 3 years to do it, why we are here at 1 o'clock in the morning to hear this amendment. I am doing it because I feel that most of the folks don't grasp the size of the difficulty. I know that most of the folks in my district don't grasp it yet. And I have been struggling with how to explain to people exactly what a $1,600 billion deficit means and a $14,000 billion debt.

This chart, I think, does it better than anything else. This chart is something that we put together using Congressional Budget Office numbers from the base line. This number, very simply, ladies and gentlemen, shows when we will use 100 percent of our revenues, 100 percent of our revenues, to pay our debt.

And that number, using the CBO estimates, is in 2055. This is the equivalent of going back to your family and saying everything that we make will go to pay down the minimum payment on our credit card. And this number is probably too late. The CBO estimates on interest are much lower than we are actually experiencing in the market these days.

The scary part is that if we don't do anything, if we continue business as usual, this will happen. This will happen unless we make dramatic changes to the way that we do business around here.

I heard the gentleman from Virginia earlier today, Mr. MORAN, mention that he thought that H.R. 1 represented an economic death spiral. This, ladies and gentlemen, is an economic death spiral. There is no coming back from a situation where you use all of your money just to pay your debt.

We can and will begin work on this this year in the budget. We can and will continue work on this as we go through the debt ceiling debate. And we can and should keep this in mind with everything that we do. But in my humble opinion, we can start tonight by approving this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0100

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. To make cuts back to the 2006 level for defense, homeland security, and veterans affairs would do

enormous damage to the country. I mean we would be talking about $65, $70 billion in defense, homeland security. And VA would be very substantial as well. I just think of the VA health care benefits that were increased by our Members of Congress working on a bipartisan basis, our former colleague Chet Edwards. We increased health care to take care of the problems associated with the veterans coming back and needing post-traumatic disorder, traumatic brain injury, needing all kinds of help.

We have thousands of veterans today who are homeless. So taking these levels back to 2006, in my judgment, would do devastation to this part of the budget. So I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I reserve my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. With all due respect to the ranking member, I was not clear. This amendment does not take defense, homeland security, or VA back to 2006 levels. Only non-defense, non-security discretionary spending.

Mr. DICKS. I would yield to the gentleman just to say we had a different description of your amendment. I regret that there were inaccuracies.

But even for the rest of the government, I think the amendment going back to 2006 is too severe. And as the chairman would say, it is an across-the-board cut, give all the authority to OMB. I am with HAL ROGERS, it's not a good idea. Let's defeat the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

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

Mr. MULVANEY. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 377 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 166 by Mr. GUINTA of New Hampshire.

Amendment No. 495 by Mr. HALL of Texas.

Amendment No. 141 by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment No. 109 by Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

Amendment No. 548 by Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. LUETKEMEYER of Missouri.

Amendment No. 149 by Mr. LUETKEMEYER of Missouri.

Amendment No. 569 by Mr. ISSA of California.

Amendment No. 94 by Mr. SULLIVAN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 216 by Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 217 by Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 545 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment No. 200 by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment No. 482 by Mr. HELLER of Nevada.

Amendment No. 563 by Mrs. NOEM of South Dakota.

Amendment No. 430 by Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 241 by Mr. CARNEY of Delaware.

Amendment No. 164 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 377 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) 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 261, noes 158, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

AYES—261

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinchey
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—158

Ackerman
Aderholt
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Berg
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Crenshaw
Critz
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gonzalez
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Manzullo
Markey
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Neal
Noem
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Platts
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rehberg
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Smith (NE)
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Visclosky

Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—14

Giffords
Harman
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meeks
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Shuster
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains on this vote.

□ 0127

Messrs. CICILLINE, FINCHER, FARR, REHBERG, and JOHNSON of Ohio changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LEVIN, McDERMOTT, HIGGINS, FRANK of Massachusetts, ALTMIRE, HUIZENGA of Michigan, BERMAN, TIERNEY, COURTNEY, HARRIS, SERRANO, RAHALL, LARSON of Connecticut, GUTHRIE, HASTINGS of Florida, DEUTCH, MURPHY of Connecticut, LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 210, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

AYES—210

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—210

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Giffords
Harman
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meeks
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Shuster
Stark
Wilson (FL)

□ 0131

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 495 OFFERED BY MR. HALL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

AYES—233

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—187

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meeks
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Shuster
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0135

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 344, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

AYES—76

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Rahall
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Tierney
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey

NOES—344

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clarke (MI)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster

West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Giffords
Harman
Harper
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meeks
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Shuster
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0138

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

AYES—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—185

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meeks
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Shuster
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0141

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 129 I was unfortunately detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 548 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 259, noes 159, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

AYES—259

Adams
Akin
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Boren
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam

Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—159

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brooks
Capps
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flores
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Olver
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Conyers
Culberson
DeLauro
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meeks
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Shuster
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0144

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 176, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

AYES—245

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—176

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman

Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Meeks
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Roybal-Allard
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0147

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 179, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

AYES—244

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—179

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 0150

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 569 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 230, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

AYES—191

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Hall
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney

Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—230

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
Labrador
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Platts
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 0153

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 133, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. SULLIVAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 285, noes 136, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

AYES—285

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clarke (MI)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—136

Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Berg
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Costello
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Donnelly (IN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luetkemeyer
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McNerney
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Napolitano
Noem
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Polis
Price (NC)
Rehberg
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Shimkus
Sires
Smith (NE)
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Whitfield
Wu

NOT VOTING—12

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
Latta
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Rangel
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 0156

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 216 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 182, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

AYES—240

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—182

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cravaack
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Sullivan
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 0200

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 217 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

AYES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino

Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—183

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Sires
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0203

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 545 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 187, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—234

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Costa
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
King (IA)
McCarthy (NY)

McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0206

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 200 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

AYES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—182

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
King (IA)
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0209

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 482 OFFERED BY MR. HELLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 213, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

AYES—209

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)

Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—213

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Olver
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Pallone
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0212

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 563 OFFERED BY MRS. NOEM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 255, noes 168, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—255

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—168

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0215

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 430 OFFERED BY MR. PITTS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—183

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0218

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 241 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 121, noes 300, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—121

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Gerlach
Goodlatte
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hirono
Honda
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, David
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Sutton
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOES—300

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clarke (MI)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Myrick
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0221

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CANTOR was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Members we have got one more amendment in this series of votes, after which we are looking at a debate time of about 1 hour. So I would advise the Members that it would probably be best to stay close to the Chamber, because we would expect the final series of votes on this bill and for the day to be within 1 hour.

AMENDMENT NO. 164 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will resume.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 93, noes 328, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—93

Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Bartlett
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Denham
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Harris
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Luetkemeyer
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Ribble
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—328

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0225

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 255 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Labor Relations Board to certify the results of an election of a labor organization under section 9(c)(1) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159(c)(1)) that is not conducted by secret ballot.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak about the importance of protecting America's workers.

My home State of Kansas is one of 22 right-to-work States in which a worker cannot be required to join a union as a condition of employment. This ensures worker freedom, and Card Check poses a direct threat to this freedom.

The last Congress knew that Card Check went against the will of the American people, but the current administration still seems intent on pushing it upon American workers.

To circumvent necessary congressional approval is to attack our representative form of government. If enacted through backdoor administrative paths and without congressional approval, Card Check would eliminate the use of a secret ballot for union elections.

Mr. Chairman, we have to preserve the use of a secret ballot. It is a fundamental institution of democracy. If the private ballot is eliminated, it opens up a window of opportunity for labor unions to strong-arm workers who are in the unions. Just this week in Wisconsin, we have seen the tactics unions are willing to use when they don't get their way; and we know the administration is encouraging this type of behavior across the country.

After speaking with colleagues, I feel another vehicle would be better for this issue, but I could not pass up the opportunity to address this matter on the floor. So I will withdraw this amendment today, and will look forward to working with my colleagues in the coming days to preserve the rights of American workers.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 273 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to administer the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, with respect to any project or program funded by this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

□ 0230

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment that is before the House this evening is an amendment that shuts off the funding within this continuing resolution to what we know as the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act is an old and archaic act that was generated during the Depression era, the early years of the Depression era, in about 1931. It was designed to keep the African American workers out of the trade unions in New York. That's the source of it. I have dealt underneath this law for my working life as a construction contractor, so my hands-on experience with Davis-Bacon, I believe, is as strong as anyone's in this Chamber.

The costs that are added to our construction projects are what we should be thinking about here in this 112th Congress, in this Congress of austerity, on this night that we've had of cutting spending and cutting spending, and it's this:

According to Heritage Study, the extra wages that are paid out unnecessarily total $10.9 billion. I have done this study within my own construction company, and have looked at the difference in the cost of the Davis-Bacon Federal wage scale. They will call it ''prevailing wage.'' I will tell you we know it's union scale, mandated by Federal law, and there is no reason for us to adhere to a union scale mandated by Federal law. My numbers show this:

It increases the cost of a project between 8 and 35 percent depending on how much is materials and how much is labor. Other data out there show an increase of 9 to 37 percent. Our numbers match well. The costs of compliance for contractors are over $190 million a year, and it distorts the relationship between management and labor. We are, Mr. Chairman, in an era where our question becomes this:

Do we want to create jobs or do we want to cost jobs? Do we want to build 4 miles of road under Davis-Bacon or do we want to build five? Do we want to build four schools or do we want to build five? Do we want to have an inflation of wages by an average of 22 percent, which is according to some of the wage and hour studies? Do we want to see the price go up? Do we want to see a construction industry that reduces workers by as much as 25,000 a year in minority workers?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 20 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the use of funds to administer the wage rate requirements under Davis-Bacon. It is yet another illustration of how the majority is making this continuing resolution a Trojan Horse, filled with ideology that irreparably harms working families.

The Davis-Bacon Act ensures that workers on federally funded government contracts are paid no less than the wages paid for similar work in a community. A simple concept. Former President Bush understood this concept when he reinstated the Davis-Bacon rules for reconstruction contracts in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

Despite the majority's argument, the Davis-Bacon Act has no effect on total costs of construction. Study after study reveals that higher productivity makes up for any additional labor cost, essentially eliminating any cost savings if the law were repealed. If this amendment is enacted into law, we will be cheating workers of a fair wage with no cost savings to show for it.

This amendment is nothing more than an attempt to accelerate a race to the bottom. It is that way of doing business which tells workers in this country ''you do not matter; your right to a decent wage does not matter; your dreams and your aspirations to do better and to provide for your family do not matter.''

All that counts is the power to extract the cheapest possible cost, the lowest labor cost, in return for the highest possible profit. This does not reflect our values as a Nation and certainly not the values that created America's middle class.

Today, as we face 9 percent unemployment, wages falling, the number of families in poverty growing and increasing costs for just about everything, gutting the law that ensures a decent job and a fair wage for workers is the wrong direction. It is the very future of the middle class that is in jeopardy if we pass amendments like the King amendment and, with it, the idea that a society can act with a shared sense of purpose and with a responsibility to each other.

Vote against this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield myself 30 seconds.

It's a little bit amazing to me that the gentlelady can get so focused on

this. I'm the one that should be focused on it in that way and animated. The taxpayers should be animated by this.

They should understand that, when the Federal Government sets union scale and drives the price up and the taxpayers can't afford it, it's not about a race to the bottom. The quality of work for my workers was always there. We take care of our people 12 months out of the year with a benefits package. We're not hiring them out of a union hall for a day, but you make us pay the price as if we were. We uphold our workers. We take care of them. We have the quality there. It's a matter of fact and it's proven, Mr. Chairman.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. I rise to speak against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Davis-Bacon Act requires that workers on federally funded construction projects be paid no less than the wages paid in the community for similar work. It sounds fair. The Davis-Bacon Act prevents the Federal Government, a large influential construction owner, from using precious tax dollars to undercut local wage standards through its investments in construction work.

Those against Davis-Bacon say it drives up costs. Not so. Why don't we deal with facts for a change?

Davis-Bacon has no effect on total costs of construction. Study after study reveals productivity makes up for any additional labor cost, essentially eliminating any cost savings if the law is repealed. In other words, projects using highly skilled workers often cost less than those using low-wage, low-skilled workers.

Opponents who claim the government could save billions by eliminating Davis-Bacon protections ignore productivity, safety and the act's economic development benefits, which contribute to the real cost effectiveness of Davis-Bacon.

In addition, the Davis-Bacon minimum wage must reflect the rate of contribution to retirement, health insurance, apprenticeship training, and disability insurance. By including fringe benefits and wage calculations, Davis-Bacon delivers health care and pensions for workers on these projects.

Without prevailing wages, investments in training fall; work related injuries increase; pension coverage drops; fewer workers have health care insurance; wages stagnate and even drop over time; and total construction costs are still unchanged.

In fact, the real economic significance of Davis-Bacon wage requirements for federally assisted construction projects is that it maintains community standards by preventing bottom-feeding contractors from driving down construction workers' wages and working conditions.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield myself 15 seconds to announce to the Chair that I have just been called a ''bottom-feeder''—a bottom-feeder for providing 12-months-out-of-the-year work, health care benefits and retirement benefits for my employees.

I take it as an insult, but I am not going to ask to take the lady's words down.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. It has been said by many that, when one goes to heaven or hell, you have to fly through the Atlanta Airport.

Just yesterday, I was talking to a contractor who is involved in doing the expansion of the Atlanta Airport, of the Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. We were talking about his business and what was going on, and he was complaining to me about the construction costs and the increase that is mandated by Davis-Bacon.

The previous speaker said that it doesn't raise the costs, but that's totally false.

In fact, this contractor told me just yesterday that the increased cost to the people of Atlanta, Georgia, and to the State of Georgia is 40 percent above what it would be if we did not have Davis-Bacon just leering over their heads like a dagger, causing them to have to pay a higher amount of money.

While we are here in tough economic times, we need to look at what the Federal Government is doing to try to increase the costs for our children and our grandchildren so that they have to pay it in the future. Davis-Bacon is one of those laws, antiquated laws, that does cost today's taxpayers a tremendous amount of money, but it's going to cost our children and our grandchildren their future.

The reason it does that is we're spending money we don't have. Davis-Bacon is a culprit in causing the debt of this country, the debt of Atlanta, Georgia, and the debt of the State of Georgia to go higher.

It is time to put Davis-Bacon to rest. It has outlived its usefulness, and we have to vote to stop the spending. Vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

□ 0240

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I tell this story every time we talk about Davis-Bacon.

Davis and Bacon were Republicans, and what was occurring was that you had out-of-town workers coming into New York City to build a hospital, undercutting the local labor market at a time when a lot of people were out of work. That's what Davis-Bacon is.

Quite frankly, the last test we had on Davis-Bacon was during the hurricanes down in the gulf coast when President Bush suspended it for a period of time. We made the case to him that you weren't saving any money. Not only weren't you saving any money, but you were having workers come in because there weren't the anti-kickback provisions, so the payrolls didn't have to be submitted; and you had a lot of illegal workers coming down who still live in Louisiana, undercutting the local labor market.

So I get that we don't like unions on this side of the aisle. But I've got to tell you, if you look at the labor rates for operating backhoes and everything else in the gentleman's, the author of the amendment, a carpenter makes $14.45 under Davis-Bacon, and a backhoe operator makes $14.53.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I don't want somebody who's operating a backhoe near my house making less than that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT. I don't think that anybody would object to paying workers on these projects a real prevailing wage. The problem is that what's called a ''prevailing wage'' is not the prevailing wage.

I have a friend who does a lot of ornamental ironwork. A lot of these buildings around here he has done. He lives out in Hagerstown. The contracts that he has to put that in require him to pay prevailing wage when he puts it in down here. The same people that install it down here do the work of preparing it out there. This is a good job in Hagerstown, and that's only—what?—about 70 miles from here. When he comes down here to put it in down here, he has to double their pay for the time he's down here.

It's just not prevailing wage, and that's why it's wrong.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Mr. Chairman, when I look at this amendment by Representative KING, it's the closest thing to a jobs bill that I've seen since January started—and it's disappointing. The reality is that I wish we weren't debating this at nearly 3 o'clock in the morning, because I would love the American people to see that this is what substitutes for a jobs bill in this day and age.

