United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 17, 2009 No. 108

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, July 20, 2009, at 1 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JULY 17, 2009

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 17, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON-LEE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, source of light and love for each of us, we approach You with grateful humility because we are aware of Your many blessings upon our Nation, our families, and upon us personally.

We stand before You in a poverty of spirit because the demands upon Congress are so great and the desire of this institution to respond to the many needs of Your people is deeply felt.

Prayer at such moments can be a crucible in which expectations and experience are crushed by grinding truth.

Yet mixed with faith in You and faith in the free people of this great Nation, this institution is confirmed, Lord, in its trust to make decisions born out of compromise. Thereupon, high hopes for the Nation can be sustained, and at the same time, specific steps can be taken to achieve a final goal.

As a people, we live with trust now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHAFFETZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side.

REPUBLICAN HEALTH CARE PLAN

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, this week, after consultation with leaders in the business community, organized labor, health care providers, patient groups, insurers, pharmaceutical makers, and small business owners, Democratic leaders introduced America's Affordable Health Choice Act, which will expand access to health care, protect consumer choices, provide a public option, and enable over $500 billion in Medicare savings.

And what is the Republicans' answer to the health care crisis in America? A color-coded chart of the Democratic plan. Here is the chart of their plan. Absolutely nothing.

Our bill addresses the needs of all Americans, including the nearly 46 million without health insurance, by maintaining the freedom to choose individual health providers, improving care, and increasing choice and competition with the new public option.

It's time for our Republican colleagues to join us in getting serious about health care coverage.

SAY IT ISN'T SO, JOE

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Say it isn't so, Joe.

Yesterday, with all due respect to our Vice President, we heard him say, We have to spend money to keep from going bankrupt. An amazing, amazing philosophy that gives you great pause.

It's no wonder why this country is nearly $12 trillion in debt. We are now

Printed on recycled paper.

spending nearly $600 million per day just in interest payments. This credit card Congress can no longer continue. We cannot spend our way out of our challenges. We have to be fiscally responsible in this country. We cannot spend our way out of these challenges. You don't do it in your family, but this Congress does. Every time we hear a challenge, all we hear about is the need for more spending.

Today we will consider a bill, a horse and burro bill, that will be nearly $700 million in new spending—$700 million in new spending to tackle horses and burros that are exploding their population in the West.

Please, Madam Speaker, I implore my colleagues, we have to stop. We have to cut our spending.

NEW GI BILL

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, this past week my office held a seminar to help our Nation's veterans access the full range of benefits they have earned, including a 4-year college education. We invited local education and workforce experts to help our veterans determine their eligibility, fill out paperwork, and receive benefits under the new GI Bill for the 21st century.

Along with many others in the House, I was proud to cosponsor this new GI Bill when it passed last year. This critical bill will ensure that our returning servicemembers are part of our economic recovery. This bill covers everything from tuition to housing to books. And it is available to military veterans who have served since September 11, 2001.

In just a few weeks, the very first veterans to enroll in college under the new GI Bill will begin their first classes.

This is truly a landmark moment, and I wish the best of luck to all of our veterans who, through this program, will become scholars as well as heroes.

NATIONALIZED HEALTH CARE AND ILLEGALS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the nationalized health care bill will continue to allow illegals to get free medical services. Foreigners who are not authorized to be in the United States flood over our wide-open borders by the millions to get free universal health care. That bankrupts Federal and State health care safety nets set up for Americans.

It's very simple to understand to most people: our citizens are forced to pay medical bills for citizens of countries all around the world. These people in our country illegally use our hospital emergency rooms like it's their primary care, and it doesn't cost them anything. And what our government doesn't pay, the hospitals are forced to pay. That drives up the cost of medical care and the cost of insurance for citizens and legal immigrants. Now those problems will just get worse under the new proposal.

The nationalized health care bill will force our citizens who cannot even pay for their own health care to pay billions of dollars a year for health care for millions of illegals. That's just wrong. Citizens and legal immigrants shouldn't be forced to pay for the health care of people illegally in the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

IMPACT OF HEALTH CARE CRISIS

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, during our last work period, I conducted a health care listening tour across my district to learn firsthand how the health care crisis is impacting working families.

I talked to Chris Davis, a single father who makes too much as an electrician to qualify for assistance but too little to afford coverage for his 7-year-old son. I listened to Bernice Romero, a fixed-income retiree who simply can't afford the rising premiums and out-of-pocket expenses to treat her debilitating carpal tunnel and knee problems.

Stories like these drive home the fact that we must do all we can to both extend coverage and contain costs in our health care system. This means preventing fraud, waste, and abuse within the system, utilizing prevention and wellness programs that save money, and promoting more efficient delivery of health care so that all regions of the country—rich, poor, urban, and rural—are on an even playing field.

We must address this issue head on, and the time to act is now.

GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, during the worst recession in a generation, Democrats propose a government takeover of health care that will lead to fewer jobs, higher taxes, and less health coverage.

Since the recession began, 6 million jobs have been lost, yet the Democrats' health care plan includes hundreds of billions of dollars in new tax hikes on small businesses, the engine of job creation in this country. Democrats propose more than $800 billion in new tax hikes. According to economic modeling by the President's own chief economic adviser, the business tax hikes alone would destroy up to 4.7 million jobs.

Despite their claims of reform that it will reduce health care costs, CBO Director Elmendorf told Congress that the Democrats' proposed reform will only increase future Federal spending on health care.

House Republicans will oppose any plan that puts Washington bureaucrats between patients and the care they need. House Republicans have a plan for reform that expands access to affordable health care and gives families the freedom to choose the health care that fits their needs without imposing a job-killing tax hike on small businesses and working families.

NEW HEALTH CARE PLAN BENEFICIAL FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I am glad to report that two of our committees have already reported out the health care reform bill. CBO indicated that 97 percent of the non-elderly, in other words, those who are not on Medicare now, would be covered by the health reform plan that our committees are now considering. Small businesses would benefit greatly. There is a 50 percent tax credit for premiums that are paid by employers of small businesses.

So this legislation has the opportunity to allow small businesses to benefit significantly, to cover their employees, to cover 97 percent of Americans who are not covered currently by Medicare. And it is moving. We expect it will be out of committee by next week and on the House floor by the end of this month. And, finally, Americans will know that their guaranteed health coverage, reduced costs, and 97 percent of Americans not in Medicare will achieve health care coverage.

I am very happy about the fact that we're proceeding with this along the promise of President Obama.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1018, RESTORE OUR AMERICAN MUSTANGS ACT

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 653 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 653

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1018) to amend the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to improve the management and long-term health of wild free-roaming horses and burros, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The

bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Rahall of West Virginia or his designee, which shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; (3) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Hastings of Washington or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. All points of order against amendments specified in the first section of this resolution are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI.

□ 0915

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 653.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 653 provides for consideration of H.R. 1018, the Restore Our American Mustangs Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule makes in order a manager's amendment and a substitute amendment from the ranking member, my former Rules colleague, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The manager's amendment is debatable for 10 minutes, and the substitute is debatable for 30 minutes. The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1018 is a bill that restores important protections for wild horses and burros. The bill received full consideration in the subcommittee and the full committee. Markups were held. Republican and Democratic amendments were offered and accepted through the regular order.

Madam Speaker, this bill will reverse a misguided and controversial rider that was adopted as part of the fiscal year 2005 omnibus appropriations bill. The provision was slipped into the bill in the dead of night when the Republicans were in control, reversing longstanding Federal policy that protected wild horses from being sold at auctions and subsequently shipped to slaughter plants. Last summer, the Bureau of Land Management announced that it would consider killing as many as 30,000 healthy wild horses and burros in BLM holding centers across the United States.

The ROAM Act, H.R. 1018, introduced by Chairman RAHALL, will restore longstanding protections by prohibiting the sale and wholesale killing of wild horses and burros; prioritize cost effective on-the-range management, overroundups, saving millions of tax dollars; facilitate the creation of sanctuaries for wild horses and burro populations on public lands; strengthen the BLM's wild horse and burro adoption program; and protect wildlife by requiring a thriving natural ecological balance on the range.

Madam Speaker, these wild animals are rounded up in huge numbers by BLM only to languish in holding pens, threatened with sale or slaughter. H.R. 1018 will minimize these stressful, inhumane roundups, and promote adoption for those horses and burros who are taken off the range, banning the sale of wild horses and burros by the BLM, as well as the transfer of these animals for the purpose of processing into commercial products.

Legislation similar to H.R. 1018 passed the House in 2007 by a landslide, bipartisan vote of 277–137. Unfortunately, this measure has never been signed into law. It is time we end this inhumane practice once and for all.

This bill is important for the protection of our Nation's wild horses and burros. I urge adoption of the rule and the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me the customary time, and I'm looking forward to our having fun here this morning as he promised yesterday.

I am intrigued by my colleague saying that this is being done to correct something slipped into a bill in the middle of the night when the Republicans were in charge. It sounds like something very nefarious was done. This is sort of news to us. We didn't hear it in Rules yesterday, and I need to point out that there was something put in an appropriations bill in 2005, as my colleague says, but it certainly wasn't nefarious. And it's my understanding that our colleagues on the other side have modified that provision several times. So I don't think this is really trying to correct something that Republicans did some time ago in the dead of the night.

But be that as it may, I think I need to point out that we are bringing this legislation at a time when more than 2 million Americans have lost their jobs since the Democrats' $1 trillion stimulus bill became law and that it is somewhat of an insult to those people. We have a 9.5 percent unemployment rate and a budget deficit of more than $1 trillion which is predicted to go to $2 trillion before the end of the fiscal year.

Given those facts, it's a little unclear to know what exactly are the priorities of the Democrats in charge of this Congress. Small business and middle class families are struggling all across this country; yet, the Democrats in charge of Congress are poised to ask them to bankroll a $700 million welfare program for wild horses. This is just another example of how out of touch Washington Democrats are.

If Democrats want to join Republicans in focusing on job creation, then we should be dealing with our American Energy Act which will create new jobs, bring down energy costs, and pave the way for a cleaner environment. And we should scrap this job-killing health care bill Speaker PELOSI is seeking to rush to a vote before the end of the month.

Now, what this bill is going to do that's underlying this rule, which I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote against, it will establish a horse census every 2 years. It provides for enhanced contraception and birth control for horses. It makes available an additional 19 million acres of public and private land for wild horses. It covers a $5 million tab to repair damage done by horses to other property and mandates that government bureaucrats perform home inspections before Americans can adopt horses.

I hardly think this is what the American people expect us to be doing these days as they face the many challenges that they're facing.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Just in brief response to the gentlewoman's comments, as she knows, when the manager's bill is adopted, this bill will have no cost.

And in response to her question about what the Democratic priorities are, they are to create jobs, they are to pass an energy bill to create more jobs, and to deal with climate change. Our priorities include passing a health care bill that will lower the cost of health care for average Americans.

I don't know about in North Carolina, but I can tell you that in my district and everywhere I go around the country, people claim with great justification that they are paying too much for health care. She may represent a bunch of millionaires, but I think most of us don't.

The fact of the matter is health care costs are too high. We need to make it more affordable for the average family, for small businesses, and so that's what our priorities are.

I should say to the gentlelady as well that according to recovery.gov, in her State, jobs that were created or saved in North Carolina are 105,000 jobs.

I also submit into the RECORD, Madam Speaker, an editorial from the Knox News in support of this stimulus package as it relates to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, which includes, I understand, part of the gentlewoman's district.

[From the Knox News, Thursday, July 16, 2009]

EDITORIAL: SMOKIES STIMULUS: LET THE GOOD WORK BEGIN

It isn't exactly a birthday present, but no matter. The Great Smoky Mountains National Park can use the infusion of $64 million in stimulus money for a variety of projects that have been needed in the park for years.

It's special that it will come in time to help those in East Tennessee and Western North Carolina celebrate the park's 75th anniversary. And it is significant that it is about eight times the amount the park usually receives for maintenance work.

The stimulus funding is expected to create up to 1,500 jobs inside and outside the park.

The money comes from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and the park officials hope to be able to award the first round of construction contracts by late next month, with work expected to begin after the Sept. 7 Labor Day holiday.

The Smokies Park is one of 380 national parks to receive funding from the stimulus package. And, as the most visited national park in the country, its share of the federal funding was greater than that for other parks.

For example, Yosemite National Park received $4.5 million and the Grand Canyon National Park received $10.8 million. Denali National Park in Alaska will get $6.3 million.

The initial phase of construction will use $7.5 million of the stimulus money to repave Cosby Campground, improve parking at the Sinks waterfalls area and upgrade 34 buildings and five comfort stations throughout the park.

The park already is using $1.2 million of the federal money to hire temporary workers who will improve 32 miles of eroded horse trails in Tennessee and North Carolina and to restore more than 60 historic cemeteries.

During the first phase of construction, the Cosby campground will close for the season after the Labor Day holiday. It normally operates through October. The campground is scheduled to reopen as usual in March.

The work on the parking area at the Sinks will cause that site to close following Labor Day, with completion scheduled for May 2010.

The project also will include a handicapped accessible masonry platform overlooking the waterfalls.

A second phase of contracts funded by the stimulus money is expected to be awarded later in the fall; work on these projects will begin in the spring.

Park spokesman Bob Miller said in May that it was a coincidence that the stimulus money comes during the yearlong celebration of the Smokies' 75th anniversary. However, he added, ''The park was created in large measure as an economic stimulus initiative, so it's timely that we're making such a substantial investment in our infrastructure.''

We hope those in the federal government, regardless of the impact of the stimulus money, realizes what those in this area have long understood. The Smokies Park is a national treasure—everyone's treasure—and its continued upkeep and improvement need to stay high on the government's to-do list.

So our priorities are pretty clear, and what we're trying to do right now is dig ourselves out of a ditch that her party and the Republican President George Bush dug our economy into. It turns out the ditch is much deeper than anybody had thought, and it's going to take us a little time to get out of it.