The fact is that this is what the very fight is all about. Do we want to build a robust middle class or do we want to pay people the least we possibly can pay them to keep them desperate and drive wages down to nothing so that we have a very small group of really wealthy people and a vast group of really desperate people who would do anything to work and who could have their unions busted because you've got people who've got to do what they've got to do and cross that line?

This is at the heart of what it's all about.

This is the fight.

Shall we have a middle class and pay people decent wages or shall we continue on this drive to separate and increase wage inequality in this country so that the richest have so much and so that the rest of us just don't have much at all?

Davis-Bacon is good legislation because it strengthens our middle class so that people can actually have a decent quality of life, send their kids to school, be able to send them to college, and have decent retirements. It's about making a strong middle class based on a decent, livable wage.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for bringing this amendment forward.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to share with you a little story that we experienced over the past couple of years with Davis-Bacon. I think that the people we often forget about here when we get into these debates are the taxpayers, themselves. The taxpayers are the ones who have to foot the bill for the wages that Davis-Bacon drives up.

After the stimulus bill was passed a couple of years ago, even though I opposed the idea of what the stimulus bill was going to do, we in our community had been taking the initiative to put in sewer systems around our lakes and our rivers to protect our soil and our resources. After a couple of projects that had already been bid out without Davis-Bacon wages, the company contacted our office and said, Hey, we would like to apply for stimulus dollars to help drive our costs down on these particular projects.

Well, after doing some research, because they did not bid the projects with Davis-Bacon wages, they were ineligible, and therefore were going to be paying higher rates. They were also going to be paying the contractors, themselves, at a lower wage because they were not eligible for the stimulus money, money which would have put infrastructure into our communities, allowing for the building of long-term assets in our communities. Instead, they were ineligible because they had not bid Davis-Bacon wages.

I think it's very important that we remember the taxpayers, who have to fund these projects because of the higher costs, and I think it's important that we also remember that each community individually recognizes that their labor costs are different and that they shouldn't always be required to deal with Federal standards.

I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa for bringing his amendment forward, and I ask that you support it.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Iowa has 12¼ minutes remaining if they choose to use it all.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. The gentleman from Minnesota really made the point. Here we are at a quarter to 3 in the morning, going after the working people of this country.

In 1932, we didn't have unemployment insurance.

Now, I'm sure your next amendment will be ''no money should be spent for unemployment insurance in this country'' because that creates that moral hazard where people sit at home and wait for that check to come in, right? They won't go down and look for work. We also had no workers' comp in this country before 1910. If a guy got hurt, they threw him out in the street and got somebody new. We didn't care.

If that's the kind of country you want to go back to, I suppose the next bill you bring out here will be ''let's repeal the minimum wage.'' Why the heck do we have minimum wage? Do you know what the prevailing wage in this city was when this building was built? It was built by slaves. Now, is that where you want to go? What are you after?

The Government of the United States should set a standard of what we want for the working people in this country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind all Members to direct their comments to the Chair, not to others in the second person.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to point out to the body also, Mr. Chairman, that I have lived under the Davis-Bacon wage scale for years. I've met payroll for 28½ years—over 1,400 consecutive weeks. I've worked for a wage underneath Davis-Bacon wage scales, and I've worked in merit shop operations. I've worked in shops in the wintertime and on construction projects in the field before it froze up, from the spring to fall. I've been on all sides of this. I've been a laborer on the pipeline. I've been a heavy equipment operator. I've been an owner and I've managed people, and I've watched what Davis-Bacon has done at every single level along the way.

It distorts the relationship between management and labor. It takes away from the individuals the ability or the willingness to contribute to the decision-making process.

□ 0250

When the government comes in and says, ''on one side of the road, you're going to pay your laborers $14 an hour, but on the other side of the road you're going to pay them $21 an hour, and if they climb in the seat of a motor grader it's going to be $35 an hour, but if it happens to be a finish machine then it's going to be $40 an hour,'' you watch your crews jockeying for the highest paying job there is.

What happens if you sit back at a bird's-eye view?

They will be scrambling over to climb onto the machine that's the least useful but that pays the most money. Then if you go away for a few days, you'll come back and find out they've rolled all the clods, that your wage price has gone up and that you're no longer competitive, and you'll have to go back on the job and essentially get out—this is figuratively speaking—the whip and make sure you crack it so you get people pushing as hard as possible.

It raises the tension, and it takes away a lot of the pleasure of taking pride in your work because now management is pitted against labor, and labor is pitted against labor in jockeying for the highest paying jobs.

This is no way to run a business. It's no way to run a company. It's no way to run a country to think that we here in this Congress should be one of the ones deciding what someone should get paid, or at least writing the rules for it, knowing that it's not prevailing wage but that it's union scale, and it takes 2½ years to get a ruling on what's prevailing wage and what isn't, and so we just don't know what it is for 2½ years.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 10¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 12½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will point out that there has been a misunderstanding here with regard to an agreement on the length of this amendment discussion. We'd agreed to take it down to 10 minutes each, but when the announcement was made, I think it was confusing to both sides.

So what I'd like to do is try to wrap up my side of this in 1 minute and yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut for as much time as she may think is appropriate to consume in order to close, if that would be agreeable. I'm going to move ahead with my part by picking up where I left off.

Mr. Chairman, the inefficiencies that are created by Davis-Bacon are multiplied in the costs that are in the jobs that we do. It is an 8 to 35 percent increase in the overall costs of our construction projects. We need to keep people at work. It means fewer people are working for more money, and it means a more distorted economy and inefficiencies that are built in that completely distort the cost of these wages.

So it is important for us to know that this isn't the first debate before this Congress but that it is the first intense debate that has taken place since the Republican majority took over here in 2011. Back in 1995, some of the cosponsors of the original Davis-Bacon repeal, a similar amendment, were BOEHNER, BARTLETT, COBLE, DREIER, GOODLATTE, HERGER, MCKEON, and WOLF.

I would urge adoption of this amendment and a strong vote to cut the funding off to anything that would be enforcing Davis-Bacon wages under this CR.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Members of both parties should oppose this amendment because it rests on three misjudgments.

The first misjudgment is that the wages established by this Davis-Bacon practice are union-imposed wages. The fact of the matter is they are prevailing wages which are determined by a survey of the local marketplace.

The second misjudgment is that it always raises the cost of a construction project. The fact is quite the opposite. When the productivity rises, the value rises; and if you have better performance and fewer errors and the faster completion of a project, productivity rises, and you get more value.

But I think the most important misjudgment is that it is, one more time, the wrong issue at the wrong time. There are a lot of Americans awake at this hour. Thankfully, for them, they're probably not watching this debate, but they're awake at this hour because this has yet been another day and another week and another month with no paycheck, no job and no hope.

What they want us to do is to work together to put them back to work. Yet what we have seen in the last 24 hours is a debate over whether to defund Planned Parenthood, a debate over whether to repeal most of the environmental protections that have taken 40 years to build up in this country, a debate over whether people have the right to know if they're buying safe toys, and now a debate over whether to repeal a successful labor-management partnership.

It's the wrong amendment at the wrong time.

Vote ''no.''

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to Amendment No. 273, offered by my colleague, Congressman KING.

This amendment's intent is to defund wage law requirements as established by the Davis-Bacon Act.

Davis-Bacon doesn't just help the workers who build our country support their families; it also makes sure that taxpayers get their money's worth.

The Davis-Bacon Act fosters competition based on quality, attracting workers who are more productive, more experienced, and well-trained.

The Federal Government should not be the engine driving the "race to the bottom", and Davis-Bacon helps ensure that public projects do not facilitate low ball bids that undercut the American worker.

Reports show that projects constructed with Davis-Bacon wage provisions are more likely to be completed on time, within budget, and with fewer future repair costs.

Problems arise in projects when you have unskilled workers who are working at the lowest of wages and do not have benefits to support their families. Prevailing wage laws help ensure the best condition for workers, and employees respond by putting their best work forward, benefitting the community and the taxpayer.

Elimination of the Davis-Bacon Act—which stabilizes wages, provides benefits to families, and promotes competition based on quality—would only foster an environment of low bidding, low wages, and poorer quality of work.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the King amendment.

This amendment would strip away Davis-Bacon wage protections in Hawaii and nationwide.

Enacted in 1931, the Davis-Bacon Act ensures that workers on federal construction contracts receive at least the prevailing wage for construction jobs. The Davis-Bacon Act ensures projects are built by skilled and experienced workers who know what they're doing. Prevailing wages and higher-skilled work result in greater productivity and lower cost.

In industries without Davis-Bacon protections, we have seen unscrupulous contractors engage in a "race to the bottom," trying to undercut each other to perform shoddy work, with less-skilled workers, at sub-par wages. These projects often end up costing more in the long run due to repairs, revisions, and delays.

Some claim that Davis-Bacon costs the Federal Government more. On the contrary, studies show that higher-wage workers are more productive, saving hundreds of millions of dollars in the long run.

Construction workers who build highways, homes, or buildings should be able to earn enough to feed their families, put a roof over their heads, and send their kids to college. Beyond just helping workers and their families, prevailing wages improve local economies. Workers spend their income in local businesses and pay local taxes. Workers participate in building trades training programs and health care programs and are not dependent on benefits from other social programs. One study found that local prevailing wage law generated 2.4 times the economic benefit of the cost of the construction project.

Sadly, this amendment is another example of this bill's consistent attacks on American workers, including the construction workers, teachers, nurses, police officers, and firefighters who are committed to build, educate, heal, and protect communities in Hawaii and throughout our country. Rather than focus on providing good jobs with fair pay, the Republicans are more interested in increasing corporate profits on the backs of American workers.

I strongly support Davis-Bacon protections and oppose this misguided amendment. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 567 OFFERED BY MS. HAYWORTH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement section 1899A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), as added by section 3403 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, section 3404 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act created the Independent Payment Advisory Board, known by the acronym ''IPAB.'' Beginning in 2014, this 15-member board will be charged with cutting the growth rate of Medicare spending. IPAB is designed as a bureaucracy that will be looking not at how to improve patient care but how to hit an expenditure target.

PPACA limits what IPAB would be able to do to restrict cost growth. For example, IPAB cannot recommend higher cost sharing, or otherwise restrict benefits or eligibility. The primary means of achieving expenditure targets will be to reduce payments to physicians and hospitals. This, in turn, will reduce access to providers—access that Medicare patients need to have—as the providers will find that they will not be able to afford to accept Medicare's reimbursement rates.

Furthermore, Congress ceded a tremendous amount of power to the IPAB. If Members believe that the cuts proposed by IPAB won't work or are too draconian, it will take an affirmative act by future Congresses to overturn its recommendations. This represents an abdication of responsibility by Congress, whose Members are expected to make these decisions, not unelected, unaccountable Federal bureaucrats. Equally troubling, the IPAB bears more than a passing resemblance to the British National Institute for Clinical Excellence, which governs payment for the National Health Service.

From my vantage point as an ophthalmologist, one example will demonstrate why a similarity between IPAB and NICE, which is the ironic acronym for this powerful British entity, should give all of us pause. Up until a couple of years ago, NICE refused to pay for treatment for a form of macular degeneration that led, in most cases, to legal blindness if the sufferer had good vision in the other eye. This is nearly impossible for an American to fathom that a government agency would compel a doctor to, in effect, calmly watch a patient go blind in one eye even though vision-saving treatment was available.

If an unelected board of advisers is compelled to make decisions primarily

on the basis of cost, then this is the kind of awful choice our doctors and patients may well be forced to accept; and this is one of many reasons the Affordable Care Act was repealed by the House last month. We honor the goals of this law to allow all Americans to have access to good care with affordable, portable health insurance; but we need to go about achieving those goals while preserving the choice, quality and innovation that Americans expect and deserve.

□ 0300

As we craft alternatives that will honor the best of American medicine, we will best serve our citizens by prohibiting any funding towards the implementation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

I strongly urge the support of all Members for the amendment I am sponsoring, and I thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Just to make a point, it sounds from the gentlelady like what you want to do is raise the Medicare rates and cut benefits—but let me just get on with this here.

How many times, as I said earlier, do we have to vote on the Affordable Care Act? This long series of ''defunding health reform'' amendments shows how far the House is straying from a serious legislative process. So far today, the House has passed no fewer than three separate, overlapping and duplicative amendments that prohibit the use of funds to carry out the Affordable Care Act.

First, the House passed the Rehberg amendment: prohibiting the use of funds for this purpose by any agency funded in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. A few minutes later, the House passed an amendment by Mr. KING: prohibiting the use of funds by any Federal agency for this purpose. A few minutes after that vote, the House passed another amendment by Mr. KING: prohibiting funds to pay the salary of any Federal employee to implement or administer the Affordable Care Act.

The majority party does not like the Affordable Care Act, and would like to cut off all funding for the act's implementation—now that much is clear—but how many times do we need to pass the same prohibition yesterday and today? Will three times be enough or will the House just keep passing more and more amendments, doing essentially the same thing until everyone on the majority's side has satisfied their urge to make clear just how opposed they are to expanding the availability of health care in this country?—which is what the Affordable Care Act is all about.

Instead of this pointless debate, we should be working on what the American public wants. They want us to create jobs. They want us to get this economy going again. They want to make sure that they have jobs, that they're able to send their children to school—and yes, they would like to have health care benefits so that, when they get sick, they will be able to have the kinds of treatment that all of us in this body have by virtue of being Members of the Congress.

We go to the head of the line. They can't get the same kind of care that we get.

Yet, day in and day out over these last several days, we've watched our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do everything they can to deny the American public the opportunity to have the same kind of health care that Members of Congress have.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out paragraph (11) of section 101 of Public Law 111–226 (124 Stat. 2389).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Burgess amendment.

Last August, as part of a $26 billion bailout bill for States, $10 billion was set aside to be distributed to the States for education. The State of Texas was set to receive $830 million as part of this education funding. As far as we are concerned, government spending does not create jobs or economic prosperity. Nonetheless, the money was appropriated for all States in the Union.

Yet tucked into this legislation was an amendment that was deliberately and maliciously slipped into it that imposed a restriction on the State of the Texas, and only Texas, so that for Texas to receive the money would force Texas to violate its constitution. The restrictive amendment required that Texas guarantee that spending levels for elementary and secondary education not dip below 2010 levels for 3 years.

This is troubling. To accept the funds, Texas would have to violate its State constitution.

Neither the Governor nor the State government branches are able to make budget decisions that bind future legislatures. This amendment is not about whether or not taxpayers' money will be spent or saved since the funds have already been appropriated. The amendment is about fairness, equal treatment for American taxpayers in one State, and malicious conduct in an arena involving Texas taxpayers and Texas schoolchildren where such legislative conduct is unconscionable.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. When Texas received $3.25 billion in education stimulus funds over the objection of every Texas Republican, Governor Perry played a shell game that left Texas schools not a dime better off than if no Federal aid had come in the first place. That is the only reason that, last summer, all 12 Democratic Texas Members—from CHET EDWARDS to SILVESTRE REYES, from HENRY CUELLAR to GENE GREEN—united, joined together, in offering our Save Our Schools amendment, which is today Federal law.

Tonight's proposal seeks to nullify that protection so that Governor Perry can reach out for another Federal bailout even if it means taking $830 million away from Texas schoolchildren. Defectively written, this amendment fails to repeal anything. The enforcement funds that it would limit are not in this bill. They are already appropriated. Vote ''no'' on a very flawed amendment for a failed purpose.

Stop begging Washington for help, Governor. Just sign the application.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Fort Worth, Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. I know it's late and people are tired, but it's not too late to right a wrong—the wrong that was done was against the schoolchildren of Texas to the tune of $830 million.

The Congress is asking the Governor of Texas to do something that he is constitutionally unable to do. What is happening to our schools is the same as in many States, but Texas has this extra burden of scrambling to find ways to afford to keep those classrooms open and the teachers there.

What we are asking you to do is to release Texas from this burden that only Texas has which was put on Texas by this Congress, I think unintentionally by most of the people in this Congress. So I would say tonight this is an issue that deals with Texas but that it affects every schoolchild and every teacher in our State.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. To my colleagues, what would you do if $3 billion for education were denied the

schoolchildren of Texas or of South Carolina or of California? You'd come to their aid. Nine Democratic Members, lonely Members—all by ourselves—decided to fight for the school districts of Texas. They called us and asked us for help.

□ 0310

What we did was just ask the Governor to certify that the dollars that we would send them—that had no votes from the Republicans—would be for the schoolchildren of Texas. I will do it tomorrow, yesterday and forever.

Today, our school districts are being cut—six in my district. Houston, Texas, HISD is being cut by $300 million. Our Governor is going against the funding process of this country. You cannot take and hoard money for children and expect us to sit idly by.

I am proud to be one of nine Democrats who stood up for the children. I ask my colleagues to stand up for us. Let the moneys go to the children and not in the pocket of the Governor of the State of Texas.

This amendment prevents the Department of Education from enforcing language that would ensure Texas school districts receive $830 million from the Education Jobs Fund that was passed last year. The Texas Delegation fought hard for these funds so that they are distributed to our neediest school districts and provides assurance that Texas will not single out education for disproportionate budget cuts in the next budget cycle.

Mr. Chair, I recently met with several superintendents of school districts in my congressional district about this issue and this is not unique to schools in Houston. In fact over 40 Texas superintendents including: several Houston school districts, Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association, Texas AFT, Texas Association of School Boards, Texas State Teachers Association, Association for Texas Professional Educators, Texas Association of School Administrators, Texas Classroom Teachers Association, requested that the Federal funds sent to the State for education should be released immediately to those districts. Our children deserve the best quality education so they can grow up to obtain good jobs. The Governor simply needs to certify that the 830 million Federal funds will only be used for education. What does this mean in terms of jobs in Texas? This amendment would essentially cut 14,500 teaching jobs in Texas. Republicans continue to say we need to create jobs, and this amendment does the complete opposite while placing our children at a disadvantage. We cannot turn our backs on our children who need a quality education and certainly not turn our backs on our teachers in a time when our economy is fragile and when they need us the most. Let us support our Texas children. Texas is estimated to have a projected deficit of up to $27 billion and there are plans to cut millions for key programs. It is unacceptable to continue with politics as usual. The Federal dollars will be released upon certification that its only use is for the education of Texas school children.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the thousands of teachers in Texas who are against this anti-Texas amendment and vote against the Burgess amendment and look out for the best interest of our children.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1 minute remaining.

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

We are hearing a lot about $3.25 billion that was sent to Texas under the stimulus/ARRA funds in 2010–2011. This money was actually appropriated by the Texas State legislature—Texas Senate: 29 ayes, 2 nays; the House: 142 ayes, 2 nays—in a bipartisan fashion. It was not the Governor. It was the State legislature, appropriately, that dealt with this money.

Texas has long prioritized public education funding. From 2000 to 2009, Texas public education spending increased $9 billion, or 82 percent.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
February 18, 2011.

DEAR TEXAS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: The current Education Jobs statute directs me to violate the Texas Constitution by requiring me to commit a certain level of spending on public education in 2011, 2012 and 2013—prior to Texas even adopting our 2012–13 budget. No other state has to make these commitments beyond 2011.

Texas submitted its application to the U.S. Department of Education on September 3, 2010, making every assurance allowed under Texas law. The application was nonetheless rejected. To date, 48 out of 50 states have received their share of Education Jobs funding.

Texas has long prioritized public education funding; from 2000 to 2009 Texas public education spending increased $9 billion, or 82 percent.

By passing Congressman Burgess' amendment, Congress can help right a wrong, apply equity to Texas, and quickly get $830 million flowing to Texas schools, teachers and children.

Sincerely,

RICK PERRY,
Governor.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise in opposition to Mr. BURGESS' amendment because the State of Texas today is facing a $27 billion deficit.

Last week, Governor Rick Perry came to Washington to ask our Republican colleagues for an $830 million bailout—and voilà—we have Mr. BURGESS' amendment. If this amendment passes, it will shortchange our schools and give a huge bailout to Governor Rick Perry.

Last year, as you have heard, he accepted more than $3 billion in Federal funds, but instead of going and putting that money towards education in Texas, he used it to expand the State's tax surplus rainy day fund.

Today, Mr. BURGESS' amendment would absolutely give Governor Perry a blank check—how good is that?—giving an $830 million bailout to the same State leadership that robbed Texas children and Texas schools and Texas teachers of that money before.

With that, I ask support to bring down this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I want to thank my colleague and ranking member from Washington State.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. Representative BURGESS' amendment would endanger the $830 million already set aside for classrooms and school districts in Texas through the Education Jobs Fund that was passed last August. At a time when our State is facing an almost $27 billion deficit, these are crucial moneys that can be used immediately to help school districts throughout Texas.

Let me give you a little history.

During the Recovery Act of 2009, Texas received $12 billion. Of that, $3.2 billion was supposed to be for public education. Our Governor and the Texas legislature used $12 billion. Instead of supplementing the current education funding, they used the $3.2 billion in place of the current education funding. The Governor went all over the country, getting books signed, saying how bad the Federal Government is, but they didn't give back that $12 billion. They used it to plus-up the rainy day fund that's over $9 billion right now, and they don't even want to use it.

So, at that time, what the Democratic Members from Texas said was that we want to make sure this $830 million goes to the schoolchildren of Texas. That's what this would do, and that's what this law does. It would make sure that that money would go to the schoolchildren. It wouldn't get stuck in Austin. It would go down to my Houston school district, the Galena Park School District, which is having to cut its budget right now because it didn't get that $3.2 billion 2 years ago.

That's why the Burgess amendment should be defeated, Mr. Chairman, and that's why we put this amendment into law. It's in the law now, and I'm proud of it. Let the money go to the school districts instead of to the folks who decided to keep it in the State capital.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I object.

Mr. DICKS. You can't object.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington controls the time for striking the requisite number of words. He is entitled to 5 minutes. He has 2 minutes 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentleman 45 seconds.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. We bent over backwards to accommodate the gentleman, but this has gone beyond what we agreed to.

Mr. DICKS. We will finish this up in 45 seconds.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Would the gentleman yield this gentleman, Mr. BURGESS, 1 minute?

Mr. DICKS. I would be delighted to do that.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington cannot yield blocks of time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. DICKS. That's right. I can regain the time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of comity, I will yield back any time that was yielded to me. The other side has had plenty of time to talk. We need to vote on this amendment and move on.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

I enter in the record the request of education organizations from all over the State of Texas for this amendment and the statements of the Texas delegation last year and again this year.

Governor Perry may have come up here on a book tour for his book ''Fed Up,'' but he's not afraid to ask for second and third helpings of Federal aid even though it takes it away from our schoolchildren.

There is a clear path to getting this money. All the Governor needs to do is to sign a three-page application, like the one he signed to get that $3.25 billion of aid he used for purposes other than education. Though this is presented as an attempt to repeal our amendment, it does not repeal it. It is a meaningless gesture, though it does cloud up the possibility that some Federal court may suggest that Texas is not entitled to any money.

Let's not shut the door of opportunity to our children. Reject this amendment.

JUNE 22, 2010.

Hon. ARNE DUNCAN,
Secretary, Department of Education, Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY DUNCAN, SPEAKER PELOSI, MAJORITY LEADER HOYER, AND CHAIRMAN OBEY: Last year, before the education Stabilization funds were provided to Texas, many of us joined together to urge you to ensure that these funds would increase the funding for Texas schools instead of merely replacing state education funding. Unfortunately, as the legislation was written the State was able to reduce its own obligations to fiscally support public education and supplant those funds with $3.25 billion of federal stablization monies. As the Administration considers additional emergency education funding to save teachers' jobs, we urge you to prevent history from repeating itself and ensure that any funds Texas receives go to help Texas schools, teachers, and students.

We support the legislative language that Members of the Texas Delegation have proposed that would guarantee these emergency federal education funds are actually spent on education in Texas. As drafted, this Texas fix has no impact on any other state and would ensure that the law is implemented as Congress and the Administration intended: to save and create teacher jobs. Specifically, this language includes four provisions that we would like to see included in any emergency education jobs bill:

Limits the additional requirements to states with Texas-sized rainy day funds;

Requires the emergency education jobs funds be distributed to Local Education Agencies within the state according to the Title I–A formula;

Prohibits supplanting of state Title I-type funds with these new emergency federal funds for education jobs; and

Requires maintenance of state primary and secondary education support in FY11, FY12, and FY13 at the current percentage of revenue provided for FY11.

This language does not prohibit cuts to education in Texas's budget, but it does prevent the state from singling out education for more cuts than other budget items due to the influx of funds from the emergency federal monies for education jobs. With Texas facing a serious budget shortfall in the coming biennial budget, the last thing we need to allow is these funds to be diverted to fill non-education gaps in the budget. We hope that you will ensure that Texas school districts do not fall through the legislative cracks this time around.

The Texas superintendents and education organizations listed below are in agreement with this letter and have given permission to add their names in support.

TEXAS SUPERINTENDENTS

(Total of 38 From Across the State of Texas)

Wanda Bamberg, Aldine ISD; Meria Carstarphen, Austin ISD; Jim T. Rumage, Banquete ISD; Jamey Harrision, Bridge City ISD; Brett Springston, Brownsville ISD; Reece Blincoe, Brownwood ISD; Jeff Turner, Coppell ISD; Scott Elliff, Corpus Christi ISD; David Anthony, Cypress-Fairbanks ISD; Michael Hinojosa, Dallas ISD.

Leland Williams, Dickinson ISD; Frances Rocha, Edcouch-Elsa ISD; Bob Wells, Edna ISD; Lorenzo García, El Paso ISD; Melody Johnson, Fort Worth ISD; Paul Clore, Gregory-Portland ISD; Jeremy Lyon, Hays CISD; Terry Grier, Houston ISD; Emilia Castro, Kingsville ISD; A. Marcus Nelson, Laredo ISD.

Michelle Carroll Smith, Lytle ISD; James Ponce, McAllen ISD; Richard A. Middleton, North East ISD; John M. Folks, Northside ISD; John Kuhn, Perrin-Whitt CISD; Sharron L. Doughty, Port Aransas ISD; Alfonso Obregon, Robstown ISD; Robert J. Durón, San Antonio ISD; Mike Quatrini, San Elizario ISD.

Patty Shafer, San Marcos CISD; Greg Gibson, Schertz-Cibolo-Universal City ISD; Rock McNulty, Smithville ISD; Lloyd Verstuyft, Southwest ISD; Robert Santos, United ISD; Joddie W. Witte, Van ISD; Richard Rivera, Weslaco ISD; H. John Fuller, Wylie ISD; Michael Zolkoski, Ysleta ISD.

TEXAS EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS

(Teachers, Principals, School Boards, and Administrators)

Sandi Borden, Executive Director, Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association; Linda Bridges, President, Texas AFT; James B. Crow, Executive Director, Texas Association of School Boards; Rita Haecker, President, Texas State Teachers Assocation; Doug Rogers, Executive Director, Association of Texas Professional Educators; Johnny L. Veselka, Executive Director, Texas Association of School Administrators; Brad Willingham, President, Texas Classroom Teachers Association.

TEXAS DEMOCRATIC DELEGATION STATEMENT ON PROTECTION FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

Last year, we voted for the Economic Recovery Act, which included $3.25 billion to support local Texas school districts. But instead of using these funds as Congress intended, State Republican Leadership used them to replace state education funding, thereby denying an increase in support for our local school districts.

We want to ensure that any new emergency funds Congress provides for education actually help our Texas schools. We have requested additional protections be incorporated into any Supplemental Appropriations legislation specifically for Texas schoolchildren to ensure local districts actually receive this federal help. These protections will ensure that the $820 million in new emergency federal funds for education go to preserve teacher jobs throughout the State and meet other local education needs.

These funds would go to local schools as long as the Governor certifies that (1) federal funds are not used merely to replace state education support, and (2) education funding will not be cut proportionally more than any other item in the upcoming Texas General Appropriations Act. This prevents any further shell games with federal education dollars at the expense of local schools districts. This approach has been endorsed by Texas statewide education organizations representing teachers, principals, school boards, school administrators, and nearly 40 superintendents.

A solid education is the foundation on which our economy and our democracy rest. Our support for our local school districts reflects a two-fold understanding: First, local districts know best what the needs of their students, teachers, and administrators are. Second, especially in times of a difficult economy, we need to invest in our schools.

Our language helps ensure local school districts in Texas have the support they need.

Lloyd Doggett; Gene Green; Rubén Hinojosa; Chet Edwards; Henry Cuellar; Charlie Gonzalez; Al Green; Solomon Ortiz; Silvestre Reyes; Eddie Bernice Johnson; Sheila Jackson Lee; and Ciro Rodriguez.

(January, 2011)

TEXAS DEMOCRATIC DELEGATION STATEMENT ON FUNDING FOR TEXAS SCHOOLS

Since the U.S. House of Representatives approved new education legislation that became federal law last August, all that has stood between Texas schools and $830 million of aid is Governor Rick Perry's signature on a three-page application. More than five months later, the Governor still refuses to turn in even that little bit of homework. With Texas public education continuing to lag in math and science scores while facing a budget crisis, our State has remained one of only two in the entire country, which have not received their share of these new federal education dollars. And these funds should be going where they are needed—to local Texas schools.

Last year, Governor Perry raised previously unmentioned constitutional limitations that allegedly prevented his acting before the Texas Legislature had convened. We disagreed with that excuse then, and we continue to disagree with it now. But with the Texas Legislature already in session, the

Governor has certainly lost his sole stated excuse.

In his own words, the Governor applied for previous emergency federal education funds as part of the Economic Recovery Act ''only in concert with State lawmakers while the 2010–2011 budget was being finalized.'' Now that the Texas Legislature has consideration of the 2012–2013 budget underway, we respectfully urge the Governor in 2011 to do just what he did in 2009. After working ''in concert with state lawmakers,'' he should simply sign on the dotted line requesting the $830 million in federal education funds that remain available a few months longer for local Texas schools.

In 2009, the State used $3.25 billion emergency education funds only to replace State funding, thereby denying an opportunity to support improvements in the quality of public education. That is why last year, our Delegation acted to prevent history from repeating itself. We worked with Texas superintendents and education organizations representing tens of thousands of Texas teachers, principals, school boards, and school administrators to craft legislative language ensuring this new emergency education funding actually helps Texas schoolchildren.

The additional protections that our Delegation authored simply ensure that federal funds are not once again used only to replace State education support. This new federal law offers Texas State officials the flexibility to cut, maintain, or increase State education support, but prohibits any further shell games with federal education dollars at the expense of our local schools.

Last summer, the Governor Perry told the Department of Education that Texas planned to eventually complete the proper application for these funds, but no such application has been forthcoming. After so long, with so much at stake, Texas students deserve better. We again urge the Governor to sign the three-page application so that our Texas schools will receive the federal aid that Congress has provided to be used solely for public education.

Lloyd Doggett; Gene Green; Rubén Hinojosa; Henry Cuellar; Charlie Gonzalez; Al Green; Silvestre Reyes; Eddie Bernice Johnson; Sheila Jackson Lee.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. The gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) had an amendment which she is going to withdraw. I want to enter into a very brief colloquy in which she can explain what her amendment attempted to do, and then we are not going to offer it.

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I had offered and that I am withdrawing has to do with the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.

The reason it is so critical to the people in Hawaii is that it is not like any other block grant. It really fulfills a trust obligation which this Congress created in 1920 by way of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. That act recognized that it was necessary to return native Hawaiians to the land for the preservation of their culture, their traditions and their values. What the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant did was actually facilitate that. It is a very successful program, nonpartisan in Hawaii, one that our Republican Governor considers to be her legacy and one that has done exactly—exactly—what we want to see these grants do.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentlelady for withdrawing her amendment so we may proceed with the next speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0320

AMENDMENT NO. 540 OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

DIVISION A—FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes, namely:

SECTION 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at the level specified in subsection (c) and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2010, for each account, program, project, or activity (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–80).

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–117).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–118).

(4) The Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–85).

(5) The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2010 (division C of Public Law 111–117).

(6) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–83).

(7) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (division A of Public Law 111–88).