But through the stimulus package, through passing health care reform to lower health care costs on families and small businesses, through a climate change bill to create thousands and thousands of more green jobs, I think we've got to turn the corner, and I think that the President of the United States is leading us on the right track.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend is engaged in revisionist history again. We did have a good economy under President Bush. After he inherited a recession and after 9/11, things went south in our economy. The President asked the Congress to cut taxes. It was a Republican-controlled Congress. We had 54 straight months of job creation.

Then the Democrats took over the Congress in January of 2007—and we have charts to show it—all of the sudden the economy really went south. Things started going downhill when Democrats took control of the Congress and have been going downhill ever since. Now, we have a Democrat-controlled Congress and a Democrat in the White House, and things are really going badly.

I think that we can prove with historical facts, not revisionist history, that under the Republicans in the House and Senate and the Republican President that the economy was in pretty good shape.

I yield to my friend from Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity.

I am from Utah. Out West we actually deal with the horses and burros that we will be talking about and debating in this rule.

Now, for whatever reason, a variety of reasons, this emergency meeting had to happen yesterday. Somehow this legislation, which had passed out of committee in April, was suddenly at 2:20 yesterday called up in an emergency meeting and that the Rules Committee had to meet at 3:30 in the afternoon.

Now, I know it's normal and customary and regular that the rule vote generally goes down partisan lines, but I would urge my colleagues to reconsider this. There is no reason to rush this legislation through.

I tried to offer an amendment. That amendment was not heard in the Rules Committee despite it being delivered and given on time. Minor, minor amendment.

I still have underlying concerns about the overall bill. I would still vote against it, but I've got to be candid, I think there's some adjustments that could be made. And I'd like to take a moment here and just talk a little bit about the amendment that I was trying to make, and I would hope that my Democratic friends and colleagues would at least allow it to be heard. I think that's the American way, and I think there's a pattern here of terrible frustration, not being able to be heard on this floor about amendments that we, the people, are here to do.

The amendment I was simply trying to offer is that this board that's going to oversee the horses and burros is consisting of 12 people. We're trying to add a few more people to that board: two representatives from State grazing boards or equivalent State agencies who are not State employees; and we're trying to add two representatives of Indian tribes who manage wild horses and burros.

□ 0930

Now, if you're out West in a State like Utah and several of the other Western States, you have Indian tribes who have a vested interest in the management interest of the horse and burros. For the Democrats to actually deny us an opportunity to allow Native Americans to be represented on the board is just ridiculous. It shows the arrogance and the heavy-handedness of this Congress.

Time after time, we have offered amendments to appropriations that never get heard on this floor. I, too, was elected. I'm a freshman. I didn't create this mess, but I am here to help clean it up.

They tell us a lot in meetings that when we talk about rules and we talk about process, it's not that sexy and we're not going to win elections based on that sort of thing. But if we don't get the process right, we're not going to get the end result right.

To take a bill that, as introduced, has a $700 million price tag to it, rush it through Rules in just over an hour, offer an amendment on time, then not being allowed to hear it where we're just simply trying to get, for instance, members of Native Americans to participate in the horse and burro bill, is just symptomatic of what is wrong and what is broken here in this process.

I have deep concerns about this bill overall. I know there's a manager's amendment. I know there's a substitute amendment. But let's also understand in this bill that we're dealing with overpopulation here. There are over 30,000-some horses and burros that are incarcerated or being held, however you want to term it, out in the Western States predominantly.

You know, they talk about save our mustangs as if it's some endangered

species. It's not an endangered species. They are rampant everywhere, destroying the land, going onto private landholders' land and destroying their crops.

And now we're offering this $700 million program and, you know what, to suggest that there's no cost to the manager's amendment I don't think is accurate. We're dealing with an overpopulation here with huge, huge price tags to it and a huge burden upon the rural Americans that live out West and have to deal with these horses.

I would encourage my colleagues to look deeply at this rule. Please, just because it's offered doesn't mean that it has to be approved. I appreciate the opportunity to stand here and share this with you today.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to say to my colleague that I appreciate his comments, especially after our previous conversation.

He is complaining about the process, but if I'm understanding this correctly, the Resources Committee held a hearing on this bill. There was a full committee markup. The gentleman offered a similar amendment, I understand, that was rejected.

He sent an amendment up to the Rules Committee, which he did not testify on behalf of, which he is not required to. But if it was so important, I would have thought that he would have been up before the committee. And I would also say to my colleague that, to the best of my understanding, none of his Republican colleagues on the Rules Committee offered his amendment.

So I would just suggest in the future, if there is an important issue like that, that there be some more groundwork in advance to it.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I think that it's very interesting to observe that there was virtually no notice whatsoever that while we're in the midst of this crucial appropriations process that this bill was going to come forward.

One hour's notice was provided to the full membership of this institution. Mr. CHAFFETZ had an amendment. He hurriedly put this together, submitted the amendment. Of course he didn't come to testify.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman's observation. But my point was that not only did Mr. CHAFFETZ not appear before the Rules Committee, but no member of the minority party on the Rules Committee offered his amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume. As my colleague from California (Mr. DREIER) was saying, we are supposedly in the midst of an appropriations process, which is so time consuming and has to be so tightly controlled that we have not been allowed to offer amendments in an open process on the floor on the appropriations bills.

Yet, here we are today, handling a bill that obviously is not an emergency, obviously doesn't need to be dealt with now, and is only being put forward because the majority didn't have an excuse to keep us in town today, when people could be at home in the real world, meeting with their constituents, hearing what they have to say, and being able to learn more about the problems that are out there.

The Democrats in this House believe all the wisdom of the world is in Washington, D.C. We Republicans believe the wisdom of the world is out in our district, and that's where we ought to be spending more time, instead of here, creating problems for the American people.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to my very distinguished colleague and former attorney general, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule. You know, there's an expression around here: When we need filler on this floor to keep Members here for whatever reason, we bring up the dogs and the cats. Well, I guess we couldn't find one so we bring up the horses and the burros today.

Somehow, those who may never have seen a mustang, who may never have ridden a horse that has a mustang heritage, are the experts on this floor telling us what we ought to do. They're the experts that tell us when government does something, it's not going to cost us anything.

I'm sort of reminded of ''Bidenomics.'' That's the new word used to describe the statements of the Vice President of the United States on economics.

He told a group yesterday, the AARP, that we have to spend more money. The Federal Government has to spend more money, the Vice President said, or else we're going to go bankrupt.

Now, let's understand what he said. Unless we spend more Federal money, we're going to go bankrupt. We've got news for the Vice President. We're already bankrupt. Bankrupt means you're taking in less than you're putting out.

And we just had a magnificent accomplishment in this administration this week. For the first time in the history of this Nation, we now have in a single year a deficit of $1 trillion. Not a billion with a B, but a trillion with a T. This is extraordinary.

Yet, we have the gentleman from Massachusetts, my friend, coming up and telling us once again: Don't worry; this bill we're bringing up here won't cost us any money.

We heard just a couple of months ago, or maybe it was a month ago, the President of the United States said, Pass my stimulus package and I guarantee you we won't have unemployment above 8 or 8.5 percent—8 percent, he said. I'm sorry. I want to make sure we're accurate here about what the President said.

He assured the American people that this stimulus package would stimulate the economy, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has just cited some statistics about all the jobs being created in North Carolina. I'm sure he's looking at the list now so he can get up and tell me how many jobs are being created in my home State of California. I'll be happy to debate that toe to toe any time. We're losing jobs in the State of California. They're losing jobs in this Nation. If the gentleman—well, I don't want to refer to the gentleman.

Let me put it this way. We have funny math here. The statistics that we have, the official statistics show that we are losing jobs at an alarming rate. We have an unemployment rate at the highest we've had in, I think, 26 years; yet we hear from the other side, Hooray for the stimulus package. It's creating jobs. And they will cite you State by State by State.

This is the only place I know where you can add up—well, you have a total number of losses of jobs, but they come to the floor and they will tell you how many jobs they're creating in each State. It's the only place I know where I guess you add up all those additions, but the net result is a subtraction.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Since my friend began speaking about State by State, he alluded to our State of California. The unemployment rate in California today is 11.5 percent.

I'd like to underscore a statement that he made earlier about the promise that was made. We have a $1 trillion so-called economic stimulus bill. It was $787 billion, but we all know with interest accrued that it will exceed $1 trillion. And we were assured that if we passed that stimulus bill, the unemployment rate across this country would not exceed 8 percent.

Right now, tragically, on a nationwide basis, it is 9.5 percent. And yesterday, a report came forward from a wide range of economists indicating that the unemployment rate will, within the next few months, exceed 10 percent. The projection is 10.1 percent. As I said, in our State of California, which is suffering like it has not in modern history, we are facing an 11.5 percent unemployment rate.

This notion of the Vice President indicating that if we don't spend more we're going to go bankrupt is preposterous.

Last night, at the encouragement of my friend from Sacramento, I had a

telephone town hall meeting with literally thousands of my constituents, and the resounding message that came through from those constituents with whom I spoke is that we need to bring about a reduction rather than increase in the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If I might just respond to that, perhaps that's the reason why they're keeping us here. The Democratic leadership doesn't want us to go home and hear from the folks at home because somehow they want us to continue with that notion that we know best. Because we know best here. We realize that in this difficult issue of dealing with wild horses, mustangs, and burros, in our greater wisdom, we have decided that there's no reason to have representation on the Board that's going to control this by the Native Americans. Why would we think the Native Americans would have any interest in this, or any knowledge in this, when those of us in Washington inside the beltway have superior knowledge.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I thank him for his contribution.

Let me just say, Madam Speaker, that one of the things that I think that is important to look to is the beginning of the appropriations process about which my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, was speaking when she began her remarks.

We were told by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that we had critical legislation that had to be addressed before we complete our work by the 1st of August. We needed to get the appropriations process done. And there's a bipartisan consensus that article I, section 9 places on us the responsibility of getting that work done, and we did not in any way want to stand in the way of completing the appropriations process.

And so, today, having been told that we did not have time for an open amendment process, which has existed for only 220 years in this country, throughout the entire history of the Nation, the pattern of having an open amendment process, ensuring that Democrats and Republicans alike would have the opportunity to offer germane amendments to appropriations bills so that they could in fact, if they chose, try and do what our constituents at these town hall meetings continue to say, and that is reduce the size, scope, and reach of government, we have been denied an opportunity to offer those in the open amendment process. And what is it that we're doing? We're dealing with this wild horses and burros bill on the floor after being told there was not enough time.

Yesterday, we had the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) point to the fact that the day before we finished voting at 4 p.m. Yet, here we are, trying to responsibly legislate, and on Friday we're being kept here so that they can continue to work on the appropriations process in a closed way.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman would allow me to reclaim my time, let me just underscore this. The gentleman mentioned the Constitution. The Constitution gives to the House of Representatives and the United States Senate the single greatest power that we have, which is the power of the purse. The power of the purse means the spending policy, the spending authority of the Federal Government resides in this body and that across the Rotunda. And when we're denied the opportunity to offer amendments, we're denied the opportunity to be able to represent our constituents as to how their money ought to be spent or how their money ought not to be spent, and that is the essential issue that we ought to talk about here.

We have been sent here by our constituents to represent them, and the most powerful tool that we've been given under the Constitution, the power of the purse, is being denied individual Members. This goes against a tradition that's over 200 years in this House, and we're doing it for the purposes of expediency, which is the very argument undercut by the fact that we're taking time here to deal with the question of horses and burros in the West.

□ 0945

Now horses and burros in the West are important. I want to tell you that. I am from the West. We understand it's important. But it certainly is not as important as the appropriations process. And the essential question in a democracy of what right do we have to take money involuntarily from people—that is the tax—if we then are not going to exercise our responsibility to represent them in the decisions as to how those tax dollars will be spent?

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

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

That was an interesting exchange. Unfortunately it didn't represent or reflect reality. The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, when Bill Clinton left the White House, he left George Bush with an enormous surplus. George Bush took that surplus and frittered it away on wars that were not paid for and $1.6 trillion in tax cuts that drove us deeper into debt. The economy spiraled down. My friends on the other side basically turned their backs on what was happening to average people all across this country. And in November of 2008 the American people spoke; and what they made clear is this: That my friends on the other side of the aisle, my Republican friends, do not know best. At every level of government, they were rejected, they were turned out of office because people were sick and tired of their policies that, they believed, drove this economy into a deep ditch. What people want are answers. They don't want the same old, same old. They don't want more tax cuts for the rich. They don't want more indifference toward middle-class working families or total indifference toward those who are struggling in poverty. They want us to try to fix this economy.

My friends take delight in trying to poke holes in the policies of President Obama, saying, Well, you know, he promised that we would create X amount of jobs. We are falling short of that. Well, it turns out that this ditch that they dug is deeper than many of us thought. But by most standards, most economists are actually seeing that things are beginning to turn—maybe slower than we would like, but they are beginning to turn. We need to continue these policies. We need to help working families in this country. We need to fix health care. We need to lower costs for families. People are paying too much for health care in this country. They're tired of the past Congresses that were more interested in pleasing insurance companies than they were in helping average families. They want us to deal with global climate change and to try to help pave the way for new jobs in the area of green technologies. So we're going to move forward.

I should also tell my friends, and as they know, that as we debate this bill, there are committees meeting, there are briefings going on on a whole number of issues from health care to the economic recovery. I'm sorry that they don't want to stay around and do that work, but that's what they were elected to do. We're going to stay here, and we're going to do the people's work until it is done.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just would like to say again to my colleague from Massachusetts that he keeps saying that the Republicans dug a deeper ditch than they expected to have. I just want to point out again that at the end of the Republicans' being in the majority in the Congress at the end of 2006, the economy was growing. We had 54 straight months of job growth. The Democrats took over in January of 2007, and that's when the economy started getting in trouble. They dug the ditch. We didn't dig the ditch.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, I would just like to point out to the gentlelady from North Carolina, who has been a constant critic of the stimulus package, that some $8 billion of that total is earmarked specifically for North Carolina. Some

of the money that has already been spent, Madam Speaker, and has been used to be able to prevent the firing of teachers. Without receiving that money, States and communities would end up firing hundreds and hundreds of teachers, which would mean that class sizes would increase and in some cases even double, denying our kids the kind of quality education that we want them to have. Some of that money went to help shore up our law enforcement, our police officers, our firefighters. So to the best of my knowledge, the people of North Carolina haven't said, Don't give us the relief. Don't give us the aid. We need help because, quite frankly, this economy is in such bad shape—and I will repeat—because of the policies of the Republican administration that held the White House for 8 years, that basically turned its back on average working people in this country. We are trying to fix the mess that they created, and we're going to do that.