(8) The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (division D of Public Law 111–117).

(9) The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2010 (division A of Public Law 111–68).

(10) The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (division A of Public Law 111–117).

(11) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (division E of Public Law 111–117).

(12) The Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2010 (division F of Public Law 111–117).

(13) Section 102(c) (except the last proviso relating to waiver of fees) of chapter 1 of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–212) that addresses guaranteed loans in the rural housing insurance fund.

(14) The appropriation under the heading ''Department of Commerce—United States Patent and Trademark Office'' in the United States Patent and Trademark Office Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–224).

(b) For purposes of this division, the term ''level'' means an amount.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the level referred to in subsection (a) shall be, with respect to the amounts appropriated in the appropriations Acts referred to in the following paragraphs of such subsection, including transfers and obligation limitations, equal to the following percentage of such amounts:

(A) In paragraph (1), 69.18 percent.

(B) In paragraphs (2) and (14), 79.77 percent.

(C) In paragraph (3), 101.30 percent.

(D) In paragraph (4), 89 percent.

(E) In paragraph (5), 81.25 percent.

(F) In paragraph (6), 95.26 percent.

(G) In paragraph (7), 80.94 percent.

(H) In paragraph (8), 82.66 percent.

(I) In paragraph (9), 93.69 percent.

(J) In paragraphs (10) and (13), 71.4 percent.

(K) In paragraph (11)—

(i) 100 percent, with respect to amounts made available for the Veterans Benefits Administration and the Veterans Health Administration; and

(ii) 96.19 percent, with respect to all other amounts.

(L) In paragraph (12)—

(i) 100 percent, with respect to amounts made available for Israel; and

(ii) 88.08 percent, with respect to all other amounts.

(2) Such level shall not include any amount previously designated as an emergency requirement and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to sections 403(a) and 423(b) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(3) Such level shall be calculated without regard to any rescission or cancellation of funds or contract authority.

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Appropriations provided by this division that, in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2010, carried a multiple-year or no-year period of availability shall retain a comparable period of availability.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this division, the requirements, authorities, conditions, limitations, and other provisions of the appropriations Acts referred to in section 101(a) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106.

SEC. 105. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were

specifically prohibited during fiscal year 2010.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this division or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this division shall be available through September 30, 2011.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111–242), shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization provided by this division.

SEC. 108. Funds appropriated by this division may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 109. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2010, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, the levels established by section 101 shall be the amounts necessary to maintain program levels under current law and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2010.

(b) In addition to the amounts otherwise provided by section 101, the following amounts shall be available for the following accounts for advance payments for the first quarter of fiscal year 2012:

(1) ''Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners'', for benefit payments under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, $41,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(2) ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Grants to States for Medicaid'', for payments to States or in the case of section 1928 on behalf of States under title XIX of the Social Security Act, $86,445,289,000, to remain available until expended.

(3) ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for Child Support Enforcement and Family Support Programs'', for payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV–D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), $1,200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(4) ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for Foster Care and Permanency'', for payments to States or other non-Federal entities under title IV–E of the Social Security Act, $1,850,000,000.

(5) ''Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Income Program'', for benefit payments under title XVI of the Social Security Act, $13,400,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 110. Amounts incorporated by reference in this division that were previously designated as available for overseas deployments and other activities pursuant to S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, are designated as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 3(c)(2) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress).

SEC. 111. Any language specifying an earmark in an appropriations Act for fiscal year 2010, or in a committee report or joint explanatory statement accompanying such an Act, shall have no legal effect with respect to funds appropriated by this division. For purposes of this section, the term ''earmark'' means a congressional earmark or congressionally directed spending item, as defined in clause 9(e) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and paragraph 5(a) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding section 101, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this division or any other Act (including division A of this Act) may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

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

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 113. (a)(1) Notwithstanding section 101, except as provided in paragraph (2), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this division or any other Act (including division A of this Act) may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or effective control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the certification described in subsection (b) by not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary of Defense to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction. The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress promptly upon issuance of any such order.

(b) The certification described in this subsection is a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that the government of the foreign country or the recognized leadership of the foreign entity to which the individual detained at Guantanamo is to be transferred—

(1) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(2) maintains effective control over each detention facility in which an individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(3) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(4) has agreed to take effective steps to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(5) has taken such steps as the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or re-engage in any terrorist activity; and

(6) has agreed to share any information with the United States that—

(A) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(B) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this division or any other Act (including division A of this Act) may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or effective control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual who was detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, at any time after September 11, 2001, who was transferred to the foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in any terrorist activity.

(2) The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that such a transfer is in the national security interests of the United States and includes, as part of the certification described in subsection (b) relating to such transfer, the determination of the Secretary under this paragraph.

(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction. The Secretary shall notify Congress promptly upon issuance of any such order.

(d) For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual who is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

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

(B) is—

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

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

(2) The term ''foreign terrorist organization'' means any organization so designated by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

SEC. 114. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division or any other Act (including division A of this Act) may be used to construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

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

(2) is—

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

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

SEC. 115. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division or any other Act (including division A of this Act) may be obligated by any covered executive agency in contravention of the certification requirement of section 6(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as included in the revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation pursuant to such section.

SEC. 116. Section 550(b) of Public Law 109–295, as amended by section 550 of Public Law 111–83, shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for ''October 4, 2010''.

SEC. 117. Section 1(b)(2) of the Passport Act of June 4, 1920 (22 U.S.C. 214(b)(2)) shall be

applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for ''September 30, 2010''.

SEC. 118. (a) Section 1115(d) of Public Law 111–32 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for ''October 1, 2010''.

(b) Section 824(g) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4064(g)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for ''October 1, 2010'' in paragraph (2).

(c) Section 61(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2733(a)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for ''October 1, 2010'' in paragraph (2).

(d) Section 625(j)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2385(j)(1)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for ''October 1, 2010'' in subparagraph (B).

SEC. 119. The authority provided by section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) shall remain in effect through the date specified in section 106 of this division.

SEC. 120. The provisions of title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11311 et seq.) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding section 209 of such Act, through the earlier of: (1) the date specified in section 106 of this division; or (2) the date of the enactment into law of an authorization Act relating to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

DIVISION B—STIMULUS RESCISSIONS

SEC. 201. (a) There are hereby rescinded all unobligated balances remaining available as of February 11, 2011, of the discretionary appropriations provided by division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5).

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to funds appropriated or otherwise made available to Offices of Inspector General and the Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board by division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5).

SEC. 202. Hereafter, no Federal agency administering funds provided by division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) may provide funding or reimbursement to any entity awarded funds from such Act for the cost associated with physical signage or other advertisement indicating that a project is funded by such Act.

DIVISION C—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 4001. [Here insert the text of section 4001 in the pending text, as perfected, such that the matter proposed to be inserted under the heading SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT is identical to the matter proposed to be stricken under that heading.]

This Act may be cited as the ''Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the Chair very much.

We have agreed informally that we are going to reduce the time on this to 20 minutes, 10 minutes per side, and I will move expeditiously through it.

There was a little issue with the drafting that will be addressed later in the debate, and I may have a motion at the end of my discussion.

I am honored to be joined in this amendment by Mr. GIBSON and Mr. DENT.

I hate across-the-board cuts. I really don't support across-the-board cuts; but I've got to tell you that this CR, as it currently stands, is the byproduct of the fact that we didn't get any appropriations bills done last year and that we have a deadline of March 4. I don't think the chairman of the full committee likes very much the CR that we are considering. If he did, he wouldn't have been required to write it three times in order to get the bill to the floor.

As for the salient points, the substitute that we are presenting tonight is a deeper cut than the base bill. The base bill is advertised as saving, I believe, $106 billion. This amendment cuts $120 billion. It adopts numbers on Defense, MILCON, Homeland, Israel, Gitmo; the earmarks are gone; the stimulus money is back.

To my Republican friends, I would say that, if this debate is really about the number, this is a bigger number, $120 billion, as opposed to $100 billion. If it's about social engineering, then you'll vote ''no'' on this particular amendment.

To my Democratic friends, I say we just can't give speeches about, well, we would like to cut stuff, but we just want to cut this stuff, and we don't want to cut that stuff.

The President's vision of a freeze was a bold strategy in 1995 when I got here. It's a failed strategy in 2011. This particular substitute restores NEA, CPB, Food for Peace, CDBG, but with shared, across-the-board sacrifice. I would ask our Members to consider it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, it really pains me to not be able to help my friend from Ohio, who is a valued member of the Appropriations Committee, who was an outstanding member of the Interior Subcommittee when I was chairman, and who I enjoy working with very much.

The LaTourette amendment would cut from the FY10 levels: 31 percent from Agriculture; 20 percent from CJS; 11 percent from Energy and Water; 19 percent from Financial Services; 5 percent from Homeland Security; 19 percent from Interior; 17 percent from Labor-HHS; 6 percent from the Legislative Branch; 12 percent from State, Foreign Operations; and 30 percent from Transportation.

Unfortunately, in addition, the amendment fails to incorporate for Afghanistan and Iraq operations provided by section 101(8) of the first continuing resolution. Omitting this provision effectively cuts Department of Defense contingency funding by nearly $30 billion. As a result, the amendment vastly underfunds DOD requirements for fiscal year 2011. It would preclude effective conduct of operations and put deployed troops at risk.

The amendment would also harm job growth.

For example, in the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee, the LaTourette amendment would cut nearly 30 percent, or more than $20 billion, from programs and activities under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. This would lead to a part-time air traffic control system by cutting over $2.8 billion from the FAA operations; cause severe reductions in service and work layoffs for Amtrak; and finally, this amendment would provide fewer resources for transportation safety overnight.

The amendment also leads to the loss of 650,000 vouchers for low-income families, and it cuts nearly $500 million from homeless assistance programs. In addition, it would threaten the ongoing recovery of the housing market by grossly underfunding the resource needs of the Federal Housing Administration.

The LaTourette amendment would also affect our domestic security by requiring the Department of Homeland Security to lay off crucial staff we have hired over the past 2 years, which includes Border Patrol agents, CBP officers at the ports of entry, ICE investigators along the Southwest border, and Secret Service agents to respond to the heightened threats against the President.

Finally, like other amendments that have already been rejected by this body, the LaTourette amendment puts OMB in charge, concedes the congressional authority on an across-the-board basis, and also takes out all the money in the CR for anomalies.

I urge all Members to reject the LaTourette amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the distinguished ranking member for the kind words. I think your speech has gotten me votes from progressives and conservatives in the same speech, so I appreciate that very much.

I now yield 2 minutes to one of my partners in crime here, a new Member of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is about jobs, fiscal responsibility and about doing what is right. A $1.65 trillion deficit. An over $14 trillion debt. We are on the path to bankruptcy, and we have got to change course.

Now, as someone who until last year was protecting our cherished way of life by serving in the United States Army, I've got to tell you that I don't see this as a partisan issue. Both parties got us into this mess, and we're going to need leadership now to get out. This has become the generational issue of our time, and we need to begin to move towards a balanced budget and fiscal responsibility, and everything needs to be on the table.

My family took the first cut. To lead by example, we're giving back to the U.S. Treasury my pension—that I earned.

This substitute amendment was intended to be a nonpartisan approach to an American issue: cuts across the board; Democratic and Republican priorities treated the same in this CR; rolling back to 2008 levels rather than eliminating programs outright in the CR. There will be time for those kinds of investigations later on in the budget process and in committees where programs can be singled out for deeper potential cuts and long-term structural changes.

As has been pointed out, in the process of writing this, there were some technical issues with it that we regret; but the point of this substitute amendment remains the same, that this is an American issue. We both have to come together to solve this. We're going to have to get our fiscal house in order, and to do that, many steps are going to be necessary, and among them is rolling back spending.

Americans today are wondering whether or not we're going to do the right thing and whether or not we're going to cut that spending and whether or not our best days are in front of us. That choice is up to us—and we will get it right.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. It really is a substitute amendment, and it's an across-the-board cut. This body has spent many late nights all this week debating a yearlong CR which makes targeted spending decisions and weighs the pros and cons of each and every program in the Federal Government, and I think the House has done itself proud this week in that work.

Under an open process, each Member has had the ability to weigh in and make their imprints on the bill through the consideration of literally hundreds of amendments—the embodiment of the democratic ideal. Adoption of this substitute proposal, however, would wipe out everything we've done this whole week. Every amendment adopted would be gone. Every calculated decision would be forgotten. Rather, the amendment would replace our hard-fought spending decisions by taking the easy way out, by making no real decisions at all, by punting the ball to OMB and the bureaucrats instead of making the decisions our electorate elected us to make.

□ 0330

The across-the-board nature of the amendment's cuts provides no opportunity for discretion. It punishes or rewards without regard to merit. For example, under this amendment, the FBI's operations would be cut by $1.5 billion. A reduction of that magnitude would result in the layoff of thousands of agents, undermining our ability to prevent terrorist attacks and to investigate the most serious Federal crimes.

The amendment fails to include the $33 billion in DOD emergency funding for troops overseas, which was passed separately last year. The Department of Homeland Security would be cut an additional $1 billion below H.R. 1, forcing the reduction of Border Patrol agents, ICE agents and active duty Coast Guard personnel.

While activities important to our national security would be unduly cut, other wasteful programs, as well as programs that put a regulatory stranglehold on our economy, are rewarded simply because they exist:

The Census Bureau would continue to receive funding at the decennial FY10 level even though its needs are significantly reduced in FY11, giving the Census Bureau a $4.5 billion slush fund and no reason for having it.

While H.R. 1 cuts $3 billion from the EPA and specifically targets that agency's climate change program funds, this amendment would provide the EPA with ample funding to continue in their anti-business regulatory regime.

While some may feel that proportionately distributing cuts will proportionately distribute the sacrifices, they couldn't be more wrong. Instead, the amendment writes a check, and let's the administration fund their priorities while the Congress sits on the sidelines, leaving the American people saddled with the results.

Congress has a responsibility to make tough choices and to provide the oversight of each department and of each program through the power of the purse. The amendment before us abdicates that responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the distinguished chairman for his remarks, and I congratulate him on his hard work this week.

However, I would note that this amendment was in order during the reading of the table of contents, and as a courtesy to the committee, we didn't offer it then. We all could have been home on Tuesday at about 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

It is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I want to commend Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. GIBSON on their efforts in drafting this amendment.

Notwithstanding any technical drafting errors that may affect $30 billion, I think it is important that we have this discussion.

The intent of this amendment is to help restore funding to programs that have been zeroed out and to then better balance these cuts. Ordinarily, I would agree with the chairman and Mr. LATOURETTE that we would not want to engage in across-the-board cuts; but given where we are in this fiscal year 2011 process, I think we should embrace this policy, better balance these cuts in a way that I think is a bit more equitable, use the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process for oversight to make further revisions, then discuss zeroing out or, in a more discriminating manner, deal with those programs that should be cut even more substantially.

This amendment will help restore programs like LIHEAP, CSBG, CDBG, which are programs that have been substantially reduced, and others that have been zeroed out. So that is why I believe it is important that we adopt this amendment.

Again, I commend Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. GIBSON for their efforts.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. It is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to a new Member of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I want to thank Mr. LATOURETTE for his work. I also want to thank the chairman in the appropriations process and also the leadership for being able to come out and really have an open discussion about what's going on.

The spirit of the amendment wasn't to necessarily pick winners and losers or to zero out programs; and as much as I do not like the idea of across-the-board cuts, I do think that the American public right now is thinking, ''How can we tighten our belts?''

The American people have tightened their belts. American businesses have tightened their belts. The Federal Government should be no different. Everything has to be on the table. The Department of Defense has to be on the table. We have to rein that in. We have

to rein in every single department, and we know we have to do it without putting people in harm's way.

This technical problem that has just surfaced in the amendment is certainly going to be problematic, but the spirit, the intent, of this amendment was to make sure that we are preserving some of what, I think, many on the other side would consider to be very important programs and what many of the independents in our Nation would consider to be appropriate programs—and important to them.

We want to let the 2012 appropriations process go through the appropriate channels, and we want to make sure we make our cuts at that point in time, so I would just urge my colleagues to keep that in mind as we move forward.