I would now like to yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do have the honor and responsibility of chairing our House Committee on Natural Resources. The gentleman from Washington, DOC HASTINGS, a former Member of the Rules Committee, is my ranking member. His amendment was made in order under this rule.

Some allusions have been made on the minority side this morning that there are important issues facing our country, but here we are debating horses and burros because we couldn't find a cats and dogs bill. Well, we take seriously our responsibility on the House Natural Resources Committee as stewards of our public lands. We take seriously our responsibility to all creatures of this great land of ours, whether they be cats, dogs, wild horses, burros, sea otters, turtles, bees, birds. You name it, they appropriately come under our jurisdiction, and they are important responsibilities that the American people value. These are creatures that God has endowed our great country with, that have no vast lobbyists here in Washington representing them; but they represent good old American family values. They represent recreational pursuits. They represent a quality of time that our families can spend enjoying with these creatures that God has so richly bestowed this country with.

So for the other side to say that with all these important issues before our country—and they are important issues, and this Congress is addressing them because we on the majority side as well as this administration can, indeed, walk and chew gum at the same time. We are addressing those issues.

As the minority knows, since they were once in a position of leadership, we are supposed to be here 5 days a week, working on behalf of our constituents. Our constituents, for the most part, work at least 5 days a week, if not 7 days a week. At least in my district, many of them go to work before the sun comes up. They don't go home and see their families until the sun has gone down. They work a full 8- if not 12-hour day; and yet the minority side is noted for their offering motions to adjourn after we come in at 10 o'clock in the morning. They want to go home at 10:10 a.m. I know this is inside Beltway, inside baseball talk; but the American people want to see Congress do its job. They recognize the many issues that face our country, and they recognize that Congress should be able to walk and chew gum at the same time, just like this administration is doing in a very appropriate way.

So we are addressing issues that affect the American people at the same time that we're addressing the issues that affect their daily lives. I think that that's what they want us to do, and they want us to do it in a bipartisan way. So we should not be up here trying to make fun of the matter that we're addressing of wild horses and burros legislation on a Friday because we know that work is being done while we are still discussing this legislation. The committees are meeting, the appropriations committees. The other committees are marking up health care reform, a very important issue. We know here amongst ourselves that if it were not for us having votes here on the floor of the House today, where would Members of Congress be? Some would be in their congressional districts, some would be out around the country doing things that Members do when we have weekends off. So this is an appropriate use of Congress' time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, there is so much to say in so little time. I don't think that Republicans need a lecture on how we should be spending our time and whether we should be in Washington 5 days a week. There is an old saying that nobody is safe as long as the Congress or the legislature is in session, and I think most Americans believe that. Being here in Washington is not necessarily meaning that Congress is being productive, and I think that is the point that we have made over and over again. Again, I will say, the wisdom of the world is not here in Washington; and I think with what's been happening, particularly in the last 6 months, the American people have found that out. I am going to be very interested to see how long our colleagues on the other side continue to defend their actions and the action of this administration as the year goes by.

In terms of looking after all God's creatures, I am a person—and my husband is—who are both owned by a dog and a cat. They live in our house. We have farmed all our lives. We have raised horses. We are very, very fond of animals. We give a lot of money to organizations that look after animals. In fact, there is one organization out West that keeps animals until they die a natural death. We feel very strongly about that. So questioning my feeling about how we should treat all of God's creatures is not going to go very far with me. This is also a group of people that wants to provide government-funded abortions and kill unborn babies at the same time we're talking about saving horses and spending money on that. That argument doesn't go very far with me.

What the difference is between our colleagues on the other side and us is that we don't believe in growing government. These are not the things the Federal Government should be about. The Federal Government should confine itself to the very narrow set of issues laid out for us in the Constitution. We should adhere to the 10th Amendment which says that if it isn't mentioned in the Constitution, then it's a province of the States; and that's what we should be doing. So I thought my colleague promised me fun today, but you brought up some issues where you've gone to meddling.

I now yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina. I represent a district that's 70,000 square miles. Over half of it is already under Federal ownership and control. I wouldn't necessarily say good management because it's also home to lots of issues involving poor forest management, catastrophic fires, lots of degradation of the habitat and lack of management over the years. One of the things that troubles me about this legislation is that we're going to spend potentially $700 million overall—I've heard figures as high as that—to apparently buy 19 million acres of land perhaps. And if it is, indeed, those levels, all that land, when the government buys it, comes off the tax rolls. I have got communities with 20 percent unemployment where the government owns 70 percent of the counties. They've shut down activity on the forests, and the Federal Government is trying to shut down activity out on the range land and destroy things like cattle ranching and some of the great economic ways of the West.

This legislation comes along and apparently is going to have us borrow another $700 million from somebody—probably the Chinese or whatever government decides they want to buy more of our debt, $700 million, almost $1 billion—so that we can go acquire more land as a government and take it off the tax rolls to deal with this issue. I just find it really disturbing. You are going to put a lot of people out of work in the rural West. This is not well-thought-out legislation. But speaking to the rule, we seem in this Congress, under Speaker PELOSI and the Democrat leadership, to have gone into not just tax-and-spend but gag-and-spend. I'll be asking soon to bring up a privileged resolution that I brought to this floor yesterday to allow us the opportunity to offer up amendments.

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

□ 1000

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. WALDEN. To be able to offer up amendments on appropriations bills as historically Members of this House were always able to do until just recently when we have seen a historic and unprecedented gagging of Members of the Republican Party by Members of the Democratic Party when we have tried to offer up alternatives, positive alternatives, suggestions, ways to protect freedom of speech and freedom of religion and to cut back on this outrageous deficit spending.

I guess those must be tough votes for the majority. They don't want to take them because they won't even allow our amendments to be debated on this House floor and considered.

So I'm sorry we have gotten into the gag-and-spend rules-making process around here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I find it ironic that my friends on the other side of the aisle want to talk about fiscal responsibility and they are worried about the deficit. Where were they for 8 years when George Bush took this economy and drove it straight into a ditch? He inherited a surplus from President Clinton, and he squandered it. And nobody, virtually nobody, on the other side of the aisle spoke about the fact that Republican economic policies are responsible for this economic crisis. This President inherited the worst economy since the Great Depression. We need to dig ourselves out of this ditch. And we are going to do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield our colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING) 2 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina.

In response to this point, I have stood here on this floor for hours and hours over several years listening to many, many Members of the Democrat Party, then the minority in Congress, plead that if they would just get the majority, give them the gavels, that the economy of this country would be brought back on track again. That happened in January of 2007. And it happened prior to any economic decline that anyone can describe on any flow chart that they can bring.

So they claimed that they would fix the economy if they could just have the majorities. They won the majorities partly on that claim, and the economy went south, and it really tanked in the anticipation of the President we have today. And it is getting worse. So I don't think that point can be made empirically.

I came here to rise in opposition to this rule. I rise in opposition to this rule for a number of reasons. I wanted to support the gentleman from Utah's statement about not having an opportunity, a legitimate opportunity, to make his case before the Rules Committee. And it is clear that that didn't happen. In a 1-hour window, he got an amendment in and filed. That was great staff work. But we have other things to do here other than sit outside the door of the hole in the wall on the third floor.

This process has got to change. We need to bring it to the floor where the American people can see what is actually being talked about in almost legislative code here.

I also want to point out that this legislation is not legislation that comes here because it is well thought out or needed by the American people. This is driven by HSUS, the Human Society of the United States. They have hundreds of millions of dollars, and they have an agenda. They are seeking to take meat off the plates of the American people and all around the globe. So we just dance to this tune in this Congress because they say so.

Nobody came from my district and said, what are we going to do about too many horses? HSUS contributed to this problem by helping to block the harvesting of horses for human consumption. And now we have what will accumulate to be 1 million extra horses in the United States. And barely do they get that over with and they come back to us and say now we need 700 billion American-taxpayer-borrowed dollars to take over more public lands in order to put more horses. This will only continue. Those horses are eating 1 billion gallons of my ethanol every year.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I want to respond to my friend from Massachusetts. He talks about deficits, and where were we? Let me point out to this gentleman, the highest deficit under George W. Bush's administration was in 2004, and that was right after we built up our forces to go into Afghanistan and Iraq.

It was slightly over $400 billion. Under your first watch, your first watch as the majority in this Congress, the deficit was $460 billion. This year it is projected to be $1.8 trillion. And here we are today on the floor talking about a bill to expand that deficit another $700 million.

Boy, talk about—well, I can't say the word. But talk about less than truthfulness. It certainly comes from the other side of the aisle on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If anyone on the other side of the aisle wants to defend the same-old-same-old policies of George Bush, then go ahead and do it. But the fact of the matter is that in November, 2008, the American people spoke overwhelmingly against and rejected those policies. The economic policies of the Republican Party and of George Bush drove this country into a ditch, and we are trying to dig ourselves out of it.

I reserve my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) 10 seconds.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The gentleman from Massachusetts has over 15 minutes, and he doesn't even want to engage in a colloquy with somebody here that is willing to stand up and at least engage.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, it appears as though we are beginning to touch a nerve on the part of our colleagues because we are presenting the facts, and they can't handle them.

We know that this economy is in terrible shape. All they can do is continue to blame President Bush. As one of my colleagues said, they asked for a chance to be in charge. They have been given a chance to be in charge. And what have they done? They have increased the debt to every American in this country in the first 6 months of this year by $9,342.83. We do face the greatest economic problem we have had in 25 years, not since the Great Depression.

Madam Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule because we don't need to be dealing with this issue now. We should be dealing with the American people who are hurting and continuing to lose jobs under the policies of Speaker PELOSI and the Bush administration.

I am asking my colleagues to vote no on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule making in order an amendment by Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah which was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

This amendment reconfigures the Joint Advisory Board to ensure representation by affected Indian tribes and State grazing boards. It also ensures that all members of the advisory board have expertise in wildlife management, rangeland management, animal husbandry or natural resources management and requires that the board members reside in a State in which wild free-roaming horses and burros are currently located.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 653 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after consideration of the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in section 4 of this resolution, if offered by Representative Chaffetz of Utah or his designee. Such amendment shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 5 is as follows: Section 8, strike paragraph (2) (page 17, lines 4 through 11) and insert the following new paragraph:

''(2) by striking 'Governments' and all that follows through 'management.' and inserting 'Governments shall include two representatives of the livestock industry; two representatives from State grazing boards (or equivalent State agency) who are not State employees; two representatives of the environmental community; two representatives

of the animal protection community; two representatives of Indian tribes who manage wild horses or burros; and four scientists. All advisory board members must have expertise in wildlife management, rangeland management, animal husbandry or natural resources management and must reside in States comprising the current range of wild free-roaming horses and burros.'; and''.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information form Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, we are here today because we are doing the work of the American people. And we are doing what the American people asked us to do.

As we debate this bill on the floor, there are major markups in the Education and Labor Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee on health care. There are also hearings and markups going on on two major appropriations bills. So there is a lot of work going on here, a lot of important work, of trying to dig ourselves out of this mess that this President inherited.

It is interesting, again, to hear my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about fiscal management and about the need to control deficits and debts when they voted for tax cuts for rich people that weren't off-set. They voted for wars that weren't paid for. And there was silence. And the economy got worse and worse and worse. On November 2008, the American people said, enough, we need to change course.

The American people want us to deal with health care. The Party of No says, no, can't do health care. They are trying to scare people, again, away from a national health care reform bill that will control and lower the cost of health care for average Americans.

People want us to deal with the issue of climate change and creating green jobs. And the Party of No says, no, we can't do that. They don't want us to deal with that issue. No, no, no, no.

Well, the reality is the American people want us to deal with the issues of law enforcement, with the issues of immigration and with a whole number of issues. And the Party of No says no. They vote against everything. They are against everything. So here we are. We are dealing with this issue today.

I think this is a commonsense bill. The chairman of the Resources Committee explained that there was a hearing and there was a markup at full committee. I would urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the previous question and ''yes'' on the rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Walden, submitted an amendment to the Committee on Rules to H.R. 3170, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act;

Whereas the said gentleman's amendment would have protected the free speech rights of broadcasters and American citizens by prohibiting funds made available in the Act from being used to implement the Fairness Doctrine and certain broadcast localism regulations,

Whereas a similar amendment was adopted by the House in 2007 during consideration of H.R. 2829, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2008 by a vote of 309 yeas and 115 nays, and became law, but the Democratic leadership allowed the provision to expire;

Whereas the gentleman's amendment complied with all applicable Rules of the House for amendments to appropriations measures and would have been in order under an open amendment process; but regrettably the House Democratic leadership has dramatically and historically reduced the opportunity for free speech on this Floor, and

Whereas the Speaker, Mrs. Pelosi, the Democratic leadership, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Obey, prevented the House from voting on the amendment by excluding it from the list of amendments made in order under the rule for the bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That H. Res. 644, the rule to accompany H.R. 3170, be amended to allow the gentleman from Oregon's amendment be considered and voted on in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oregon wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged for immediate consideration?

Mr. WALDEN. Yes, Madam Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WALDEN. I appreciate that, Madam Speaker. Rule IX is intended to allow a Member to raise questions which, and I quote, ''those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; and those affecting the rights of Members, individually, in their representative capacity.''