Mr. DICKS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to another fine Member, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we are now 6 months into our fiscal year, and we have not been able to pass a dozen or more individual appropriations bills within that time. We inherited a spending regime, but we have a mandate from the American people to cut spending. We must do it equitably, fairly and quickly; and I think that Mr. LATOURETTE has come up with an amendment which has a really fair way of doing this:

Don't zero out programs without hearings. Don't pick winners and losers. Don't do this without having the proper hearings and oversight. By reducing our discretionary programs at the same rate across the board, we don't risk alienating future priorities or vulnerable constituencies that may receive funding which is at risk of being terminated.

The chairman of Appropriations and this whole body have done a great job in looking at all of this, and I think we will come out with something that we will all be very proud of. The LaTourette amendment offers another way to do just that.

Mr. DICKS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. May I inquire as to how much time I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. Both the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Washington have 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Which is really 3 minutes remaining. So, if it's all right, I would like to yield 1 minute, and then I will notify the distinguished ranking member that I will take the last 2 minutes and close.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the oldest returning freshman—a freshman in 1995 and again in 2011.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank my colleague from Ohio for such a wonderful introduction.

I want to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the members of the committee for all their hard work.

Cutting programs to zero in the middle of a fiscal year may be good legislative policy, but it isn't really all that practical. We need to address the future size and scope of government in the normal, regular order of the appropriations process. The LaTourette amendment makes us meet our spending reduction goals, but does it in a way that is simple and is fair and is effective and is practical.

I support the LaTourette amendment because I think it is ''the'' vehicle that will actually do what we want to do, which is to cut spending now and then get on with the regular appropriations process, in which we can give these agencies the kind of oversight they need so that we will make the right decisions.

So I urge the support and adoption of the LaTourette amendment.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I would notify the distinguished ranking member that I'm the last speaker, and I'm going to consume our last 2 minutes—so have at it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

□ 0340

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague for yielding me this time.

It has been suggested by more than one person, not just today but also a moment ago, that we are headed towards a cliff in terms of our financial circumstances. It could take our country to bankruptcy and create a circumstance from which we would, perhaps, never come back.

To suggest that this substitute makes sense really baffles me. I've been told by the Speaker that the gentleman from Ohio is a very thoughtful Member and will contribute a great deal to our committee, which he has and is; but across-the-board cutting in an effort to make sense out of our spending process makes no sense at all. We are elected to look at the whole mix and to pick winners and losers, to decide what programs should be cut significantly, and to decide which ones should be eliminated. Indeed, that is part of our work.

In this substitute, essentially we are taking all the work we've done these last several days and kicking it out the door. These efforts on the amendments were not worth any time at all. We shouldn't have been here these last several days. If this amendment is successful, there is just one thing that it does that is bothersome to me but which illustrates the point:

This amendment would provide $1 billion below our CR in terms of Homeland Security. That is 2.6 percent lower in funding for those people who are protecting the border. To suggest by way of this substitute that we can eliminate 1,000 of those people who are on the border is ludicrous in my judgment.

Indeed, it is our responsibility to select winners and losers, and this substitute is a waste of our time if we are serious about changing the direction of our country. So I would strongly oppose this substitute.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have 2 minutes remaining; is that right?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, I've got 2 minutes, so I'm going to yield myself the balance of my time.

I certainly don't wish to waste anybody's time, but I've sat through a lot of interesting debate over the last 3 or 4 days, and my time has been wasted plenty with silly things like not wanting to pay for the repairs at the White House, but we went through that exercise today.

This was a serious attempt to talk about shared sacrifice and the belief that, in some parts of the country, some programs are more popular than others. So our belief was, if we're going to have shared sacrifice, everybody should be in the game. We shouldn't pick programs the Republicans like and keep them and pick programs that Democrats like and be done with them.

Now, I do want to take one second to talk about this defense number—because I drafted this thing. I'm not the sharpest knife in the drawer, but I've got to tell you that it was never our intent to not carry over the emergency supplemental. The information that we had is that the language included in the substitute did, in fact, by indicating that we were not dealing with emergency spending and referencing section 423 of the supplemental, accomplish that purpose. I'm told by much brighter people than I that we didn't do that, so I apologize for that drafting error.

Having said that, let me tell you, I'm not going to apologize for taking 20 minutes out of 80 hours—or whatever we had here—to talk about the vision of some people on our side who don't think this bill represents shared sacrifice.

In Cleveland, Ohio, people listen to the radio, and some of them like to listen to NPR. We don't think that that should be zeroed out. In Cleveland, Ohio, some people value the arts, and we don't think that there should be a tremendous cut to the National Endowment for the Arts. In Cleveland, Ohio, we build our communities with the Community Development Block Grant, and we don't think it should get a 66 percent cut. As Americans, we happen to value the Food for Peace program, which not only feeds hungry people all across the world, but is really the last bastion, if we're going to talk about jobs around here, the merchant mariner, it's one of that merchant mariner's lifelines for employment.

So I don't make any apologies for taking 20 minutes out of your busy

lives to talk about this vision and why some of us wish that both sides would get together, not have the sacred cows that keep us from reaching a conclusion on this thing, and work this thing out.

I guess I'm apologizing for being the last person; but in light of the defense number, I don't want to put my young lambs at risk of some stupid political ad that says they sponsored something that cut $33 billion from the Defense Department of this great country.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chair, I support the amendment offered by my colleague from Ohio, Representative LATOURETTE.

I do believe the time has come for Congress to address a federal deficit that will exceed $1 trillion for the third consecutive year.

I do agree that the total dollar amount cut by the underlying bill is appropriate and represents a move toward fiscal responsibility.

The amendment under consideration shows the same commitment to fiscal responsibility; in fact, it cuts more spending than the underlying bill.

Beyond that, the amendment spreads the spending cuts across all non-security federal programs for the remainder of 2011.

No programs are eliminated, and with limited exceptions, no non-security spending is left untouched.

Meeting our financial crisis will entail sacrifice from many quarters, and this amendment shares that sacrifice broadly across our entire discretionary spending budget.

Beyond this year, an across-the-board cut provides a better point of departure for the 2012 appropriations process which will begin shortly.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 273 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 154 by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 273 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) 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 189, noes 233, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

AYES—189

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—233

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Costello
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Smith (TX)
Stark
Wilson (FL)

□ 0406

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 187, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

AYES—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Costello
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Smith (TX)
Stark
Wilson (FL)

□ 0409

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 144 and 145, I was unfortunately detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011''.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, 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. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 92, reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HEINRICH. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Heinrich moves to recommit H.R. 1 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title VIII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Department of Education, Departmental Management, Program Administration'', and increasing the amount made available for ''Department of Education, Student Financial Assistance'' (and the amount made available under such heading for subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965), by $39,000,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, Americans need jobs.

Up until now, Republicans have ignored this problem, and now they're making it worse. Our Nation's large and unsustainable budget deficit is staring us in the face, but it is at critical moments like this when we must approach our Nation's greatest challenges with responsibility and prudence. The approach we take must focus on responsible cuts, which will have a lasting impact on the deficit, not arbitrary short-term cuts to programs that are needed to prepare the next generation of American workers and taxpayers.

Consider the effects of the bill before us on Specialist John Carabillo from my home State of New Mexico. Specialist Carabillo served in the Army for 6 years, and he was deployed to Iraq twice during his service. He then enlisted with the National Guard, and served an additional tour in Iraq.

After returning to New Mexico, Specialist Carabillo decided he wanted to go back to school and earn his degree in IT. The Pell Grant scholarships and GI benefits Specialist Carabillo receives have allowed him to enroll in an associate's program at a vocational school. When he graduates, he hopes to find an IT job at Kirtland Air Force Base.

The Republican bill would cut Specialist Carabillo's Pell Grant scholarship. This cut in his financial aid means that he will have to take fewer courses this year and graduate later, try to take a loan he can't afford or drop out of school.

Specialist Carabillo is not alone.

If students who rely on college aid from the Pell Grant program drop out of school, America runs the risk of dropping out of first place in the world economy.

This motion to recommit would be a downpayment to restore Specialist Carabillo's future. Simply put, this motion to recommit would transfer funds from the Department of Education administration to fund Pell Grant scholarships at the current level.

My amendment to restore these scholarships won't add a penny to the deficit. In fact, this MTR is paid for by cutting salaries and expenses at the Department of Education, which takes it back to fiscal year 2008 levels.

So this motion to recommit calls on the House to make a choice. Do we want responsible, measured spending cuts or reckless ones? Do we want cuts to come at the expense of middle class America or corporate special interests? Do we want a weaker America that cuts education or a stronger America that competes and wins in the global economy? Whose side are we on?

We say: We're on the side of American jobs. We're on the side of American education. We're on the side of working families and their sons and daughters.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, it is time to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his reservation of the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member rise in opposition to the motion?

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 238, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

AYES—186

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

□ 0433

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to speak out of order.)

RECOGNIZING JOHN BLAZEY

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the entire staff of the House Appropriations Committee for the fantastic work that they have done.

No one better exemplifies those qualities than Mr. John Blazey. One of the best moves we made was to steal him away from the Senate Budget Committee.

Next week, Blazey will end his 20-year career with the committee, where he worked on five different subcommittees, and holds the distinction of having been named the Transportation subcommittee staff director at the youngest age. His knowledge of process and substance is matched only by his style and parties.

Blazey—and his elf costume—will be missed.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Let me associate myself with the remarks of my friend in thanking John Blazey for his long tenure and service here in this great body.

Best wishes for the future.

To all the rest of you, I think you've done yourselves proud this week. I think the House distinguished itself, and I thank you, especially this terrific staff that made all of this happen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 189, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Stark
Wilson (FL)

□ 0440

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. DAVID SCOTT, Georgia (in lieu of Representative AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, House Democratic Leader:

FEBRUARY 18, 2011.

HON. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 4(b) of House Resolution 5, 111th Congress, I am writing to appoint the following members to the House Democracy Partnership:

The Honorable Susan Davis of California (in lieu of the Honorable Donald Payne of New Jersey).

The Honorable Gwen Moore of Wisconsin (in lieu of the Honorable Allyson Schwartz of Pennsylvania).

Thank you for your attention to these appointments.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic Leader.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. QUAYLE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of the death of his father-in-law, Mr. Dale Crane.

Ms. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official travel.

Mr. PETERS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 8 p.m. on account of family medical emergency.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 266. An act to redesignate the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge as the Sam D. Hamilton Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 307. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the ''W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 365. An act to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 17,

112th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, February 28, 2011, at 2 p.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constition of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> 'I, AB, do solemnly swear (or Affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.'

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 112th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

1 Jo Bonner
2 Martha Roby
3 Mike Rogers
4 Robert B. Aderholt
5 Mo Brooks
6 Spencer Bachus
7 Terri A. Sewell

ALASKA

At Large, Don Young

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega

ARIZONA

1 Paul A. Gosar
2 Trent Franks
3 Benjamin Quayle
4 Ed Pastor
5 David Schweikert
6 Jeff Flake
7 Raúl M. Grijalva
8 Gabrielle Giffords

ARKANSAS

1 Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford
2 Tim Griffin
3 Steve Womack
4 Mike Ross

CALIFORNIA

1 Mike Thompson
2 Wally Herger
3 Daniel E. Lungren
4 Tom McClintock
5 Doris O. Matsui
6 Lynn C. Woolsey
7 George Miller
8 Nancy Pelosi
9 Barbara Lee
10 John Garamendi
11 Jerry McNerney
12 Jackie Speier
13 Fortney Pete Stark
14 Anna G. Eshoo
15 Michael M. Honda
16 Zoe Lofgren
17 Sam Farr
18 Dennis A. Cardoza
19 Jeff Denham
20 Jim Costa
21 Devin Nunes
22 Kevin McCarthy
23 Lois Capps
24 Elton Gallegly
25 Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon
26 David Dreier
27 Brad Sherman
28 Howard L. Berman
29 Adam B. Schiff
30 Henry A. Waxman
31 Xavier Becerra
32 Judy Chu
33 Karen Bass
34 Lucille Roybal-Allard
35 Maxine Waters
36 Jane Harman
37 Laura Richardson
38 Grace F. Napolitano
39 Linda T. Sánchez
40 Edward R. Royce
41 Jerry Lewis
42 Gary G. Miller
43 Joe Baca
44 Ken Calvert
45 Mary Bono Mack
46 Dana Rohrabacher
47 Loretta Sanchez
48 John Campbell
49 Darrell E. Issa
50 Brian P. Bilbray
51 Bob Filner
52 Duncan Hunter
53 Susan A. Davis

COLORADO

1 Diana DeGette
2 Jared Polis
3 Scott R. Tipton
4 Cory Gardner
5 Doug Lamborn
6 Mike Coffman
7 Ed Perlmutter

CONNECTICUT

1 John B. Larson
2 Joe Courtney
3 Rosa L. DeLauro
4 James A. Himes
5 Christopher S. Murphy

DELAWARE

At Large, John C. Carney Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton

FLORIDA

1 Jeff Miller
2 Steve Southerland II
3 Corrine Brown
4 Ander Crenshaw
5 Richard B. Nugent
6 Cliff Stearns
7 John L. Mica
8 Daniel Webster
9 Gus M. Bilirakis
10 C. W. Bill Young
11 Kathy Castor
12 Dennis A. Ross
13 Vern Buchanan
14 Connie Mack
15 Bill Posey
16 Thomas J. Rooney
17 Frederica S. Wilson
18 Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
19 Theodore E. Deutch
20 Debbie Wasserman Schultz
21 Mario Diaz-Balart
22 Allen B. West
23 Alcee L. Hastings
24 Sandy Adams
25 David Rivera

GEORGIA

1 Jack Kingston
2 Sanford D. Bishop Jr.
3 Lynn A. Westmoreland
4 Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson Jr.
5 John Lewis
6 Tom Price
7 Rob Woodall
8 Austin Scott
9 Tom Graves
10 Paul C. Broun
11 Phil Gingrey
12 John Barrow
13 David Scott

GUAM

Delegate, Madeleine Z. Bordallo

HAWAII

1 Colleen W. Hanabusa
2 Mazie K. Hirono

IDAHO

1 Raúl R. Labrador
2 Michael K. Simpson

ILLINOIS

1 Bobby L. Rush
2 Jesse L. Jackson Jr.
3 Daniel Lipinski
4 Luis V. Gutierrez
5 Mike Quigley
6 Peter J. Roskam
7 Danny K. Davis
8 Joe Walsh
9 Janice D. Schakowsky
10 Robert J. Dold
11 Adam Kinzinger
12 Jerry F. Costello
13 Judy Biggert
14 Randy Hultgren
15 Timothy V. Johnson
16 Donald A. Manzullo
17 Robert T. Schilling
18 Aaron Schock
19 John Shimkus

INDIANA

1 Peter J. Visclosky
2 Joe Donnelly
3 Marlin A. Stutzman
4 Todd Rokita
5 Dan Burton
6 Mike Pence
7 André Carson
8 Larry Bucshon
9 Todd C. Young

IOWA

1 Bruce L. Braley
2 David Loebsack
3 Leonard L. Boswell
4 Tom Latham
5 Steve King

KANSAS

1 Tim Huelskamp
2 Lynn Jenkins
3 Kevin Yoder
4 Mike Pompeo

KENTUCKY

1 Ed Whitfield
2 Brett Guthrie
3 John A. Yarmuth
4 Geoff Davis
5 Harold Rogers
6 Ben Chandler

LOUISIANA

1 Steve Scalise
2 Cedric L. Richmond
3 Jeffrey M. Landry
4 John Fleming
5 Rodney Alexander
6 Bill Cassidy
7 Charles W. Boustany Jr.

MAINE

1 Chellie Pingree
2 Michael H. Michaud

MARYLAND

1 Andy Harris
2 C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger

3 John P. Sarbanes
4 Donna F. Edwards
5 Steny H. Hoyer
6 Roscoe G. Bartlett
7 Elijah E. Cummings
8 Chris Van Hollen

MASSACHUSETTS

1 John W. Olver
2 Richard E. Neal
3 James P. McGovern
4 Barney Frank
5 Niki Tsongas
6 John F. Tierney
7 Edward J. Markey
8 Michael E. Capuano
9 Stephen F. Lynch
10 William R. Keating

MICHIGAN

1 Dan Benishek
2 Bill Huizenga
3 Justin Amash
4 Dave Camp
5 Dale E. Kildee
6 Fred Upton
7 Tim Walberg
8 Mike Rogers
9 Gary C. Peters
10 Candice S. Miller
11 Thaddeus G. McCotter
12 Sander M. Levin
13 Hansen Clarke
14 John Conyers Jr.
15 John D. Dingell

MINNESOTA

1 Timothy J. Walz
2 John Kline
3 Erik Paulsen
4 Betty McCollum
5 Keith Ellison
6 Michele Bachmann
7 Collin C. Peterson
8 Chip Cravaack

MISSISSIPPI

1 Alan Nunnelee
2 Bennie G. Thompson
3 Gregg Harper
4 Steven M. Palazzo

MISSOURI

1 Wm. Lacy Clay
2 W. Todd Akin
3 Russ Carnahan
4 Vicky Hartzler
5 Emanuel Cleaver
6 Sam Graves
7 Billy Long
8 Jo Ann Emerson
9 Blaine Luetkemeyer

MONTANA

At Large, Denny Rehberg

NEBRASKA

1 Jeff Fortenberry
2 Lee Terry
3 Adrian Smith

NEVADA

1 Shelley Berkley
2 Dean Heller
3 Joseph J. Heck

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1 Frank C. Guinta
2 Charles F. Bass

NEW JERSEY

1 Robert E. Andrews
2 Frank A. LoBiondo
3 Jon Runyan
4 Christopher H. Smith
5 Scott Garrett
6 Frank Pallone Jr.
7 Leonard Lance
8 Bill Pascrell Jr.
9 Steven R. Rothman
10 Donald M. Payne
11 Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
12 Rush D. Holt
13 Albio Sires

NEW MEXICO

1 Martin Heinrich
2 Stevan Pearce
3 Ben Ray Luján

NEW YORK

1 Timothy H. Bishop
2 Steve Israel
3 Peter T. King
4 Carolyn McCarthy
5 Gary L. Ackerman
6 Gregory W. Meeks
7 Joseph Crowley
8 Jerrold Nadler
9 Anthony D. Weiner
10 Edolphus Towns
11 Yvette D. Clarke
12 Nydia M. Velázquez
13 Michael G. Grimm
14 Carolyn B. Maloney
15 Charles B. Rangel
16 José E. Serrano
17 Eliot L. Engel
18 Nita M. Lowey
19 Nan A. S. Hayworth
20 Christopher P. Gibson
21 Paul Tonko
22 Maurice D. Hinchey
23 William L. Owens
24 Richard L. Hanna
25 Ann Marie Buerkle
26 Christopher John Lee
27 Brian Higgins
28 Louise McIntosh Slaughter
29 Tom Reed

NORTH CAROLINA

1 G. K. Butterfield
2 Renee L. Ellmers
3 Walter B. Jones
4 David E. Price
5 Virginia Foxx
6 Howard Coble
7 Mike McIntyre
8 Larry Kissell
9 Sue Wilkins Myrick
10 Patrick T. McHenry
11 Heath Shuler
12 Melvin L. Watt
13 Brad Miller

NORTH DAKOTA

At Large, Rick Berg

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Delegate, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan

OHIO

1 Steve Chabot
2 Jean Schmidt
3 Michael R. Turner
4 Jim Jordan
5 Robert E. Latta
6 Bill Johnson
7 Steve Austria
8 John A. Boehner
9 Marcy Kaptur
10 Dennis J. Kucinich
11 Marcia L. Fudge
12 Patrick J. Tiberi
13 Betty Sutton
14 Steven C. LaTourette
15 Steve Stivers
16 James B. Renacci
17 Tim Ryan
18 Bob Gibbs

OKLAHOMA

1 John Sullivan
2 Dan Boren
3 Frank D. Lucas
4 Tom Cole
5 James Lankford

OREGON

1 David Wu
2 Greg Walden
3 Earl Blumenauer
4 Peter A. DeFazio
5 Kurt Schrader

PENNSYLVANIA

1 Robert A. Brady
2 Chaka Fattah
3 Mike Kelly
4 Jason Altmire
5 Glenn Thompson
6 Jim Gerlach
7 Patrick Meehan
8 Michael G. Fitzpatrick
9 Bill Shuster
10 Tom Marino
11 Lou Barletta
12 Mark S. Critz
13 Allyson Y. Schwartz
14 Michael F. Doyle
15 Charles W. Dent
16 Joseph R. Pitts
17 Tim Holden
18 Tim Murphy
19 Todd Russell Platts

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner, Pedro R. Pierluisi

RHODE ISLAND

1 David N. Cicilline
2 James R. Langevin

SOUTH CAROLINA

1 Tim Scott
2 Joe Wilson
3 Jeff Duncan
4 Trey Gowdy
5 Mick Mulvaney
6 James E. Clyburn

SOUTH DAKOTA

At Large, Kristi L. Noem

TENNESSEE

1 David P. Roe
2 John J. Duncan Jr.
3 Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann
4 Scott DesJarlais
5 Jim Cooper
6 Diane Black
7 Marsha Blackburn
8 Stephen Lee Fincher
9 Steve Cohen

TEXAS

1 Louie Gohmert
2 Ted Poe
3 Sam Johnson
4 Ralph M. Hall
5 Jeb Hensarling
6 Joe Barton
7 John Abney Culberson
8 Kevin Brady
9 Al Green
10 Michael T. McCaul
11 K. Michael Conaway
12 Kay Granger
13 Mac Thornberry
14 Ron Paul
15 Rubén Hinojosa
16 Silvestre Reyes
17 Bill Flores
18 Sheila Jackson Lee
19 Randy Neugebauer
20 Charles A. Gonzalez
21 Lamar Smith
22 Pete Olson
23 Francisco ''Quico'' Canseco
24 Kenny Marchant
25 Lloyd Doggett
26 Michael C. Burgess
27 Blake Farenthold
28 Henry Cuellar
29 Gene Green
30 Eddie Bernice Johnson
31 John R. Carter
32 Pete Sessions

UTAH

1 Rob Bishop
2 Jim Matheson
3 Jason Chaffetz

VERMONT

At Large, Peter Welch

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Delegate, Donna M. Christensen

VIRGINIA

1 Robert J. Wittman

2 E. Scott Rigell
3 Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott
4 J. Randy Forbes
5 Robert Hurt
6 Bob Goodlatte
7 Eric Cantor
8 James P. Moran
9 H. Morgan Griffith
10 Frank R. Wolf
11 Gerald E. Connolly

WASHINGTON

1 Jay Inslee
2 Rick Larsen
3 Jaime Herrera Beutler
4 Doc Hastings
5 Cathy McMorris Rodgers
6 Norman D. Dicks
7 Jim McDermott
8 David G. Reichert
9 Adam Smith

WEST VIRGINIA

1 David B. McKinley
2 Shelley Moore Capito
3 Nick J. Rahall II

WISCONSIN

1 Paul Ryan
2 Tammy Baldwin
3 Ron Kind
4 Gwen Moore
5 F. James Sensenbrenner Jr.
6 Thomas E. Petri
7 Sean P. Duffy
8 Reid J. Ribble

WYOMING

At Large, Cynthia M. Lummis

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information.

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco ''Quico'' Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. ''Gerry'' Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. González, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A.S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie K. Hirono, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

558. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium and Potassium salts of N-alkyl (C8-C18)-beta-iminodipropionic acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0098; FRL-8861-9] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

559. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0982; FRL-8859-6] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

560. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — n-Octyl alcohol and n-Decyl alcohol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0181; FRL-8860-7] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

561. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — (S,S)-Ethylenediamine Disuccinic Acid Trisodium Salt; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0733; FRL-8860-6] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

562. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyprodinil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0385; FRL-8860-3] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

563. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Isobutane; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0676; FRL-8860-4] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

564. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bispyribac-sodium; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0796; FRL-8860-2] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

565. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revocation of Requirements for Full-Size Baby Cribs and Non-Full-Size Baby Cribs received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

566. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Additional Air Quality Designations for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards, 110(k)(6) Correction and Technical Correction Related to Prior Designation, and Decisions Related to the 1997 Air Quality Designations and Classifications for the Annual Fine Particles National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0562; EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0163; FRL-9261-3] (RIN: 2060-AQ30) received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

567. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination Of Attainment for PM10; Columbia Falls and Libby Nonattainment Areas, Montana [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0749; FRL-9260-6] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

568. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revision to Definitions; Construction Permit Program; Regulation 3 [EPA-R08-OAR-2007-1027; FRL-9251-1] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

569. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory, Reasonable Further Progress Plan, Contingency Measures, Reasonably Available Control Measures, and Transportation Conformity Budgets for the Pennsylvania Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City 1997 8-Hour Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0552; FRL-9262-7] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

570. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska: Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Permitting Authority and Tailoring Rule Revision [EPA-R10-OAR-2010-0921; FRL-9257-1] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

571. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Florida: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2010-0810; FRL-9262-2] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

572. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2009-0962; FRL-9261-9] received February 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 795. A bill to expand small-scale hydropower; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 796. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure that the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security trust funds are not included in a unified Federal budget and to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply payroll taxes to remuneration up to the contribution and benefit base and to remuneration in excess of $250,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey):

H.R. 798. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security and Medicare benefits under titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTRIA (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 799. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 800. A bill to make the E-verify program permanent, and to provide for penalties to enforce compliance with the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAVAACK (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 801. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to vehicle weight limitations applicable to the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 802. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a VetStar Award Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 803. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase vocational rehabilitation and employment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 804. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of certain veterans who serve in support of Operation New Dawn for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 805. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to educate certain staff of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to inform veterans about the Injured and Amputee Veterans Bill of Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 806. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 807. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the prohibition on collective bargaining with respect to matters and questions regarding compensation of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs other than rates of basic pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POLIS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 808. A bill to establish a Department of Peace; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 809. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to display in each facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs a Women Veterans Bill of Rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 810. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the tolling of the timing of review for appeals of final decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 811. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse certain volunteers who provide funeral honors details at the funerals of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 812. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 813. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the period of time for which a veteran must be totally disabled before the veteran's survivors are eligible for the benefits provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for survivors of certain veterans rated totally disabled at time of death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 814. A bill to provide Medicare payments to Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities for items and services provided to Medicare-eligible veterans for non-service-connected conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 815. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 816. A bill to prevent the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act from establishing health care provider standards of care in medical malpractice or medical product liability cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 817. A bill to amend the Antiquities Act of 1906 to place additional requirements on the establishment of national monuments under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 818. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 819. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 820. A bill to aid and support pediatric involvement in reading and education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida:

H.R. 821. A bill to require zero-based budgeting for departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 822. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. DENT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. LONG, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. GERLACH):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. DICKS):

H.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. WU, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 104. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 105. A resolution congratulating Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., on the historic milestone of 100 years of serving local and international communities, maintaining a commitment to the betterment of mankind, and enriching the lives of collegiate men throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H. Res. 106. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that defense systems, including the helicopter fleet used to transport the President of the United States, should not be procured, directly or indirectly, from an entity controlled, directed, or influenced by the Government of China; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H. Res. 107. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 823. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmen Castro Ramirez and J. Refugio Carreno Rojas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 824. A bill for the relief of Daniel Wachira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT OMITTED FROM THE RECORD OF FEBRUARY 14, 2011

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and

proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power . . . To borrow Money on the credit of the United States.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. AUSTRIA:

H.R. 799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. CRAVAACK:

H.R. 801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.R. 808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The preamble to the Constitution has the following injunction: ''. . . to promote domestic tranquility . . .'' This is the purpose of the bill.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress has power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers'' when the need exists to clarify existing law.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 and

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROSS of Florida:

H.R. 821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, Commerce Clause

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to ''establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization''. The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in Galvan v. Press, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954), ''that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government.'' And, as the Court found in Kleindienst v. Mandel, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972) (quoting Boutilier v. INS, 387 U.S. 118, 123 (1967)), ''[t]he Court without exception has sustained Congress' 'plenary power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden.' ''

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 42.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.J. Res. 43.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principle constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of Appropriations made by law . . .'' In addition, clause I of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .'' Together these specific Constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 5: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 10: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 24: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 27: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. REYES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 73: Mr. CANSECO, Mr. REYES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. STARK, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 96: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 104: Mr. UPTON and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 140: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 150: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 191: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 198: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 217: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 218: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 238: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 263: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 280: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 308: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 324: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 360: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 401: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 412: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 436: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 440: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 450: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 452: Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 456: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 458: Mr. STARK and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 459: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 484: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 509: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 535: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.

H.R. 539: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 546: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ISSA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 567: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 609: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 613: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 651: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 659: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 674: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 675: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 688: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 689: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 690: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 694: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 704: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 709: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 718: Mr. OWENS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 729: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 736: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 740: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 758: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 780: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 782: Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 783. Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 793: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TIPTON, and Ms. BUERKLE.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. HECK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. BUERKLE, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. BOREN and Mr. PETERSON.

H. Res. 25: Mr. HECK, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Res. 60: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Res. 81: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 88: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WELCH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SIRES, Mr. REYES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. WU, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H. Res. 90: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BACA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CANSECO, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. LEVIN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleague Congresswoman COLLEEN HANABUSA that would restore funding for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program.

The Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant is an authorized program under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act.

The block grant is used to carry out affordable housing activities for Native Hawaiian families who are eligible to reside on Hawaiian Home Lands, which were established in trust by the United States under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920.

In 1903, Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole was elected to serve as Hawaii's delegate to Congress. One of his most notable achievements was the passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, which set aside some 200,000 acres of land for Native Hawaiians. The reason for the legislation was the landless status of so many Native Hawaiians, who were displaced by newcomers to the islands and became the most disadvantaged population in their native land. Congress passed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, which is still in force, in recognition of its responsibility toward Native Hawaiians.

As with other indigenous people, Native Hawaiian views on land tenure were different from that of the newcomers, resulting in loss of much of the land that had been traditionally occupied and cultivated by Native Hawaiians to these newcomers.

Despite the good intentions of the Congress and the State of Hawaii, progress in meeting the goal of delivering land to native Hawaiians was slow. Most of the Hawaiian Homelands were located in areas far from jobs and infrastructure like roads and utilities, were nonexistent. There are currently 23,000 native Hawaiians on the waiting list for residential, farm or ranch lots. Some families have been on the waiting lists for decades.

I want to share the story of the Lincoln family. Aloysius Lincoln first applied for Hawaiian Home Lands in 1949. In 2006, a wait of 57 years, his daughter, Frances Segundo, claimed a lease for a Department of Hawaiian Home Lands home in Kapolei on the island of Oahu. Frances claimed the lease because her father had unfortunately passed away two years earlier. Frances herself was just a baby when her father signed up for the program.

The $13 million that the amendment restores to the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program provides the opportunity for Native Hawaiian families to live the dream of homeownership.

The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) is one of the most efficient users of funds provided under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act. The majority of these funds have been used for infrastructure development on Hawaiian Home Lands benefiting low-income residents. DHHL has also been able to use these funds to: Assist families in applying for FHA mortgage insurance and HUD loan guarantees; operate a direct loan program to provide new housing units and improve existing structures; support local housing and housing service providers such as Habitat for Humanity; and initiate highly successful pre- and post-purchase homeownership counseling programs.

I urge my colleagues to support reinstating funding for the successful Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant Program.

Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word in strong opposition to the Price Amendment and the underlying bill.

This amendment would make this atrocious CR even worse. Section 1517 of the CR already cuts the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection by 40 percent. And as if that wasn't enough to cripple this new bureau, the Price Amendment would prohibit funding for salaries and expenses—ending the agency as it's just getting started.

Although, I guess we shouldn't be surprised. Mr. PRICE and his colleagues have fought long and hard for their friends on Wall Street to allow them to continue gouging families and small businesses with predatory mortgages and credit cards.