So I pose the question, What is more fundamental to the rights of Members of this House than the ability to represent their constituents and affect legislation brought to this floor?

The Democratic majority, under Speaker PELOSI, has unilaterally ended a 220-year tradition of allowing any Member to amend a spending bill. When my constituents sent me to Congress, they didn't send me here to just push the buttons using this card in a voting terminal. They wanted me to exercise all of the abilities granted to a Member of Congress. And the rule which this House passed yesterday by only a handful of votes, after arm twisting by the majority, denies me and every other Member the opportunity to fully represent their constituents.

If that does not ''affect the rights of this House,'' if that does not affect its ''dignity and the integrity of its proceedings,'' if that does not affect my rights as a Representative, I don't know what does.

For 220 years, we went along in this House with the opportunity to offer amendments. And sure, there were instances along the way where both parties probably restricted amendments that could be offered on appropriations bills, but not very often.

This is unprecedented and historic in terms of the gagging of Members on both sides of the aisle. We had them on the floor yesterday trying to offer an amendment, a Democrat, and he too was turned down and upset. So I'm sure the Chair can find some technical reason why my resolution to protect free speech rights on the public's airwaves may not be in order.

All we were trying to do is offer an amendment that had been offered up in 2007 and approved by over 300 Members of this House. When it was allowed to be considered and voted upon, it was approved by over 300 Members to protect the free speech rights of broadcasters, the citizens of this country as well. And instead, what we have now operating, I believe, affects the very rights of this House collectively, affects the dignity and integrity of its proceedings and affects the rights of its Members as described under rule IX individually in their representative capacity.

That is why I brought this privileged resolution to the floor, because I believe, as a citizen of this country and a Member of this great institution, that our rights have been diminished, and that indeed the integrity of this very House is on the line.

In fact, when you go to the Speaker's Web site, at least I think it is still up, she pledged an open debate and an opportunity for Members of Congress to be able to come to the floor and offer amendments, much like the chairwoman has done over time, and relishes that, as I do. It is part of what we do here, or what we were sent to do here.

It is pretty hard to offer up alternatives to spending bills to reduce deficits and to put ideas into law when the Speaker's Rules Committee acts and shuts down our very opportunity to even bring amendment up for debate.

□ 1015

Whether it passes or not will be up to the collective votes of this body. But we know that if we can never bring them up for debate, there will never be a vote. Now, maybe that's convenient to those who don't like to vote on difficult issues, or stand up for the free speech rights of broadcasters, whether they be religious broadcasters or those on the right or the left on talk radio, which is what my amendment would have sought to protect in the future.

But I really believe that rule IX is intended to allow Members to raise questions affecting the rights of the House collectively, to discuss its safety, and that's not at issue here, but its dignity is. The integrity of its proceedings are. Those rights, these are fundamental to each of us, regardless of the label behind our name that designates our party.

This is the one time we've had in this institution, to come forward with our ideas on how to control the bureaucracy, to offer an amendment that controls it. It's the only time I, as an individual, have that opportunity in the appropriations process, because I'm not a member of that committee, to represent my constituents. That's why I believe, under rule IX, my representative capacity is diminished, and that of many other Members in this Chamber, many who are watching right now. The public needs to understand this as well, that something has changed here, and it's not for the good. And I think it reflects badly on our proceedings. And I think it injures the integrity of this institution, let alone it's dignity. And that's why I make this parliamentary argument, that under rule IX, under rule IX, Members, it talks about collectively affecting the House.

Tell me, when Members of the minority or majority come before the Rules Committee and seek—well, first of all, have to even go to the Rules Committee. That didn't use to occur on appropriations bills, did it? It didn't used to occur. Only rarely, maybe once or twice in a year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind the gentleman to confine his remarks to his parliamentary question.

Mr. WALDEN. I appreciate the gentlelady's counsel and I will attempt to do that. I was trying to do that here, and certainly I'm arguing in favor of the rules of this House being observed; that's why I argue about the integrity of its proceedings.

In my view, proceedings have been shattered. Members of both parties are denied the opportunity, as our predecessors were allowed to have, to come to this floor and offer up amendments during the appropriations process. So I think my privileged resolution should be made in order, because I think my rights have been affected, and not in a good way. The rights of other Members are affected. I had more than one person on my amendment. And so individually, our representative capacity has been diminished. The voices I'm trying to represent are not allowed to be considered if I can't get my privileged resolution to be considered. All it did was ask for a vote on my amendment, that it be made in order, so that we could vote on it on the rule, which, oh, by the way, at this point, the way this process has been conducted, not only has the rule been passed, but also the bill has been passed. So it's kind of ironic now we'd have this argument about whether my privileged resolution was in order, which would have allowed me, had it been secured, it would have allowed me to have some additional representative capacity and be able to have a vote on the amendment or a vote on whether I could offer the amendment. I guess that's what would have occurred.

So I posit this point: That under rule IX, we are allowed to raise questions about issues that affect the rights of the House collectively. I can't think of something that affects the House more collectively than our inability to offer amendments. And so I think our integrity is at issue here, these proceedings. I think Americans have come to understand, bills are rammed through here without the opportunity to be read. We've got a 1,026-page bill in the Energy and Commerce Committee that I can't imagine anybody has read yet.

So, Madam Speaker, I'll conclude; that I hope you'll rule in my favor because I know, in your heart of hearts, you're a woman who believes in fairness, and you believe in the integrity of these proceedings, and you believe firmly and fervently in protecting the rights of Members, both individually and collectively, and that you, in no way, would want to diminish the capacity for yourself, when you're not in the chair, Members of this body, and for Members who will follow us. So I plead with you to do the right thing and allow a vote on my privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

In evaluating the resolution offered by the gentleman from Oregon under the standards of rule IX, the Chair must be mindful of a fundamental principle illuminated by annotations of precedent in section 706 of the House Rules and Manual. The basic principle is that a question of the privileges of the House may not be invoked to prescribe a special order of business for the House.

The Chair finds that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Oregon, by proposing directly to amend House Resolution 644, prescribes a special order of business. Under a long and well-settled line of precedent presently culminating in the ruling of July 9, 2009, such a resolution cannot qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

The Chair therefore holds that the resolution is not privileged under rule IX for consideration ahead of other business. Instead, the resolution may be submitted through the hopper in the regular course.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I move to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion that the appeal be laid on the table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

ordering the previous question on House Resolution 653; and

adopting House Resolution 653, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 174, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—238

Abercrombie
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—174

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Cantor
Eshoo
Graves
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Kildee
Lucas
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Patrick
Reyes
Richardson
Schakowsky
Sutton
Taylor
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1045

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois and PERRIELLO changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 573, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1018, RESTORE OUR AMERICAN MUSTANGS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 653, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

YEAS—232

Abercrombie
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Braley (IA)
Ellison
Gohmert
Graves
Kind
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Nadler (NY)
Rangel
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1053

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, on July 17, 2009, I inadvertently failed to vote on rollcall No. 574. Had I voted, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 574, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 186, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

YEAS—236

Abercrombie
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Griffith
Guthrie
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Brady (TX)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Graves
LaTourette
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1100

Mr. NADLER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORE OUR AMERICAN MUSTANGS ACT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 653, I call up the bill (H.R. 1018) to amend the Wild Free-

Roaming Horses and Burros Act to improve the management and long-term health of wild free-roaming horses and burros, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 653, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1018

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Restore Our American Mustangs Act''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Act of December 15, 1971 (commonly known as the ''Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act''; 16 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.).

SEC. 3. POLICY.

The first section is amended by striking ''in the area where presently found, as''.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 (16 U.S.C. 1332) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (b), by inserting ''born or present'' after ''unclaimed horses and burros'';

(2) in paragraph (c), by striking ''which does not exceed their known territorial limits,'';

(3) in paragraph (d)—

(A) by inserting ''and any associated foals'' after ''his mares''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(4) in paragraph (e), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(5) in paragraph (f)—

(A) by striking ''(1) which'' and all that follows through ''(2)'';

(B) by inserting '', in accordance with section 3(d),'' after ''from an area''; and

(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) 'thriving natural ecological balance' means a condition that protects ecosystem health, the ecological processes that sustain ecosystem function and a diversity of life forms, including those species listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and further ensures that wild horses and burros, livestock and wildlife species are given fair consideration in the allocation of resources on those lands where said species are authorized or managed consistent with the requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–579) and other applicable law; and

''(h) 'fatally injured or terminally ill' means an animal exhibiting one or more of the following:

''(1) A hopeless prognosis for life.

''(2) A chronic or incurable disease, injury, lameness, or serious physical defect (including severe tooth loss or wear, club foot, and other severe congenital abnormalities).

''(3) A condition requiring continuous treatment for the relief of pain and suffering in a domestic setting.

''(4) An acute or chronic illness, injury, physical condition or lameness that would preclude an acceptable quality of life for the foreseeable future.''.

SEC. 5. INVENTORY AND DETERMINATIONS.

(a) Section 3(a) (16 U.S.C. 1333(a)) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking ''is authorized and directed to'' and inserting ''shall—

''(1)''.

(2) By striking '', and he may'' and inserting a semicolon.

(3) By inserting before ''designate'' the following:

''(2)''.

(4) In paragraph (2) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking ''their'' and inserting ''the'';

(B) by inserting ''of wild free-roaming horses and burros'' after ''preservation'';

(C) by striking ''wherein'' and inserting ''where'';

(D) by striking ''deems'' and inserting '', considers''; and

(E) by striking ''desirable. The Secretary shall'' and inserting ''desirable;

''(3)''.

(5) In paragraph (3) (as so designated), by striking the period after ''public lands'' and inserting a semicolon.

(6) By striking ''He shall'' and inserting the following:

''(4)''.

(7) In paragraph (4) (as so designated), by striking ''of this Act.'' and inserting ''of this Act;''.

(8) By striking ''All'' and inserting the following:

''(5) ensure that''.

(9) In paragraph (5) (as so designated)—

(A) by inserting ''related to wild free-roaming horses and burros are'' after ''activities'';

(B) by striking ''shall be'' both places it appears;

(C) by inserting ''relevant State'' after ''in consultation with the'';

(D) by striking ''of the State wherein such lands are located'';

(E) by striking ''which inhabit such lands''; and

(F) by striking the period after ''endangered wildlife species'' and inserting a semicolon.

(10) By striking ''Any'' and inserting the following:

''(6) ensure that any''.

(11) In paragraph (6) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking ''on any such lands shall take'' and inserting ''are made after taking''; and

(B) by striking ''which inhabit such lands.'' and inserting ''; and''.

(12) At the end of such subsection, add the following:

''(7) ensure that the acreage available for wild and free-roaming horses and burros shall never be less than the acreage where wild and free-roaming horses and burros were found in 1971.''.

(b) Subsection (b)(1) of section 3 is amended as follows:

(1) By striking ''(b)(1) The Secretary shall'' and inserting the following:

''(b) In order to determine if a thriving natural ecological balance exists with regards to wild free-roaming horses and burros, the Secretary shall—

''(1)''.

(2) In paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking ''a current'' and inserting ''an''; and

(B) by striking the period after ''public lands'' and inserting a semicolon and the following:

''(2) update the inventory every two years; and

''(3) make the inventory available to the public on the Website of the Bureau of Land Management.''.

(3) By striking ''The purpose'' and all that follows through ''the Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(c) In order to better manage and protect wild free-roaming horses and burros, and to achieve and maintain a thriving natural ecological balance, the Secretary, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, shall take the following actions:

''(1) Adopt and employ the best scientific, peer-reviewed methods to accurately estimate wild free-roaming horse and burro populations on public lands for purposes of the inventory required in subsection (b).

''(2) Develop a policy and standards, with public involvement, for setting consistent, appropriate management levels on public lands, based on scientifically sound methodologies.

''(3) Provide a public process, including a period for notice and comment, for finalizing appropriate management level standards.

''(4) Publish and distribute these standards to each field office so that the methodology for estimating population and determining appropriate management levels is consistent across public lands.

''(5) Train Federal personnel on the use of these standard techniques to estimate population and determine appropriate management levels.''.

(4) By striking ''shall consult with'' and inserting the following:

''(6) Develop and finalize the standards in consultation with—''.

(5)(A) By inserting ''(A)'' before ''the United States Fish''.

(B) By inserting ''(B)'' before ''wildlife agencies''.

(C) By striking ''wherein'' and inserting ''where''.

(D) By striking ''such individuals'' and inserting ''(C) individuals''.

(E) By striking ''such other individuals'' and inserting ''(D) individuals''.

(F) By striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Secretary''.

(G) By inserting ''to'' after ''determines''.

(6) In subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (6) (as so designated), by striking each comma and inserting a semicolon.

(7) In subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (6) (as so designated), by moving the margins of such subparagraphs 4 ems to the right.

(8) After paragraph (6) (as so designated), by inserting the following:

''(7) Identify new, appropriate rangeland for wild free roaming horses and burros, including use of land acquisitions, exchanges, conservation easements, voluntary grazing buyouts, and agreements with private landowners to allow for the federally supervised protection of wild horses and burros on private lands, except that the Secretary shall assess the effects of new range for wild free-roaming horses and burros on rangeland health, riparian zones, water quality, soil compaction, seed bed disturbance, native wildlife, and endangered or threatened species and transmit the results of the assessment to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

''(8) Establish sanctuaries or exclusive use areas, except that the Secretary shall assess the effects of sanctuaries or exclusive use areas for wild free-roaming horses and burros on rangeland health, riparian zones, water quality, soil compaction, seed bed disturbance, native wildlife and endangered or threatened species and transmit the results of the assessment to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

''(9) In identifying or designating any new rangeland, or establishing any sanctuary or exclusive use area for wild free-roaming horses and burros, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall take into account and avoid any potential conflicts with wind, solar, geothermal, oil, natural gas, energy transmission, and mineral resources potential of the lands affected by the identification, designation, or establishment.

''(10) Research, develop, and implement enhanced surgical or immunocontraception sterilization or other safe methods of fertility control.''.

(c) In subsection (b) of section 3, by striking ''(2) Where'' and inserting ''(d) If''.

(d) In subsection (d) (as so designated) of section 3—

(1) by striking ''determines'' and all that follows through ''horses and burros to be'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''has exhausted all practicable options for maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance on the range, the Secretary may provide that wild free-roaming horses and burros are'';

(2) by striking ''for which he determines'' the first place it appears and inserting ''so long as the Secretary has determined'';

(3) by striking ''and for which he determines he can assure'' and inserting ''and the Secretary can ensure'';

(4) by striking ''(including'' and all that follows through ''That, not'' and inserting the following: ''by requiring that—

''(1) no'';

(5) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking ''animals'' the first two places it appears and inserting ''wild free-roaming horses and burros'';

(B) by striking ''such'' the first place it appears and inserting ''the''; and

(C) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon and adding the following:

''(2) each individual adopter shall execute an appropriate attestation, pursuant to section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, affirming that adopted animals and their remains shall not be used for commercial purposes; and

''(3) wild free-roaming horses and burros may not be contained in corrals or short-term holding facilities for more than 6 months while awaiting disposition.''; and

(6) by striking subparagraph (C) and paragraph (3).

(e) Redesignate subsection (c) of section 3 as subsection (e) and in such subsection—

(1) by striking ''Where excess animals have'' and inserting ''When a wild free-roaming horse or burro has'';

(2) by striking ''a period of'';

(3) by striking ''is authorized'' and inserting ''shall,'';

(4) by inserting a comma after ''transferee'';

(5) by striking ''to'' before ''grant'';

(6) by striking ''title to not more than four animals to''; and

(7) by striking ''at the end of the one-year period'' and inserting ''title to that animal''.

(f) Redesignate subsection (d) of section 3 as subsection (f) and in such subsection—

(1) by striking ''Wild'' and inserting ''(1) Except as provided for in paragraph (2), wild'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively;

(3) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking ''(c) except for the limitation of subsection (c)(1)'' and inserting ''(e)'';

(4) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by striking ''(b)''and inserting ''(h)'';

(5) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(6) in paragraph (5), by striking ''(5)'' and all that follows through ''burro'' and inserting the following:

''(2) No animal ever covered under this Act''.

(g) By inserting after section 3(f) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(g) Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this subsection, for the purposes of carrying out a successful wild free-roaming horse and burro adoption program the Secretary shall—

''(1) implement creative and more aggressive marketing strategies for the adoption program, including the use of the internet or other media to showcase horses and the adoption program;

''(2) explore public outreach opportunities, including agreements with local and State organizations that are using horses for rehabilitation, therapy, or prisoner programs;

''(3) provide resources to properly screen and train potential adopters;

''(4) conduct tours of Bureau of Land Management facilities for interested parties;

''(5) develop volunteer mentor and compliance check programs for assisting the agency in facilitating successful adoptions;

''(6) develop a program through which potential adopters may be offered an economic incentive for successful completion of the adoption process; and

''(7) take any and all other actions that the Secretary determines to be necessary and useful towards expanding the wild horse and burro adoption program.

''(h) The Secretary may not destroy or authorize the destruction of wild free-roaming horses or burros unless the Secretary—

''(1) determines that the wild free-roaming horse or burro is terminally ill or fatally injured; and

''(2) ensures that the terminally ill or fatally injured wild free-roaming horse or burro will be destroyed in the most humane manner.

''(i) If the immediate health or safety of wild free-roaming horses or burros is threatened, such as in severe drought conditions, the Secretary may temporarily remove animals from the range.

''(j) The Secretary may remove from the range wild free-roaming horses and burros determined to be a threat to the health and well being of native plant or wildlife species.

''(k) Except in cases of removal under subsection (d), (i), or (j), if the Secretary removes wild free-roaming horses or burros from an area, the Secretary shall provide a public notice on the Website of the Bureau of Land Management 30 days prior to the planned removal.

''(l) The Secretary shall—

''(1) track the number of wild free-roaming horses and burros injured or killed during gathering or holding in a centralized database system;

''(2) determine what information on the treatment of gathered wild free-roaming horses and burros in holding and adopted wild free-roaming horses and burros could be provided to the public to help inform the public about the treatment of wild free-roaming horses and burros; and

''(3) ensure that such information is easily accessible on the Website of the Bureau of Land Management.''.

(h) By striking subsection (e) (relating to sale of excess animals).

SEC. 6. PRIVATE MAINTENANCE.

Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 1334) is amended—

(1) by striking ''animals removed'' and inserting ''animals returned to public land''; and

(2) by inserting ''pursuant to section 3(h)'' after ''agents of the Secretary''.

SEC. 7. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

Section 6 (16 U.S.C. 1336) is amended by inserting ''and other private entities'' after ''landowners''.

SEC. 8. JOINT ADVISORY BOARD.

Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 1337) is amended—

(1) by striking ''nine'' and inserting ''12'';

(2) by striking ''Governments'' and all that follows ''management.'' and inserting ''Governments and shall include at a minimum three representatives of the livestock industry; three representatives of the environmental community; three representatives of the animal protection community; and three scientists with expertise in wildlife management, animal husbandry, or natural resource management.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Nomination of members of the board shall be conducted by public notice and comment in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix) and shall be for a term of four years. No individual shall serve more then two consecutive terms.''.

SEC. 9. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.

Section 8 (16 U.S.C. 1338) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Any person who'' and inserting ''(a) Any person who''; and

(2) in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking ''except as provided in section 3(e),'';

(B) by inserting '', transports for processing,'' after ''processes'';

(C) by striking ''the remains of a'' and inserting ''a live or deceased''; and

(D) by inserting ''for consideration'' after ''burro''.

SEC. 10. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY.

Strike section 10 (16 U.S.C. 1339) and redesignate section 11 as section 10.

SEC. 11. REPORTS.

Section 10 (as so redesignated by section 10 of this Act) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking ''After the expiration'' and all that follows through ''thereafter'' and inserting ''(a)(1) Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter''.

(2) By striking ''will submit to Congress a joint report'' and inserting ''shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a joint report''.

(3) By striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Secretaries''.

(4) By inserting after subsection (a)(1) (as so designated) the following:

''(2) The report shall also contain the following—

''(A) the number of acres managed by the Bureau of Land Management and the USDA Forest Service for wild free-roaming horses and burros;

''(B) the appropriate management levels on public rangelands;

''(C) a description of the methods used to determine the appropriate management levels and whether it was applied consistently across the agency;

''(D) the number of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public lands;

''(E) a description of the methods used to determine the wild free-roaming horse and burro population;

''(F) any land acquisitions, exchanges, conservation easements, and voluntary grazing buyouts that the Secretary has acquired or pursued for wild free-roaming horses and burros;

''(G) any sanctuaries or exclusive use areas established for wild free-roaming horses and burros;

''(H) programs established for immunocontraception research, development, and management level implementation;

''(I) the extent to which fertility control is being used by the Secretary to control the population of wild free-roaming horses and burros;

''(J) the percentage of the Bureau of Land Management budget devoted to contraception annually;

''(K) the ratio of animals the agency has contracepted and put back on the range; and

''(L) which herds have been administered contraception and with what results.

''(3) Each report submitted under paragraph (2) shall be made available to the public on the Website of the Bureau of Land Management.''.

(5) By inserting ''(b)'' before ''The Secretary of the Interior''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part A of House Report 111–212 if ordered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) or his designee, which shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. It shall be in order to consider a further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of House Report 111–212 if offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) or his designee, which shall be considered as read and debatable for

30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1018.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today H.R. 1018, the Restore Our American Mustangs Act, legislation that will save the taxpayers money while saving tens of thousands of wild horses and burros from slaughter.

Earlier this year, the Bureau of Land Management made a truly shocking announcement. This Federal agency tasked with managing our magnificent public lands and resources announced future plans to destroy, i.e., slaughter, 30,000 healthy wild horses and burros entrusted to their care by the American people.

The announcement was even more stunning given that Congress enacted the Wild, Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971 declaring that these iconic animals were ''living symbols of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West'' and ''are to be considered an integral part of the natural system of the public lands.''

How in the world can a Federal agency be considering massive slaughter of animals the law says they are supposed to be protecting?

At my request, the Government Accountability Office conducted a complete review of the program, and they documented its numerous shortcomings.

The bill before us amends the 1971 act to implement the suggestions made by GAO and give the agency as many options as possible to avoid destroying these animals. Most significantly, this legislation will move the agency toward increasing the acreage available to wild horses and burros.

When the original act passed in 1971, 20 percent of BLM land was open to the horses. Today, they are only allowed on 13 percent of BLM land. The agency has never justified the removal of horses and burros from these missing acres.

This bill will also require consistency in management planning, with publication of standard operating procedures for managing these animals across all of our public lands. It will require better accounting methods so the agency can be certain how many animals are truly out on the range. It will strengthen the adoption program so that many more eligible horses and burros can go to adoptive homes. And it will authorize cooperative agreements with individuals and nonprofits so that large numbers of animals might be moved onto non-Federal land. Each of these provisions will make this program more cost-effective and will make it more efficient.

Despite these improvements, opponents of this bill are going to claim today that it will be expensive to implement. Their solution is to simply pass the same narrow bill prohibiting slaughter approved in the last Congress. You're going to hear that this bill goes so far that it should be called welfare for horses. That's what they will claim.

This is a funny line, but it uses high cost estimates to gloss over the fact that since the last Congress we have the benefit now of a comprehensive GAO report identifying many more strategies that we must pursue. Commissioning a good report and then ignoring its recommendations I hardly think is a way to save money. Stopping slaughter is an important step, and I'm pleased to see my friends on the other side of the aisle are now supporting that, but we do need to do more.

To be very clear, the pending bill, H.R. 1018, contains no direct spending. We are not creating an entitlement for horses. So the welfare joke falls completely flat.

Any increase in funding for the wild horse and bureau program would be the result of appropriations, not this authorization bill. Increasing the number of Federal acres available to horses and burros from the current 13 percent of BLM land back to the 20 percent available to them in 1971 should not cost the taxpayers anything. It is merely a 7 percent management adjustment, nothing more.

Our friends across the aisle always claim that BLM owns too much land. Now, we don't think so, but they certainly own enough to accommodate horses and burros. Furthermore, the management efficiencies in other parts of this bill will actually save money, and here is what we are doing: increasing adoptions, contraception and reducing overcrowding that will relieve the agency from having to round these animals up and care for them in long-term holding facilities, an expensive proposition.

The status quo is the worst of both worlds. It requires the BLM to hold these animals in expensive, long-term storage right up to the point when the money runs out, and then the agency has to kill thousands of them.

And witness these photos. These are American wild mustangs. And this is their fate. This is their fate held in captivity, abused. This is not what America is all about. This is not what America approves.

H.R. 1018 will give the agency new and better tools to avoid this outcome and will save money in the process.

At the appropriate time, I will be offering a manager's amendment further clarifying that the restoration of the missing acreage is a goal rather than a legal requirement, and so I would urge my colleagues concerned about the cost involved to support that amendment at the time and then support this legislation on final passage.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, across our Nation, Americans are struggling to pay their bills; 9.5 percent of Americans are out of work. This is the highest unemployment rate that America has experienced in over a quarter of a century. President Obama and his economic advisers expect the number of jobless to climb higher, into the double digits.

After bailouts for Wall Street and a stimulus bill that has cost hundreds of billions of dollars and still isn't creating the jobs that the Democrats promised, the national deficit has now hit $1 trillion, and that is an historic and worrying amount that President Obama says keeps him awake at night.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are hurting. Our economy is in a recession. Two million jobs have been lost since the stimulus bill passed this Congress in February. Government spending is going through the roof. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that since January, the Obama and Pelosi budgets will lead to increased spending of $2.6 trillion over the next 10 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, with this backdrop, what is the response of this Democrat Congress to month after month of lost jobs, record unemployment, out-of-control spending, and skyrocketing deficits? Their response is to vote on a bill to create a $700 million welfare program for wild horses and burros.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people want an illustration of just how out of touch this Congress has become on spending, they need to look no further than what's happening here on the floor of the House with this issue of wild horses and burros.

In the last Congress, the House passed legislation to ban the commercial slaughter of wild horses and burros. It was a one-page bill, and CBO estimated that it would cost taxpayers less than $500,000 a year. Now we're just 2 years from that time period and we're looking at a bill that, again, bans slaughter of these animals but then proceeds to spend a CBO estimate of $700 million to create a new welfare program for wild horses.

Mr. Speaker, that's right. Under the fiscal plan of this Democrat Congress the amount they want to spend on wild horses from the last Congress, which was $500,000, to this Congress, is $700 million.

So let's take a look at what the taxpayers' dollars would be spent on in

this vast increase of public spending. It would mandate a wild horse census be conducted every 2 years. It provides enhanced contraception and birth control for these horses. It would spend and somehow acquire or move 19 million acres of public and private land for the specific purpose of giving these horses more places to roam around.

Mr. Speaker, 19 million acres is roughly the size of the distinguished chairman's State in West Virginia. That's the size of what we're talking about. And after we do that, Mr. Speaker, $5 million will then be spent to repair the damage that these horses will do on these lands. And then, of course, there are new mandates that government bureaucrats perform home inspections before Americans can adopt a wild horse. That's the spending that would be encompassed in this $700 million.

So again, just to repeat, just to be sure that everybody understands, the taxpayers are being asked to buy up millions of acres of land for the enjoyment of wild horses, and then taxpayers will have to pay $5 million a year to repair the damage that these horses will do to those lands.

Mr. Speaker, I must say only in Washington, D.C., does this make sense. Our country is in the middle of the worst recession in a half century. Over 14.5 million Americans are unemployed and can't find jobs. How in the world can the Democrats in this Congress hold a vote on this bill?

Americans are hurting. Republicans are focused on creating the jobs in this country, but this Democrat Congress seems to be more worried about hundreds of millions of dollars for wild burros and wild horses.