But last year the Democratic majority overcame their corporate lobbyists and special interests to finally bring an end to these Wall Street abuses. We enacted historic credit card reforms and established the new independent Consumer Financial Protection Bureau tasked specifically with protecting consumers—the first of its kind. This new Bureau will finally ensure that mortgage and credit card agreements are safe for the families and small businesses most vulnerable to predatory practices. The Bureau's Office of Service Member Affairs, led by Holly Petraeus, is specifically tasked with protecting our men and women in uniform who all too often are preyed upon by unscrupulous lenders.

No more hidden fees. No more arbitrary interest rate hikes. No more twisted contracts that lawyers can't even understand. This is the type of protection the American people expect from their government. Reasonable, responsible measures to ensure out troops and consumers aren't taken advantage of.

But, for some reason, Mr. PRICE and those who support this amendment believe our troops and the American people don't deserve these protections. They're unabashedly trying to destroy the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau before it even gets started. They're trying to return to the days when Wall Street ran amok and did as it pleased. They're trying to return to the same failed policies of the past that caused the financial crisis we're still climbing out of.

One would think that such a ridiculous maneuver would at least be disguised as something less destructive. But then again, the Majority has made no secret of its pursuit of political gimmicks over substantive measures to create jobs.

Just look at this CR—hundreds and hundreds of pages that do nothing but undercut our fragile economic recovery and destroy jobs. Nothing but page after page of absurd cuts to proven programs that protect consumers, stimulate growth and create jobs.

Not to mention that we have yet to consider a single bill on the House floor that would actually create jobs. Not one.

Mr. Chair, the American people expect better. They sent us here to create jobs, not destroy them.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the PRICE Amendment and the underlying bill. I yield back.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to call up my amendment at the desk, amendment number 504, which would restore the cuts made to the defense appropriations section of H.R. 1. I am pleased that so many of my Republican colleagues in the House Armed Services Committee supported this amendment and are willing to stand with me

against these cuts. HASC Chairman MCKEON, Ms. HARTZLER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIGELL and Mr. SCHILLING should all be recognized for their commitment to our men and women in uniform.

We cannot in good conscience stand by while this body takes an ax to the defense budget.

My amendment restores cuts to the Department of Defense to the level authorized by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2011. The C.R. contains approximately $516 billion in defense appropriations found in Division A, about $14 billion below the defense appropriations authorized in the 2011 NDAA. We should honor that budget authorization with this amendment.

We have watched the Obama Administration develop a pattern of raiding the defense accounts first, not last, as it should be. We have a Constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense and yet, the Administration sees defense as an account that can be gutted at the expense of our national security. The government has already asked the Pentagon to find $100 billion in efficiencies and to cut $78 billion over the next five years. The cuts proposed in H.R. 1 are just the beginning of a downward spiral.

Our government has a constitutional mandate to protect the American people. America must retain her qualitative edge in the world. Weakness will invite aggression and lead to instability throughout the world.

As I have said before, I wholeheartedly support finding cost savings through efficiencies in all areas of the Federal Government. In the area of national defense, I believe we must reinvest those savings in other defense priorities such as an effective and robust homeland missile defense system, equipment that increases protection and combat effectiveness for our servicemembers, and modernizing our aging defense infrastructure. As vital as it is to cut our national budget so we can live within our means, my hope and desire is that we do so in a way that does not sacrifice our military capability.

Again, I thank my colleagues who have vocally supported this amendment and I ask other Members in the House to do the same.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. PAYNE. I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would prohibit any United States assistance to a country that opposed the position of the United States in the United Nations. If passed tomorrow, this amendment would prohibit assistance to over 130 countries including Cote D'Ivoire, Rwanda, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and Jordan. (It prohibits assistance to countries whose recorded votes at the UN were the same as the United States less than 50 percent of the time.

This amendment does not take into account the voting realities of the UN. It only focuses on recorded votes or non-consensus issues. But the fact is, similar to the workings our own Senate, a significant amount of votes—or consensus resolutions—are adopted by the UN. According to the State Department's Voting Practices in the United Nations, when consensus resolutions are factored in as votes identical to those of the United States, average overall General Assembly voting coincidence of all UN members with the United States in 2009 was 84.3%. So, in reality, most member states are agreeing with the position of the United States.

Finally, if the logic of this bill was utilized in our own Congress, how could we ever reach bipartisan agreement? Because a Member does not support your bill, would that mean you would never work with them on anything again? Or, if the Texas delegation to the House voted against a transportation appropriation, should they receive no money to build roads?

I urge my colleagues to vote NO on this amendment.

VOTING PRACTICES IN THE UNITED NATIONS 2009

(Report to Congress submitted pursuant to Public Laws 101–246 and 108–447, Mar. 31, 2010.)

I: INTRODUCTION

This publication is the 27th annual Report to the Congress on Voting Practices at the United Nations. It is submitted in accordance with Section 406 of Public Law 101–246. This law provides, in relevant part:

''The Secretary of State shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a full and complete annual report which assesses for the preceding calendar year, with respect to each foreign country member of the United Nations, the voting practices of the governments of such countries at the United Nations, and which evaluates General Assembly and Security Council actions and the responsiveness of those governments to United States policy on issues of special importance to the United States.''

This report reviews voting practices in the UN Security Council and General Assembly (UNGA) in calendar year 2009 and presents data in a variety of formats. All Security Council resolutions for the entire year are described, and voting on them is tabulated (Section II). The report also statistically measures the overall voting of UN member states at the 64th General Assembly in the autumn of 2009 in comparison with the U.S. voting record (Section III). It also lists and describes UNGA resolutions selected as particularly important to U.S. interests, again with tables for regional and political groupings (Section IV). It then presents all data by country (Section V). Finally, an annex is included to present the voting patterns on General Assembly resolutions relating to Israel and opposed by the United States.

The Security Council and the General Assembly deal with a full spectrum of issues—including threats to peace and security, disarmament, economic and social development, humanitarian relief, and human rights—that are considered critical to U.S. interests. A country's behavior at the United Nations is always relevant to its bilateral relationship. Nevertheless, a country's voting record in the United Nations is only one dimension of its relations with the United States. Bilateral economic, strategic, and political issues are at times more directly important to U.S. interests.

VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH THE UNITED STATES

On non-consensus issues, i.e., those on which a vote was taken, the average overall General Assembly voting coincidence of all UN members with the United States in 2009 was 39 percent, up significantly from 2008, when it was 25.6 percent, and more than twice the figure from 2007 (18.3 percent).

When consensus resolutions are factored in as votes identical to those of the United States, a much higher measure of agreement with U.S. positions is reached—84.3 percent in 2009. (See Section III—General Assembly—Overall Votes for additional comparisons.)

FORMAT AND METHODOLOGY

The format and presentation of this report are consistent with provisions of Public Law 101–246 as amended by Public Law 108–447, and the methodology employed is the same as that used since the report's inception.

The tables in this report provide a measurement of the voting coincidence of UN member countries with the United States. However, readers are cautioned about interpreting voting coincidence percentages. In Section III (General Assembly Overall Votes), Section IV (General Assembly Important Votes and Consensus Actions), and the Annex, the percentages in the last column of the tables, under ''votes only,'' are calculated using only votes on which both the United States and the other country in question voted Yes or No; not included are those instances when either state abstained or was absent. Abstentions and absences are often difficult to interpret, but they make a mathematical difference, sometimes significant, in the percentage results. The inclusion of the number of abstentions and absences in the tables of this report enables the reader to consider them in calculating voting coincidence percentages.

The percentages in the second-to-last column of the tables, under ''including consensus,'' offer another perspective on General Assembly activity. These figures, by presenting the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including consensus resolutions as additional identical votes, more accurately reflect the extent of cooperation and agreement in the General Assembly. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, the report credits to each country a portion of the 184 consensus resolutions based on its participation in the 84 recorded Plenary votes. Each country's participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes/No/Abstain votes it cast in the Plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total number of Plenary votes). However, this calculation assumes, for want of an attendance record, that all countries were present or absent for consensus resolutions in the same ratio as for recorded votes.

Questions about this report may be directed to the Bureau of International Organization Affairs in the Department of State.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment introduced by Congressman TED POE. This amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from enforcing common-sense protections against carbon dioxide pollution and other greenhouse gases from big polluters.

The underlying legislation, H.R. 1, is replete with provisions like this. Instead of eliminating tax breaks for the oil and gas industries and choosing to adhere to the scientific evidence that carbon pollution is changing the climate and endangering our health and the environment, the Republican majority's continuing resolution slashes EPA's funding by almost a third and prohibits EPA from enforcing existing greenhouse gas monitoring and reporting requirements. The bill attacks the Clean Air Act directly so that EPA will be prevented from protecting public health and fighting climate change.

The Clean Air Act has a proven 40-year track record of cutting dangerous pollution to protect human health in a cost-effective manner that spurs innovation. According to EPA, the Clean Air Act prevented an estimated 843,000 asthma attacks, 18 million cases of respiratory illness among children, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 21,000 cases of heart disease, and 200,000 premature deaths.

The Clean Air Act continues to reduce air pollution and improve the health of children, seniors, and adults: the Clean Air Act has decreased lead emissions from cars by 95 percent, decreasing by 86 percent the number of children whose development is affected by lead exposure; by requiring all new diesel engines to be more than 90 percent cleaner, EPA will prevent more than 21,000 premature deaths and $160 billion in health costs every year by 2030; by phasing out the most dangerous ozone-depleting chemicals, EPA will cut the American incidences of non-melanoma skin cancer by 295 million by 2075; by launching the acid rain program, EPA has dramatically reduced soot and smog by levels that will reduce premature deaths by between 20,000 and 50,000 per year in 2010.

Since its enactment in 1970, the health benefits of the Clean Air Act have far outweighed industry's compliance costs, reducing toxic and health-threatening air pollutants by 60 percent while at the same time the economy grew by over 200 percent.

Now this legislation attempts to gut the Clean Air Act's pollution standards and repeal EPA's authority to limit health-threatening pollution in order to protect the profits of the big polluters.

It also prevents EPA from continuing to improve our health by updating its pollution standards and improving safeguards for public health. In addition, it repeals important Clean Air Act safeguards that are needed to create American clean energy jobs, reduce energy costs, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and increase our economic competitiveness.

It's time for us to stand up for clean air and the health of the American people rather than work for the polluters who want to interfere with EPA's efforts to reduce life-threatening pollution and turn back the clock on air quality.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and oppose the continuing resolution.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Amendment, Amendment No. 199, to H.R. 1 "Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011", offered by Mr. POE of Texas and provides that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice, or any other Agency to litigate the continuation of the case United States of America v. The State of Arizona and Janice K. Brewer regarding Arizona law S.B. 1070.

As a Senior Member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I have vast experience in dealing with the issues of immigration and border security. And as a member of these committees, I can unequivocally say that this amendment and talk of supporting state immigration laws is absolutely inappropriate. It is a clear violation of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution and the long established tenets of federalism, which grant the United States government the exclusive, preemptive power to establish laws on Immigration and Naturalization.

It is necessary to oppose this amendment offered on the floor today. The Department of Justice has a federal mandate to pursue litigation in matters that constitute violations of federal law. This authority includes actions against states such as Arizona. The Arizona immigration statute appears to violate federal law and we must not strip the Department of Justice of the funding it needs to carry out its mission.

The laws of the United States do not allow state-by-state legislation of immigration policy. If we allow states to enact immigration statutes and regulate and enforce immigration policy, we would be granting permission for the separate states of our country to set up a severely disconnected patchwork of immigration laws and policies that will be extremely difficult to enforce, invite discrimination and make our country dangerously unstable and unsafe.

Our forefathers had the wisdom and insight to realize the importance of handling certain issues exclusively on a national level and saw fit to enshrine them in the Constitution. In this instance, we must not depart from the long established doctrine of exclusive federal control of immigration and naturalization. If we tread on the dangerous path of deconstruction of appropriate federal exclusivity in the area of immigration law, we will certainly force the federal courts to take corrective action and restore the exclusive role of the federal government in this area. Moreover, it would take a constitutional amendment and not the mere passage of federal or state statutes to overturn this long established legal principle.

The Department of Justice must be provided with the necessary funds to continue litigation of its case against the state of Arizona. To do otherwise would erode the constitutional protections of our Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. Therefore I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to this amendment. Thank you Madam Chair; I yield back the balance of my time.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Broun amendment that would eliminate funding for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers coastal projects.

Simply put—this is a "penny wise/pound foolish" effort.

Representing a coastal district I can speak first hand to the importance of coastal projects.

Beaches are of incredible economic importance to the local, state, regional, and national economy contributing nearly $35 billion in annual Federal revenues.

There are over 2 billion visits made to our nation's beaches each year, with the Federal Government collecting $320 per beach tourists for every $1 spent on beach renourishment!

And more people visit our nation's beaches each year than all of our national parks combined!

North Carolina beaches create about 50,000 jobs, $1.6 billion in spending revenues, $78 million in state revenue and beach-related tourism provides a total payroll of $350 million!

But the coast is also something much more important than numbers—it is a place where our batteries can be recharged, where family memories are built, and where many choose to live out the sunset of their lives.

Let's reject this amendment and support the coastal communities which support and provide much-needed employment and enjoyment for our Nation!

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. JON RUNYAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Broun amendment No. 246. This amendment would prohibit the use of funds

made available by this act to be used for beach replenishment projects by the Army Corps of Engineers.

In understand the need for shared sacrifice, and applaud my colleagues for looking to further reduce spending wherever possible, however funding for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies Fund have already taken a huge hit in the underlying legislation.

New Jersey has 127 miles of coastline with a large portion of it lying within my Congressional District. This shore-line is the economic engine behind a multi-billion dollar coastal tourism industry. Tourism is New Jersey's second largest industry, and provides jobs for many of the 35 million people living within 100 miles of our beaches.

Within my district lies Long Beach Island. Over 2 million people use the beaches of Long Beach Island every year. The island is key part of New Jersey's economy with over $15 billion in ratables.

Long Beach Island is a barrier island and acts as a natural levy protecting long stretches of New Jersey's coastline from flooding. The New Jersey coast is frequently the victim of powerful hurricanes, and Nor'easters. We need beach replenishment projects to help repair these natural levies after natural disasters.

These projects are vital to the homeowners Long Beach Island. Without beach replenishment projects they are in danger of losing their homeowners insurance, and seeing the value of their homes plummet. In an already deflated housing market we can't afford more foreclosures!

Mr. Chair, I look forward to supporting the underlying legislation, which cuts the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies Fund by $30 million. However, I cannot support this amendment at this time.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House passed H.R. 1, Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, February 28, 2011.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 28 public bills, H.R. 795–822; 2 private bills, H.R. 823–824; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 42–43; and H. Res. 104–107 were introduced.