□ 1115

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, before recognizing the distinguished subcommittee chair, I do want to say I'm joined in cosponsoring this legislation by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and by my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

At this point, I will yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of our National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise today in support of the Restore our American Mustangs Act, H.R. 1018, a bill that will ensure wild horses and burros continue to have a place to roam on our public lands.

Mr. Speaker, as a steward of our public lands, I have been appalled by the proposal of the Bureau of Land Management to euthanize tens of thousands of healthy wild horses. According to the recent report by the Government Accountability Office, the BLM's Wild Horse and Burro Program is terribly inefficient and ineffective, and the BLM's so-called solution to this inefficiency is to simply put the animals they care for to death.

Mr. Speaker, there has to be a better way.

The better solution includes more options and more rigorous management. The ROAM Act will provide both. It includes reasonable tools such as the use of fertility control, the establishment of sanctuaries, and a much more robust adoption program, all leading to a more humane and constructive scheme.

Mr. Speaker, the amended bill being considered today has taken into account input from a range of stakeholders, including the administration, wild horse advocacy groups, and, based on their experiences and their efforts in the field, this bill has been put together.

Perhaps most significant, the bill provides a definition for the term ''thriving natural ecological balance,'' which appears in the 1971 law but was not defined. The definition makes clear that the management of horses and burros should seek to achieve a balanced, multiple-use of public lands, ensuring the health of all aspects of the range.

Testimony given to the Natural Resources Committee under consideration of this bill from the Director of the Game and Fish Department in my home State of Arizona highlighted the need for such a definition, and the bill provides one.

The amended bill is a solid foundation from which to correct the problems with BLM management of wild horses and burros and to begin to restore these animals to their natural, rightful place on our public lands as intended by the original 1971 law.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill before us today and to reject the substitute. The substitute has no cost savings. It guts H.R. 1018. It continues the costly practice of holding animals in pens that cost $27 million a year to taxpayers. And it's a carte blanche for the BLM to kill, outright, up to 30,000 horses they have sitting in their holding pens.

This amendment is expensive and inhumane, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) who has an absolute hands-on experience with the issue that we're dealing with here today. She's also a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I am from Wyoming, a State that has many wild horses on its public lands. I also have a degree in animal science, and I may be the only Member of this body who has ridden a BLM wild horse. My sister adopted two. This bill is not respectful of the grass resource.

Let's talk about the ecology and the environment of the plains of this great country. Wild horses graze differently than cattle, sheep, elk, and deer. And the reason is they have a solid hoof; whereas, buffalo, elk, deer, and cattle have a split hoof. When a solid-hoofed animal is pounding our fragile soils in the West, they are tamping or compacting that soil so it does not accept water that is needed to sustain very shallow, very fragile topsoil and the important diversity of grass species that are supported and are needed by every animal that grazes those lands and every endangered and threatened species that uses those same lands.

Furthermore, wild horses are there year-round. Livestock is only there at certain times of the year. Wild horses that were not native to these lands, in the spring, create tremendous damage when the thawing occurs that creates great rises and disruptions of the soil.

Furthermore, when they graze, they pull plants out from the roots. Some of these species are, themselves, threatened and endangered grass and flowering plant species. That is why the Wyoming Nature Conservancy has opposed this bill.

Let me read you what the Wyoming Nature Conservancy has to say: H.R. 1018 is an affront to efforts that have united conservation and ranch interests to achieve real, on-the-ground results throughout the West. Western rangeland supports population of native plants, wildlife, livestock, and wild horses. It is our position that effective management of this rangeland must be based on science, not emotion.

This bill is based on emotion and not science.

Furthermore, when flies congregate on wild horses in the summer, the horses tend to gather closely and try to roll to prevent the flies from staying on them and laying their eggs. Consequently, they're destroying sage grass habitat.

Sage grass is a threatened species that is headed for the endangered species status if we do not control the activity of species that interfere with the recovery of the sage grass.

In other words, this bill is elevating wild horses above threatened and endangered species, above all the plant and animal species that share the same habitat in the West, and this is inappropriate land management, grass management. It creates an unsustainable situation. That is why Wyoming's Democrat Governor has also opposed the bill.

Governor Dave Freudenthal of Wyoming: H.R. 1018, to be frank, props up a program in need of sweeping reform. The current adoption program is full and is not responsive to the real issues of wild horse management. By increasing expensive holding facilities where many of these animals live out their lives because they are unadoptable, H.R. 1018 ignores the reality that wild horse and burro populations are out of control and doesn't get to the real problems that cripple our ability to truly manage these animals.

Furthermore, Wyoming's highly respected premier Game and Fish Department: Simply put, we are very concerned that expanding the management

of free-roaming horses and burros to all public lands would have devastating impacts to the long-term sustainability of the public's fish and wildlife resources and their habitats in the West.

The list goes on and on of opponents. These opponents are people that manage fish and wildlife. These are people who manage grass resources. These are people who have boots-on-the-ground experience and know that you cannot elevate one nonnative species over native species of plants and animals and have an ecologically sustainable grass resource and prairie system.

Chairman RAHALL, I have great respect for your knowledge of the mining laws that are so important to my State and your State, but I can tell you respectfully, Mr. Chairman, that wild horses are a problem in Wyoming, and I'm very hopeful that you will choose not to import the problem to your State of West Virginia. But if you do, you will find, of course, that you can sustain mammals in terms of a number of mammals per acre. In Wyoming, it's the number of acres per mammal, and it can vary anywhere from 35 acres to sustain one mammal to over 100. Because of that, the consequences of overgrazing are enormous.

Today's population of wild horses stands at approximately 36,000, and we know that the wild horse program stipulates that the total population of wild horses on public land should not exceed about 28,000 in order to promote a thriving ecological balance.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about ecological balance. Yes, this is an expensive program, and I concur with the remarks of my ranking member from Washington. But I want to emphasize the disrespect that this bill places on our sensitive, fragile grass resources in the West that, during times of drought and during times of heavy pressure, are unavailable to sustain this feral horse population, nonnative, that is in need of control.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank my very good friend, the chairman of the committee. I was struck by the comments of the gentlelady from Wyoming referring to what she calls a feral horse problem here and the idea that we might be likely to vote on the basis of emotion rather than pure science.

Well, I'm going to give some hard-and-fast numbers. But first in response to that, it seems to me that we should reflect upon the fact that virtually all of our heroes are depicted in statues on horses. If they were killed in battle, their horse has the two front hooves up in the air. If they were wounded, one hoof is up.

Now, there's nothing scientific about that. It's all about emotion. It's about inspiring the American people. It's about what this country was about. And one of the things this country was about is its wild, open spaces where horses and buffalo were free to roam.

Now the argument is made they are nonnative. Well, the cows are nonnative, too, and in large measure this is to provide more room for cow grazing.

Let me get to some hard-and-fast numbers, because I strongly support Mr. RAHALL's bill, because not only is it fiscally responsible, it is the right thing to do. Mr. HASTINGS' substitute is not the best solution.

The House has voted three times on this issue with overwhelming bipartisan support every time. This bill provides cost-effective, on-the-range management for our mustangs.

The Bureau of Land Management's program really isn't working very well. They're rounding up wild horses, only to keep them in holding pens. It's not good for the horses and it's wasting money, frankly.

Now, when you spend two-thirds of your program feeding captive wild mustangs in costly pens, you ought to figure out if there isn't a better alternative. Mr. RAHALL's bill and Mr. GRIJALVA's is a much better alternative to let them live in the open range but to reduce the population through humane birth control measures.

The gentleman suggests this is welfare for horses. The U.S. Geological Survey, the Journal of Wildlife Management, and the GAO all agree that this saves more than $6 million as well as saving 30,000 horses. Mr. HASTINGS' amendment would be voting to slaughter 30,000 wild horses.

□ 1130

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

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank my very good friend, the chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia.

I can't imagine that we want that picture that Mr. RAHALL showed on the floor, which was only a half dozen horses, magnified 5,000 times. Mr. HASTINGS' amendment will cause 5,000 times that slaughter, 30,000 slaughtered horses.

Now, as to this wild horse welfare, the reality is that the Geological Survey has figured that by implementing herd reduction with birth control, Mr. RAHALL's bill, H.R. 1018, saves more than $6 million a year. The U.S. Geological Survey says it will save $7.7 million a year. What is planned is to use a much less expensive, far more humane process of population control, contraceptive measures to humanely reduce the number of horses while allowing them to use the range. We're talking about federally owned Bureau of Land Management land. We're not talking about letting the horses loose in everybody's backyard in Wyoming or any other State. We're talking about BLM lands. What the GAO found, and I quote, ''reducing authorized grazing levels would likely be cheaper than wild horse removals to achieve the same reduction in forage consumption.''

Well, that's the economics of this. This is fiscally responsible. This saves money, according to experts. But there's also something to be said for the other, the noneconomic, nonpragmatic issue. It seems to me that it is wrong for this Congress to vote to slaughter 30,000 wild horses. Basically it was their land, and we took it from them. Let's go with Mr. RAHALL's amendment and do the right thing. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, before I yield time to my friend from Utah, I just would point out to my friend from Virginia that the amendment that I am going to offer later on is precisely word for word a bill that he voted on 2 years ago.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman.

I guess one of the problems I have is that I have actually read this bill and some of the amendments that are going to be proposed here. It seems that we are in a situation where we are more concerned—or at least the leaders of this Congress are more concerned—about homes for horses than we are homes for Americans or jobs for Americans. And from the very few people that still have jobs, we are now going to take $700 million, at the minimum, from their pockets to try to create a solution to a problem this Congress has solved.

In years past, the land managers in this country have pled with this Congress not to take away the management tool; yet year after year in proposal after proposal, we in Congress have, indeed, micromanaged those individuals. We have stopped the ability of a sale from these horses even though the contract for the sale prohibited resale for slaughtering purposes. That no longer is a tool that they have. We have tried to reduce the ability that they have of running an adoption program until today. It is no longer effective because of our efforts on this floor to micromanage. There is an effort—even the administration complained about a provision that will be in the bill and that will remain in this bill about the process of taking a horse that has died of natural causes to a rendering factory that could be construed as a felony. The administration complained about that, and we have done nothing to take out that micromanagement element to it. In years past the Secretary of the Interior did have the right to euthanize old, sick or lame horses; but we have also narrowed that down to the point that that could only happen with a terminally ill horse as a means of a mercy approach.

In addition to that, other elements that this House passed in the agriculture bill and in finance bills have totally eliminated the abilities of those in the private sector who have

horses to do anything else except what is left to them, dump these on the Federal range, which means that the count the people have been talking about by the States—and it is only 10 of them that are impacted with the wild horses and wild burros—recognize that there is a significant undercount of this problem and this situation. We already have dedicated solely to wild horses and wild burros an amount of land that is owned by the public that is the size of the State of New York. And even with that much land dedicated solely to the purpose of horse range, our micromanagement in taking tools away from the land manager who went and complained about that has caused us to have an overabundance of horses on that land until, indeed, 35,000 horses, we have to find other activities for them; and Mr. Speaker, it is important to know that by the laws of this country they cannot be slaughtered. There is no slaughter of horses. We have banned the practice. We have banned the transportation.

No one is talking about the slaughtering of horses. The closest this bill comes to slaughter is the Rules chairman who limited all the amendments that were possible under this particular bill. And unfortunately because of how we have micromanaged this land, the appropriations for our Horse and Burro Program, which will run close to $60 million in next year's budget, 75 percent has to be done to the excess that we have that has been caused by decisions that we have made on this floor.

Now the solution being presented today is simply not trying to give the land managers the tools that they ask. It is to expand the amount of land by a size equal to the State of West Virginia for more area at a cost of $700 million, according to CBO. However, the agency itself said this will be well over $1 billion when we are finished with this solution. We have found that we have a problem in this country where stimulus bills don't create the jobs we expected, our bloated budgets don't create the jobs we expected, our tax increases don't create the jobs we expected. So instead of tackling that issue, which would be a perfectly legitimate subject today, we're talking about horses, horses roaming an area the size of the State of New York. We may be willing to ration health care for humans but not health care for horses. We have more concern with the habitat for horses than homes for humans, and I have a big problem—and I will speak to the amendment now so I will not come back—with the concept of the change the gentleman from West Virginia is offering. By changing this bill from mandating that the size of West Virginia be found somewhere to setting it only as a goal makes it a much more pernicious issue. A goal is not a legal requirement, but a goal is not defined anywhere in terms in law, which means a goal may actually be an incentive to force them to reprioritize in a way that the BLM does not want to reprioritize.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. A goal in statute may be an element and a door opening for lawsuits that will be used against this element. I mean, this is the most dangerous of language when it is so vague that no one has defined it, no one has considered it, but it may be used against us, and especially when the Secretary of the Interior is one of the few people in Washington that has the power of condemnation. Not even the President of the United States has the ability of going in and condemning lands. The Secretary of the Interior does, and we are now empowering that Secretary with a vague undefined term of having a goal of finding enough land, public or private, the size of the State of West Virginia.

May I state one other thing. The chairwoman of the Rules Committee is from New York. The person that was representing this bill from the Rules Committee was from Massachusetts. The good gentleman is from West Virginia. Last year when we talked about this bill, there were gentlemen from West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio speaking towards this issue. With all due respect, there are only 10 States that are impacted by wild horses and wild burros. Those States I have just mentioned have absolutely zero wild horses on their property. If they would take these wild horses and provide a habitat for them, I would be ecstatic. But until that time happens, we are the ones that are bearing the burden, and we understand the issues. And the land managers are asking, free their hands so they can solve this problem, and Congress does not have the wisdom to listen to the experts to do what they know is right to solve this particular problem. This is a conundrum that we should not be talking about. We should be talking about how we can make life better for Americans with more jobs and a better lifestyle.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a dear friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), one of the cosponsors of the legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Obviously this is a very important issue. And I might say that opponents of this legislation—at least some of them—argue that under these difficult economic times, the Democrats are spending millions of dollars to protect wild horses. Now in my view, it is a much more complicated issue than that. This is a classic case of competing interests. On one side we have corporations, partnerships, individuals who have leased almost 250 million acres of land, owned by the taxpayers, from the Federal Government, and on the other side we have wild horses.