Pages H1249–51, H1361–62

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1252–53, H1364**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011: The House passed H.R. 1, making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 147. The measure was considered on February 15th, 16th and 17th. **Pages H1202–27, H1227–44, H1244–53, H1255–H1308, H1308–57**

Rejected the Heinrich motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 146. **Pages H1355–56**

Agreed to:

Kline amendment (No. 214 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that prohibits funds for the use of the ''Program Integrity: Gainful Employment-New Programs'' section of the bill (by a recorded vote of 289 ayes to 136 noes with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 92); **Pages H1234–35**

Pence amendment (No. 11 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that prohibits the use of funds for Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. (by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 185 noes with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 93); **Page H1235**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 533 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that prohibits the use of funds by the Environmental Appeals Board to consider, review, reject, remand, or otherwise invalidate any permit issued for Outer Continental Shelf sources located offshore of the States along the Arctic Coast under section 328(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7627(a)) (by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 94); **Pages H1235–36**

Poe (TX) amendment (No. 466 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that seeks to prohibit the use of funds by the EPA to implement, administer, or enforce any statutory or regulatory requirement pertaining to emissions of greenhouse gases (by a recorded vote of 249 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 96); **Page H1237**

Rehberg amendment (No. 575 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to pay any employee, officer, contractor, or grantee of any department or

agency to implement the provisions of The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 97);

Pages H1202–13, H1237–38

King (IA) amendment (No. 267 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds in H.R. 1 to be used to carry out the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, or any amendment made by either such Public Law (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 98); **Pages H1215–17, H1238–39**

King (IA) amendment (No. 268 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds in H.R. 1 to be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of any Federal department or agency with respect to carrying out the provisions of Public Law 111–148 (Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act), Public Law 111–152 (Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010), or any amendment made by such either Public Law (by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 99); **Pages H1217–19, H1239**

Emerson amendment (No. 83 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds in H.R. 1 to be used by the Internal Revenue Service to implement or enforce section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, section 6055 of such Code, section 1502(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, or any amendments made by section 1502(b) of such Act (by a recorded vote of 246 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 100); **Pages H1219–21, H1239–40**

Forbes amendment (No. 145 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to take any action to effect or implement the disestablishment, closure, or realignment of the United States Joint Forces Command; **Pages H1273–75**

Reed amendment (No. 583 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to change any rate of salary or basic pay pursuant to section 1113 of Public Law 111–32; **Page H1280**

Matheson amendment (No. 38 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used for the Community Connect broadband grant program administered by the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture; **Page H1280**

Weiner amendment (No. 126 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to provide assistance to Saudi Arabia; **Page H1288**

Weiner amendment (No. 101 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide non-recourse marketing assistance loans for mohair under section 1201 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8731); **Page H1288**

Price (GA) amendment (No. 409 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds made available by division B of the Public Health Service Act to implement or enforce section 2718 of the Act (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 110);

Pages H1261–62, H1297–98

McClintock amendment (No. 296 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to implement the Klamath Dam Removal and Sedimentation Study (by a recorded vote of 215 ayes to 210 noes, Roll No. 111);

Pages H1262–65, H1298

Herger amendment (No. 177 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for the Secretary of Agriculture to implement or enforce Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule, relating to the designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use, in any administrative unit of the National Forest System (by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 113); **Pages H1268–69, H1299–H1300**

Boren amendment (No. 566 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to require a person licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to report information to the Department of Justice regarding the sale of multiple rifles or shotguns to the same person (by a recorded vote of 277 ayes to 149 noes, Roll No. 115);

Pages H1271–73, H1300–01

Forbes amendment (No. 146 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds made available by division A of this Act for Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide from being used for official representation purposes, as defined by Department of Defense Instruction 7250.13, dated June 30, 2009 (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 116); **Pages H1275, H1301–02**

Johnson (OH) amendment (No. 498 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to develop, carry out, implement, or otherwise enforce proposed regulations published June 18, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 34,667) by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior

(by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 119); **Pages H1279–80, H1303–04**

Goodlatte amendment (No. 467 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to develop, promulgate, evaluate, implement, provide oversight to, or backstop total maximum daily loads or watershed implementation plans for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 195 noes, Roll No. 120); **Pages H1282–84, H1304**

Gardner amendment (No. 79 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services who develops or promulgates regulations or guidance with regard to Exchanges under subtitle D of title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 121); **Pages H1285–86, H1304–05**

Rooney amendment (No. 13 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled ''Water Quality Standards for the State of Florida's Lakes and Flowing Waters'' published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency on December 6, 2010 (by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 123); **Pages H1290–91, H1305–06**

Stearns amendment (No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States (by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 124); **Pages H1291–93, H1306–07**

Flake amendment (No. 377 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for the construction of an ethanol blender pump or an ethanol storage facility (by a recorded vote of 261 ayes to 158 noes, Roll No. 125); **Pages H1308, H1329–30**

Hall amendment (No. 495 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to implement, establish, or create a NOAA Climate Service as described in the ''Draft NOAA Climate Service Strategic Vision and Framework'' published at 75 Fed. Reg. 57739 (by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 127); **Pages H1310–11, H1330–31**

Griffith amendment (No. 109 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to the EPA, the Corps of Engineers, or the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement from being used to carry out, implement, administer, or enforce any policy or procedure set forth in the memorandum issued by the EPA (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 129); **Pages H1312–13, H1332**

Jones amendment (No. 548 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for any fishery under the jurisdiction of the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, New England, or Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council to develop or approve a new limited access privilege program (by a recorded vote of 259 ayes to 159 noes, Roll No. 130); **Pages H1313–14, H1332–33**

Luetkemeyer amendment (No. 47 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for the study of the Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 176 noes, Roll No. 131); **Pages H1314–15, H1333–34**

Luetkemeyer amendment (No. 149 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds for contributions to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 132); **Pages H1315–16, H1334**

Sullivan amendment (No. 94 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to implement the decision of the Administrator of the EPA entitled ''Partial Grant of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy to Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 percent'' (by, a recorded vote of 285 ayes to 136 noes, Roll No. 134); **Pages H1317–18, H1335–36**

McKinley amendment (No. 216 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used by the Administrator of the EPA to carry out section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 135); **Pages H1318–19, H1336**

McKinley amendment (No. 217 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds by EPA to develop, propose, finalize, implement, administer, or enforce any regulation that identifies or lists fossil fuel combustion waste as hazardous waste subject to regulation (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 136); **Pages H1319–20, H1336–37**

Pompeo amendment (No. 545 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to carry out any of the activities described in section 6A of the Consumer Product Safety Act (by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 137); **Pages H1320–22, H1337–38**

Burgess amendment (No. 200 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight in the Department of Health and Human Services (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 138);

Pages H1322–23, H1338

Noem amendment (No. 563 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to modify the national primary ambient air quality standard or the national secondary ambient air quality standard applicable to coarse particulate matter under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (by a recorded vote of 255 ayes to 168 noes, Roll No. 140); **Pages H1325–26, H1339**

Pitts amendment (No. 430 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits funds from being used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, or the Department of the Treasury who takes any action to specify or define, through regulations, guidelines, or otherwise, essential benefits under section 1302 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 141); **Pages H1326–27, H1340**

Hayworth amendment (No. 567 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to implement section 1899A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), as added by section 3403 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and

Pages H1345–46

Burgess amendment (No. 154 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that prohibits the use of funds to carry out paragraph (11) of section 101 of Public Law 111–226 (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 145).

Pages H1346–49

Rejected:

McCollum amendment (No. 50 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that sought to prohibit funds from being used for the Department of Defense sponsorship of NASCAR race cars (by a recorded vote of 148 ayes to 281 noes, Roll No. 90);

Pages H1232–33

Nadler amendment (No. 232 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that sought to limit the use of funds for the United States military operations in Afghanistan to no more than $10,000,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 98 ayes to 331 noes, Roll No. 91);

Pages H1233–34

Nadler amendment (No. 524 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was debated on February 17th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to make an application under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) for an order requiring the production of library circulation records, library patron lists, book sales records, or book customer lists (by a recorded vote of 196 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 95); **Pages H1236–37**

Kind amendment (No. 89 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds in to provide payments (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to provide payments) to the Brazil Cotton Institute (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 246 noes, Roll No. 101); **Pages H1222–23, H1240–41**

Kind amendment (No. 88 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds in division A of H.R. 1 to be used to research, develop, or test the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle and the Surface-Launched Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile program (by a recorded vote of 123 ayes to 306 noes, Roll No. 102); **Pages H1223–24, H1241**

Blackburn amendment (No. 104 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce spending by 5.5% in 8 non-security spending subsections of the bill and reduce Legislative Branch appropriations by 11% (by a recorded vote of 147 ayes to 281 noes, Roll No. 103);

Pages H1226–27, H1227–31, H1241–42

Matheson amendment (No. 496 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to reduce the total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (other than for the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security) by $600,000,000; **Pages H1280–81**

Matheson amendment (No. 497 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to reduce the total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (other than for Department of Defense and the U.S. Postal Service) by $280,000,000; **Pages H1284–85**

Bishop (NY) amendment (No. 414 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Manhattan, Kansas (by a recorded vote of 156 ayes to 269 noes, Roll No. 104); **Pages H1245–46, H1293–94**

Campbell amendment (No. 519 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to reduce funds by 3.5% for the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security (by a recorded vote of 68 ayes to 357 noes, Roll No. 105);

Pages H1246–47, H1294

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 246 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for beach replenishment projects by the Army Corps of Engineers (by a recorded vote of 74 ayes to 348 noes, Roll No. 106); **Pages H1247–49, H1294–95**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 263 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to pay any dues to the United Nations (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 107); **Pages H1249, H1255–57, H1295–96**

Wu amendment (No. 526 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce section 3(e) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(e)) (by a recorded vote of 87 ayes to 338 noes, Roll No. 108); **Pages H1257–58, H1296**

Markey amendment (No. 27 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to issue any new lease that authorizes production of oil or natural gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 251 noes, Roll No. 109); **Pages H1258–61, H1296–97**

McDermott amendment (No. 99 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to plan for, begin, continue, finish, process, or approve the relocation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Marine Operations Center-Pacific from Seattle, Washington, to Newport, Oregon (by a recorded vote of 91 ayes to 333 noes, Roll No. 112); **Pages H1265–68, H1298–99**

Blumenauer amendment (No. 323 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide benefits described in section 1001D(b)(1)(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)(1)(c)) to a person or legal entity in excess of $250,000 (by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 114); **Pages H1269–71, H1300**

Kaptur amendment (No. 333 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to reduce by 75% the amount made available for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program (by a recorded vote of 32 ayes to 394 noes, Roll No. 117); **Pages H1275–77, H1302**

Polis amendment (No. 46 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to maintain an end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty in Europe in excess of 35,000 members and end strength levels for active duty members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of 565,275, 328,250, and 329,275, respectively, and the amounts otherwise provided by this Act for ''Military Personnel, Army'', ''Military Personnel, Navy'' and ''Military Personnel, Air Force'' in title I of division A are hereby reduced by $155,914,688, $18,047,700, and $118,488,825, respectively (by a recorded vote of 74 ayes to 351 noes, Roll No. 118); **Pages H1277–79, H1302–03**

Neugebauer amendment (No. 151 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for repair, alteration, or improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House (by a recorded vote of 63 ayes to 362 noes, Roll No. 122); **Pages H1289–90, H1305**

Kucinich amendment (No. 233 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the missile defense program of the Department of Defense; **Pages H1311–12**

Heller amendment (No. 174 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository; **Pages H1324–25**

Guinta amendment (No. 166 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to enter into, after the date of the enactment of this Act, a Government contract that requires a project labor agreement (by a recorded vote of 210 ayes to 210 noes, Roll No. 126); **Pages H1308–10, H1330**

Lee amendment (No. 141 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for any account of the Department of Defense (other than accounts listed in subsection (b)) in excess of the amount made available for such account for fiscal year 2008 (by a recorded vote of 76 ayes to 344 noes, Roll No. 128); **Pages H1312, H1331–32**

Issa amendment (No. 569 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to fund periodic step increases described in Section 5335 of Title V of the United States Code (by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 133); **Pages H1316–17, H1334–35**

Heller amendment (No. 482 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to designate monuments under the Act of June 8, 1906, (commonly known as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906''; 16 U.S.C. 431, et seq.) (by a recorded vote of 209 ayes to 213 noes, Roll No. 139); **Pages H1323–24, H1338–39**

Carney amendment (No. 241 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds for the Oil and Gas Research and Development Program of the Department

of Energy (by a recorded vote of 121 ayes to 300 noes, Roll No. 142); **Pages H1327–28, H1340–41**

Mulvaney amendment (No. 164 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used in excess of the amount available for such account during fiscal year 2006 (Defense and Homeland Security funds are exempt) (by a recorded vote of 93 ayes to 328 noes, Roll No. 143); and **Pages H1328–29, H1341–42**

King (IA) amendment (No. 273 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to administer the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, with respect to any project or program funded by this Act (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 144). **Pages H1342–45, H1354**

Withdrawn:

Polis amendment (No. 48 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds to be used to enforce section 75.708 of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, as it relates to section 5205 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7221d); **Pages H1224–25**

Flake amendment (No. 367 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds to pay salaries and expenses of Agriculture Department personnel to provide Food Security Act benefits to a person or legal entity if the average adjusted gross income of the person or legal entity exceeds $250,000; **Page H1308**

Bishop (UT) amendment (No. 515 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds for the National Landscape Conservation System; **Page H1322**

Huelskamp amendment (No. 255 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used by the National Labor Relations Board to certify the results of an election of a labor organization under section 9(c)(1) of the National Labor Relations Act that is not conducted by secret ballot; and **Page H1342**

LaTourette amendment (No. 540 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have struck all after the enacting clause and inserted new text. **Pages H1349–54**

Point of Order sustained against:

King (IA) amendment (No. 266 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds in H.R. 1 or any previous Act, to be used to carry out the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, or any amendment made by either such Public Law; **Pages H1213–15**

Schrader amendment (No. 552 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to set new 302(b) limits and appropriate more to Homeland Security; **Pages H1221–22**

Poe (TX) amendment (No. 199 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of Justice, or any other Agency, to litigate the continuation of the case United States of America v. the State of Arizona and Janice K. Brewer regarding Arizona law S.B. 1070; **Pages H1231–32**

Bishop (NY) amendment (No. 336 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to require the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to jointly study the effect that this Act will have on job levels and report the findings of the study in the Employment Situation Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics; **Pages H1243–44**

Clyburn amendment (No. 408 printed in the Congressional Record of February 15, 2011) that sought to require that 10% of the funds made available by this Act, for stated Departments and activities, shall be allocated for assistance in persistent poverty counties; **Page H1271**

McMorris Rodgers amendment (No. 274 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to pay any employee, contractor, or grantee of the Internal Revenue Service to implement or enforce the provisions of, or amendments made by, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and **Pages H1281–82**

Kaptur en bloc amendment (consisting of amendments No. 329, 330, and 331 printed in the Congressional Record of February 14, 2011) that sought to eliminate the operation and maintenance accounts of the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration. **Pages H1286–88**

H. Res. 92, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on February 15th.

Order of Procedure: Agreed by unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to H. Res. 92 and the order of the House of February 17, 2011, it shall be in order for the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments specified in the order of the House of February 17th

not earlier disposed of, and that amendments so offered shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by said chair and ranking member, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. **Page H1244**

Order of Procedure: Agreed by unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to applicable previous orders of the House, each amendment otherwise debatable for 10 minutes instead be debatable for 6 minutes. **Page H1308**

United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Representative David Scott of Georgia (in lieu of Representative Austin Scott of Georgia). **Page H1357**

House Democracy Partnership—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she appointed the following Members to the House Democracy Partnership: Representative Susan Davis of California (in lieu of Representative Donald Payne of New Jersey) and Representative Gwen Moore of Wisconsin (in lieu of Representative Allyson Schwartz of Pennsylvania). **Page H1357**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H1227.

Senate Referrals: S. 365 was referred to the Committee on Energy and the Workforce; S. 266 was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources; and S. 307 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. **Page H1357**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and fifty-seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1232–33, H1233–34, H1234–35, H1235, H1235–36, H1236–37, H1237, H1237–38, H1238–39, H1239, H1240, H1240–41, H1241, H1242, H1293–94, H1294, H1294–95, H1295–96, H1296, H1296–97, H1297–98, H1298, H1298–99, H1299–H1300, H1300, H1300–01, H1301–02, H1302, H1302–03, H1303–04, H1304, H1304–05, H1305, H1306, H1306–07, H1329–30, H1330, H1330–31, H1331–32, H1332, H1332–33, H1333–34, H1334, H1334–35, H1335–36, H1336, H1336–37, H1337–38, H1338, H1338–39, H1339, H1340, H1340–41, H1341–42, H1354, H1354–55, H1356, and H1357. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:41 a.m. on Saturday, February 19th, pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 17, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 28, 2011.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, February 28, 2011

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senator Isakson will deliver Washington's Farewell Address, to be followed by a period of morning business until 3:30. Following which, Senate will begin consideration of S. 23, Patent Reform Act. At 4:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Amy Totenberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, and Steve C. Jones, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, with a voice vote on confirmation of the nomination of Amy Totenberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, and a roll call vote on confirmation of the nomination of Steve C. Jones, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, February 28

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Capps, Lois, Calif., E317
Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E317, E318
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E319
Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E317
McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E319
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E318
Runyan, Jon, N.J., E319

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.