Now there's been some question about whether or not these wild mustangs were native or not. I'm not an expert in that field, and I certainly respect the gentlelady from Wyoming on her comments. But it was e-mailed to me that Dr. Kay Kirkpatrick, who is one of the leaders and one of the respected experts in this field, has said that these wild horses were re-released native wildlife, that they were native. They were captured and then re-released. Now because these leaseholders do not want wild mustangs grazing on their land, they have been successful through lobbyists of changing Federal law to require that there only be so many wild mustangs for a certain area of land. And because of that, BLM flies helicopters around. They count the wild mustangs. If they exceed that number, they move them in these holding areas. It is without dispute that these holding areas are the most expensive way to deal with these animals. That's why millions of dollars are being spent right now.

I think the reason that the Rahall legislation can help solve this problem is this: Number one, it reduces the number of horses in the holding areas. Number two, it expands the area for grazing; but most importantly, it directs BLM to use immunocontraception to reduce the size of the herds.

Now I can tell you something—when I looked at the conference report on the Interior appropriations bill a couple of years ago, we found out that these leaseholders of these taxpayer lands were paying the Federal Government about 9 cents per acre per year. And I can tell you, the farmers of Kentucky and in the East cannot get access to land for 9 cents per acre per year. So we have this competing interest.

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

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. We have this competing interest. We have this commercial interest, which we all admire and respect, and we think that they should be able to use this land for grazing. The leaseholders should be able to use it for grazing, for dude ranches, for recreation, for whatever they might want. But at the same time we have these wild mustangs that deserve some protection, particularly when the leaseholders are paying about 9 cents per acre per year to the Federal Government. So I would urge support of the Rahall legislation because it expands the grazing area; it's going to reduce the number of wild mustangs; and it's also going to reduce the number held in holding areas, which is the most expensive way to take care of these animals. I urge support of the Rahall legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I come to the floor to address a subject matter that seems a bit surrealistic. We have a love for horses in this country. Most of us in this Chamber would agree with that, and I am among those. I can think of a lot of happy times around horses, on horses and working with horses. We also have a responsibility to manage the resources of this country. There seems to be a conviction to try to pull this globe—under the climate change legislation or the cap-and-tax legislation and many other pieces—back to what would have been pre-Garden of Eden before man supposedly desecrated the planet.

□ 1145

And the default position, amazingly for me, is what was nature like before man began to compete as a species with the other species on the planet? And so that default position that comes from the environmentalists from consistently out of the political left would be this natural balance of our environment.

I have just heard the gentleman state that these horses were native. But they were not native. They are not indigenous. No surviving species of horse was indigenous to this continent nor this hemisphere. They were brought here by the Spanish in the 1500s and beyond. The horses got loose and began to roam the range, and they competed with the existing species that were there.

So if, really, our default position is back to whatever it was Mother Nature gave to us before we competed as a species, then we should look at this not as horses as a natural component of the habitat, but an unnatural, feral component of the habitat.

When I hear about the discussion about the millions spent on these helicopter cowboys herding these horses around and putting horses into holding pens and buying up hay to feed them, I think of visiting the National Bison Reserve that is out there in, I have forgotten exactly where that was, whether it is in southern Montana or up in Wyoming. I remember going there to visit. And I was fascinated. I drove a long way to get there because I wanted to see what it was like when the buffalo roamed the plain. I have walked into the virgin timberland and stood there and imagined what it was like for the pioneers and the settlers to walk through that forest. I wanted to be out there to see what it was like for the native buffalo.

What I saw were paddock-style pastures. In order to manage the bison, the Federal Government has built a great big old pasture and divided it into four quadrants, and there we manage the buffalo by herding them into one corner of the pasture and then another and then another, harvesting some for slaughter. We sell them for breeding stock and we eat them. We do that with buffalo, but we can't do that with horses, because somehow a horse has been raised to another level of species.

This is an amazing thing to me. And as I read through this bill, I don't think I have ever been so taken aback by reading through language. There is much of it that has been produced in this Congress.

I listened to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) talk about this contraception that is here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

I think it is important for us to actually read the language on this horse contraception. It says: ''Research, develop, and implement enhanced surgical or immunocontraception sterilization or other safe methods of fertility control.'' Now let that soak in for a little bit. This is enhanced contraception for horses. I don't know what that is. I think it could be about anything that human beings might use. But I suspect that it doesn't include horse abortion for one thing. And so I'm implying that there is a different set of standards for a horse species than there is for a human species, given the debate we have had in this Congress.

It is a breathtaking step to think about what enhanced contraception is for horses. It is one of those things that I don't think will be described here on the floor of the House. It is kind of an imaginary thing. It is difficult to manage these horses. And I would say that abstinence will not be part of this; that is also part of the debate.

So as I watch what is going on, there has been a real effort here to block the humane harvesting of horses. And the HSUS has been successful in doing that. There are no horses slaughtered in America that are going off for human beings to eat anywhere. Some are being hauled, I think against the law, maybe across the border to be slaughtered elsewhere; but to manage all of our livestock, all of the species in our country, we have to be smart about it.

What has happened is they have, through legislation and litigation, blocked the responsible harvesting of horses. It has taken the market of them down from 5 to 600, down to essentially nothing; and the result is we have a lot more horses than we need. And now they have the audacity to come to this Congress and say, we are going to have to hit up the American people for 700 million more dollars in order to take care of these extra animals that we decided now we want to keep around as national pets.

I did the math on this. And if you calculate how the increase in the horse population because of the restrictions in the harvesting, never mind the value of what has happened to the property of the horse owners, they will eat up enough hay from enough ground, there will be 1 billion gallons of ethanol we could produce off of that horse pasture.

Mr. RAHALL. May I have a time check, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 12 minutes remaining with the right to close. The gentleman from Washington has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, let me repeat that when America is hurting, we should be addressing those issues in which to try to resolve those problems and those issues that are making America hurt. Unemployment is at 9.5 percent, and President Obama says it could go into double digits in the near future.

And so what is our response to that? Our response is to, unlike 2 years ago, address this issue in a different manner, to address it at least partially the same way, but add another $700 million for, as I mentioned, and the distinguished chairman acknowledged that we would mention, welfare for horses.

I don't think that that is the proper way we should be debating, given the economic environment we have in this country. Yet that is precisely where this bill goes.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier today in debate on the rule on this legislation, this Congress can walk and chew gum at the same time. We can address unemployment, we can address health care reform, we can address the war, deficits, and at the same time, we do not need to allow the status quo to continue as it affects our wild horses and burros. These are icons of America, the American mustang. The status quo is a national disgrace. It is a disgrace to our heritage. It is a disgrace to all for which we stand.

Those on the other side of the aisle who want to make light of this situation, I'm sure if they were to go home to their Main Streets and pose a question to their constituents, do you support your Federal Government slaughtering 30,000 American wild horses, do you support them being held in holding pens, I suggest I know what the answer would be. The bottom line, this is the wild horse version of Gitmo, the wild horse version of Gitmo.

The pending legislation seeks to remedy the critical lapse that is taking place under the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971 by invoking a number of commonsense measures. The measure would promote the use of better science to determine whether the amount of range that is available to wild horses is capable of sustaining them.

This would be accomplished through maintaining a valid inventory of the

wild horse population on the range and establishment of appropriate, scientifically based methodologies to determine management levels.

Second, the pending bill would increase the amount of range available to wild horses, including through private lands controlled by entities seeking to establish sanctuaries. Many of us have heard about the Pickens Plan. And I'm not talking about the T. Boone Pickens plan, the one dealing with wind and solar energy. I'm talking about the one advanced by his wife, Madeline Pickens, to utilize private resources for the establishment of wild horse sanctuaries.

The pending legislation makes it a goal, not a requirement, but a goal to increase the acreage on which wild horses can roam. By doing so, we reduce the number of animals that are culled from the herd and placed in holding facilities.

These holding facilities which have come up during this debate, I think it is important to recognize that keeping wild horses and burros in these holding facilities costs $21 million annually, or two-thirds of the entire cost of the wild horse and burro management program. The cost of these holding facilities has been rising dramatically from $7 million in 2000 to $21 million in 2008.

So we are attempting to reduce costs here, reduce the holding cost by lessening the number of roundups through a combination of what we are doing in this bill, making more public land available for wild horses and burros, strengthening and reforming the adoption program, enhancing measures for fertility control and contraception.

Third, even with the actions that I have already outlined, there will not be enough open range land to sustain all of our wild horses. In an effort to contain the costs associated with these holding facilities, we seek to bolster the adoption program and implement sterilization and other fertility controls. We seek to give the Bureau of Land Management the tools with which to do a better job.

And, finally, what the bill does not allow is the destruction of healthy horses; fatally injured or terminally ill animals, yes, but not healthy wild mustangs.

Let us stop the slaughter. Stop the abuse. Save taxpayer money and vote for the pending legislation. Let's save mustangs and save tax dollars at the same time and support the pending legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAHALL:

Page 6, line 20, insert '', to the extent practicable,'' after ''ensure that''.

Page 11, line 4, before ''surgical'' insert ''fertility control for mares, stallions, or both, such as''.

Page 11, line 5, insert '', humane, and effective'' after ''safe''.

Page 12, line 11, strike ''and'' and all that follows through line 12, and insert ''or their remains shall not be sold or transferred for consideration for processing into commercial products; and''.

Page 17, line 6, strike ''at a minimum''.

Page 19, line 22, strike ''immunocontraception'' and insert ''fertility control''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 653, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, this amendment makes four changes to H.R. 1018 as reported by our Natural Resources Committee. First, after further consultation with experts in the field, the amendment will broaden the types of fertility control that would be available to the Bureau of Land Management in order to better manage the wild horse and burro population.

Next, the amendment narrows the definition of ''commercial uses'' prohibited under the act. The purpose of this change is to clearly prohibit the sale of horses and burros for slaughter while clarifying that use of these animals on farms or in other commercial operations is allowed.

The amendment also makes a technical change to clarify the membership requirements for the Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Council.

And, finally, the amendment relaxes the requirement that the BLM return wild horses and burros to the acres of public land from which they have been removed since 1971.

The CBO cost estimate for this bill was based on the assumption that significant land acquisition would be required. That will not be the case, however; these horses and burros can be accommodated on existing Federal lands. Restoration of those acres remains an important goal but would not be a legal requirement.

This is a good package of small changes which will improve H.R. 1018. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to give credit to my friend and chairman of the Natural Resources Committee for the creativity that is exhibited in the manager's amendment.

On the one hand, this manager's amendment is an outright admission that we can't afford this costly new welfare program for wild horses. And then on the other hand, this amendment doesn't delete, erase, strike out or eliminate even a single page, section or word from this bill.

Somehow, we are to believe that adding four little words to this 20-page bill, without deleting anything from it, somehow makes the CBO-estimated price tag of $700 million magically go away. Even with this manager's amendment, Mr. Speaker, the pricing remains.

This manager's amendment doesn't eliminate the sections from the bill to restore wild horses and burros to 19 million acres of land. By the way, it is an area, as we have said before, larger than the State of West Virginia. But just to put this in perspective, it is also larger than the combined area of New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut and New Jersey. So we are not talking about a small piece of land. We are talking about a huge area.

The CBO estimates that complying with the new policies in this bill and restoring horses to this 19 million additional acres will cost over $700 million. Now, the chairman tries to explain that all we are doing is changing this requirement to a goal.

The American people, I think, are not going to breathe any easier when they hear that Congress has a goal of spending $700 million to create welfare programs for wild horses and burros.

So, Mr. Speaker, the manager's amendment doesn't change the real plan in the bill at all. The plan is to spend $700 million for welfare for wild horses and burros.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, with that I will yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1200

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 111–212 printed in Part B offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SALE OF WILD FREE-ROAMING HORSES AND BURROS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(d)(5) of Public Law 92–195 (16 U.S.C. 1333(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking the period and inserting the following: ''*Provided*, That no wild free-roaming horse or burro or its remains may be sold or transferred for consideration for processing into commercial products.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (e).

(b) CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.—Section (8)(a)(4) of Public Law 92–195 (16 U.S.C. 1338(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''except as provided in section 3(e),''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 653, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to call this my amendment because actually it was written by Chairman RAHALL. This is the exact text of H.R. 249 that passed the House in the last Congress. It passed the House in April of 2007. It bans the commercial slaughter of wild horses and burros. It is less than one page in length, and CBO estimated in the last Congress that it would cost under $500,000 a year.

Members of this House voted for this bill just 2 years ago, and at that time, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate nationwide was 4.3 percent.

Fast forward to today, when the unemployment rate today has more than doubled to 9.5 percent and is estimated by officials in the Obama administration to go into double digits in the near future.

With this background, Mr. Speaker, we are now considering a bill that bans the slaughter of wild horses and creates a new $700 million welfare program for wild horses and burros. This House, Mr. Speaker, can choose between banning slaughter of wild horses for less than $500,000, which is what my substitute would do, or banning the slaughter of wild horses with a $700 million price tag, which is the subject of the underlying bill. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very easy choice.

Let me repeat again. The vote for the Hastings substitute would ban horse slaughter at a cost of $500,000 a year. H.R. 1018 bans horse slaughter, just like my substitute, but creates a new welfare program for $700 million. I think, in this economic atmosphere that we are in, the best option is to adopt my substitute.

Now, in the interest of full disclosure, Mr. Speaker, I voted against that bill 2 years ago because I think there has to be an option for slaughter. But given the option today of spending an extra $700 million or spending less than $500,000 and still banning slaughter, I think that is the proper way to go and that is precisely what my substitute does. And so I would urge my colleagues to vote for the substitute.

I reserve my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Washington's comments on my efforts, and appreciate his full disclosure. I'll probably repeat it a few times here in the next couple of minutes, but I do appreciate him being up front about it.

This substitute, which is my anti-slaughter bill from last Congress, addresses one piece of a much larger puzzle. While the slaughter issue is a disturbing one, the ROAM Act will actually address the underlying problems facing the BLM horse and burro program, which has made slaughter a possibility. The substitute would address the symptom, while the underlying legislation will provide a cure.

I'm pleased that the gentleman from Washington State now opposes the slaughter of horses. When this substitute came before the Congress as a free-standing bill last Congress, and which he has already fully disclosed, he voted against it. But now he is in support thereof and is even offering it on the floor of the House. That is a step forward. Unfortunately, this conversion is a day late and several dollars short.

This substitute was the right approach last Congress, but that was before the BLM announced that the program was bankrupt and they were going to have to kill 30,000 horses and burros.

The GAO documented that the BLM program is out of control. First the agency was holding 5,000 horses, then 10,000, now it's 30,000. The agency now claims killing these animals is the only solution.

Adopting the Hastings substitute would stop private slaughter, but without the other reforms in the underlying legislation, 1018, the BLM will have to destroy these animals. The Hastings substitute just changes the identity of those who are killing the horses. Only the underlying bill actually stops the slaughter.

This substitute was the right approach last Congress, but that was also before the release of the GAO report. Now we have a thorough analysis of the obstacles facing the BLM, and a list of recommendations to address the root causes.

The GAO documented the enormous cost of the current BLM approach and proposed solutions. The Congress is now in a position to do more, and we must do more. H.R. 1018 does more.

Adopting this substitute would cost money, cost money, not save it, because it would allow the BLM to continue pouring good money after bad, without fixing the inefficiencies which plague the program in the first place.

Since I authored the legislation Mr. HASTINGS is now offering as his substitute, my colleagues and I have worked with the BLM, the Humane Society, the Animal Welfare Institute, the GAO and others to find new and more comprehensive solutions. We have apparently succeeded in bringing Mr. HASTINGS up to where we were last Congress, and I hope that eventually all of our colleagues will understand that now is the time to do more.

The substitute is too little, too late, should be rejected.

And I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield one minute to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I think I must be confused. The unemployment rate in our country is at over 9½ percent, as I speak. The unemployment rate in my home State of Ohio is now over 11 percent. Two million Americans have been put out of work since the stimulus bill was signed into law. Our budget deficit is already this year over $1 trillion and expected to reach nearly $2 trillion. And faced with this news, what's the House doing today? Talking about a $700 million welfare program for wild horses and burros.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that our constituents may be confused about their Congress?

Let's get this straight. We're debating a bill to spend millions of dollars to save wild horses, but yesterday, Democrats in the House blocked Republicans from offering an amendment to prevent Federal dollars from being spent on saving unborn children. Oh, yeah. $700 million today to save wild horses and burros, and yesterday, we weren't even allowed to offer an amendment to save the lives of unborn kids. That doesn't make any sense to me. But I think, Mr. Speaker, most of my constituents would look up and go, well, that's just Washington being Washington. And it doesn't make any sense that we're debating a welfare program about wild horses when the American people really want to know, where are the jobs?

Debating this bill, I frankly think, is an insult to the American people who are out there looking for work; small businesses who are looking for customers trying to keep their doors open.

And if Democrats want to do something serious here in this House, they should join with Republicans and focus our efforts on those things that will help create jobs in America, which, after all, is the number one priority of the American people.

Probably ought to do a few other things. If we're going to talk about creating jobs and keeping jobs in America, maybe we ought to scrap Speaker PELOSI's national energy tax, which is going to cost us about 2½ million jobs every year over the next 10 years. Or maybe we should shelve the government takeover of health care that's being debated in several of our committees as we speak, which is going to take the health care, the private health care, away from millions of Americans and shove them into some government-run system, and on top of all that, has a giant tax on small businesses. It taxes employment, and it's even going to lead to even greater job losses in our country.

But if we're serious about wanting to create jobs, maybe, maybe we could work together to bring the American Energy Act to the floor of this House, our all-of-the-above energy strategy which will create well over a million new jobs here in America, bring us more energy to the marketplace with lower prices, reduce our dependence on

foreign sources of oil. And guess what? If we do all of the above, we'll actually have much cleaner air than the bill that passed here last month.

Mr. Speaker, I think American families and small businesses deserve better than what they are getting out of this Congress. They expect us to work together on their behalf. They expect us to deal with issues that will help get this economy moving again, and help create jobs; not to be debating a $700 million program, welfare program to save wild horses and burros.

I think the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment. His amendment will cost $500,000. That's $699,500,000 less than the underlying bill. It will be at least a step in the right direction, and maybe our constituents, Mr. Speaker, would think that we've got some sense for once in our lives.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the nobility of the effort to help wild horses at this time. But Americans are losing their habitats. We found out for June, another 400,000 Americans have lost jobs. In 2009 already, since President Obama has taken office, we've lost 1.9 million jobs—I'm sorry—1.9 million foreclosures. We've got 14.7 million unemployed. And that doesn't just represent individuals. That's families we're talking about who are desperate right now, and we're hearing from them. You know, what about my habitat? I understand you want to help wild horses and burros, but what about my habitat? How about American individuals getting help?

We are squandering money like never before in history. And folks, you can lose a country by overspending. Go ask the former Soviet Union if you can find any of those people. They lost their country because they spent until nobody would lend them another dime. They were irresponsible.

And so here we want $700 million for horses?

And I appreciate the chairman's comment that this amendment by DOC HASTINGS is a dollar short. But it's actually $699,500,000 short, basically. This is incredible.

But I thought about when you get on an airplane, we're told, in the safety instructions, that if the cabin loses pressure, an oxygen mask will drop. Do not put it on someone else first. You put it on your own face first and save yourself. Then you'll be in position to save your children and those around you. But if you don't save yourself first, you can't help anyone.

And that's where this country is. If we don't save this country by this reckless overspending, we're not going to be in a position to help anybody. Immigrants won't have any place to come for safety and for jobs because we have wiped ourselves out.

No wonder the Chinese laughed when Geithner said we were going to reduce our deficit. I'm telling you.

And then jobs? What about American jobs?

Well, there's one little part in here, and it provides for enhanced contraception for the wild horses. Maybe there are jobs in there. Maybe somebody out of work can apply for how you apply enhanced contraception to a horse. I'm familiar with artificial insemination. I was not familiar with enhanced contraception. Maybe there's a green job or some color there. But we need to help Americans.

□ 1215

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of my friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee, if he is prepared to close after I close?

Mr. RAHALL. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just repeat again: My substitute is a substitute that is identical to the bill that passed this House in April of 2007, and the cost at that time was $500,000. The underlying bill that we are debating today has essentially those same provisions plus a price tag of $700 million, a huge difference between the two. I think, due to the economic times that we are in right now, the most prudent way for this Congress to act is to go with the lesser amount of money, and that's precisely what my substitute does.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one other point.

The distinguished chairman in his manager's amendment made some different calculations as to the $700 million and as to the 19 million acres that were to be part of this bill. I just want to make a point. The CBO has not scored that one way or the other, but if an absolute figure of acquiring or of moving around 19 million acres costs $700 million, then only logic would suggest that it's going to be precisely the same amount of money. So I just want to make a point that the CBO has not estimated the score of the manager's amendment.

The difference here in the debate still is the difference, during these economic times we're in, between spending 700 million taxpayer dollars on welfare for horses or spending $500,000 to ban the slaughter of wild horses and burros. I think the latter that I spoke about is a better way to go, and I would urge my colleagues to vote for the substitute.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the CBO estimate, the $700 million that has been thrown out by the other side as a potential cost to this legislation, was done in the last Congress. It was done before the adoption of the manager's amendment that we just adopted today in an earlier voice vote. It was done without considering the ramifications of the other aspects of H.R. 1018 that this House will adopt today. It was done taking into account in a very narrow, single shot-type fashion, if you will, the potential costs of purchasing 19 million acres of additional Federal land for the use of these wild horses and burros.

Therefore, when taking into account that cost, as CBO has done, they did not consider the fact that there are already Federal lands owned by the American people that are available and out there. The CBO did not take into account the management tools contained in the pending legislation with which we intend to help the BLM do a better job and improve the status quo. The CBO did not estimate any cost savings from an enhanced adoption program or from sterilization programs. The CBO did not take into account the reduction in costs of these holding pens, which I referenced earlier, the $21 million annually that it costs today—and that number keeps going up—of the current holding pens for these wild horses and burros. The CBO did not consider any of the ''today'' costs or how the improved management tools offered in H.R. 1018 will save dollars in the years ahead.

I urge a ''no'' vote, not only on the Hastings substitute amendment but also a ''yes'' vote on the pending H.R. 1018. H.R. 1018 is the humane and right vote to cast today. It will save our mustangs. It will save tax dollars. It will save millions of tax dollars annually. When you look through all of the smoke and mirrors of the numbers that have been thrown out today, you will find that, by implementing herd reduction with birth control, we can save more than $6 million alone each year. Again, when we look at the cost reductions of these holding pens, this legislation is the tax-wise way to go.

So I conclude by urging a ''no'' vote on the Hastings substitute and a ''yes'' vote on the underlying bill, H.R. 1018.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 653, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of House Report 111–212 offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 74, nays 348, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

YEAS—74

Aderholt
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boucher
Boustany
Buchanan
Burgess
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carson (IN)
Coffman (CO)
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Giffords
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Johnson, Sam
Kosmas
Lamborn
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McClintock
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Paulsen
Perriello
Pitts
Posey
Radanovich
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schmidt
Shuler
Tanner
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Turner
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—348

Abercrombie
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (UT)
Coble
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Shea-Porter
Slaughter
Taylor
Westmoreland

□ 1255

Messrs. HARE, BECERRA, MATHESON, HUNTER, SCOTT of Georgia, DONNELLY of Indiana, ELLISON, Mrs. BACHMANN, Messrs. GALLEGLY, BAIRD, BUTTERFIELD, TIAHRT, CUELLAR, CONAWAY, LATTA, CULBERSON, GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. McCOLLUM, Messrs. ELLSWORTH, WEINER, KINGSTON, MARSHALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Messrs. REHBERG, YOUNG of Alaska, GINGREY, CAMP, CHILDERS, SMITH of Nebraska, ALEXANDER, ISSA, WALDEN of Oregon, MILLER of Florida, BLUNT, POE of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Messrs. SHIMKUS, CASSIDY, MARCHANT, BOOZMAN, WITTMAN, FRANKS of Arizona, and TERRY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. SHULER, PITTS, ROGERS of Michigan, McINTYRE, TURNER, and Mrs. BIGGERT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is passed. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BIGGERT. I ask for a rollcall vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the gentlewoman to initiate the request at this stage would not be timely.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, the way that I voted, I expected that there would be a rollcall vote on that. I ask unanimous consent to have a rollcall vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentlewoman asking for a recorded vote immediately after the vote by voice?

Mr. RAHALL. I object to the unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not entertaining a unanimous consent request at this time.

If the gentlewoman is making the averment that she was requesting a vote right after the vote by voice, the Chair would accept that.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Yes, I request a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman aver that she has been requesting that vote since the voice vote?

Mrs. BIGGERT. I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair only wants to establish that the gentlewoman was requesting a vote at the time the vote by voice was called.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Yes, I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A recorded vote is requested.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no unanimous consent request. The Chair is accepting the gentlewoman's averment.

A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—239

Abercrombie
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)

Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kirk
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—185

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Buyer
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Childers
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Griffith
Guthrie
Halvorson
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Coble
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Schock
Taylor
Westmoreland

□ 1315

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. CARNAHAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 645 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. 3183.

□ 1315

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. 3183) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. TIERNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 15, 2009, amendment No. 4 printed in part D of House Report 111–209, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 63, line 12.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111–209 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 9 printed in part A by Mr. HEINRICH of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 10 printed in part A by Mr. CAO of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 11 printed in part A by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 2 printed in part B by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 1 printed in part C by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 printed in part C by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 printed in part C by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 5 printed in part C by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 10 printed in part C by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 11 printed in part C by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 1 printed in part D by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 printed in part D by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 printed in part D by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

PART A AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. HEINRICH

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. HEINRICH:

In section 307, strike ''6 percent'' and insert ''7 percent''.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

AYES—424

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio

DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Visclosky

NOT VOTING—14

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Cassidy
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Peterson
Pierluisi
Rush
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1335

Mr. BACHUS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART A AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. CAO

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. CAO:

Page 62, line 15, strike ''90'' and insert ''60''.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—423

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark

Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—1

Nadler (NY)

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Coble
Faleomavaega
Gohmert
Graves
Harman
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Peterson
Pierluisi
Roskam
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains on this vote.

□ 1339

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART A AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 11 offered by Mrs. BLACKBURN:

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

SEC. ____. Percentage Reduction of Total Funds.—Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 259, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

AYES—167

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Childers
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—259

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Chandler
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Lucas
Meek (FL)
Miller, Gary
Pierluisi
Slaughter
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1342

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

The 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 text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL:

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

SEC. ____. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' shall be available for the Housatonic River Net-Zero Energy Building project, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects) are each hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 121, noes 303, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

AYES—121

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn

Boehner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Hall (TX)
Harper
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—303

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Pierluisi
Polis (CO)
Taylor
Tierney
Tsongas
Waters
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains on this vote.

□ 1345

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART C AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The 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 text of the amendment is as follows:

Part C amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' shall be available for the Maret Center project, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects) are each hereby reduced by $1,500,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 338, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

AYES—89

Austria
Bean
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Campbell
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMahon
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schauer
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Souder
Stearns
Thornberry
Tiberi
Wilson (SC)

NOES—338

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell

Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Coble
Faleomavaega
Gohmert
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Pierluisi
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1349

Mr. MCMAHON changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART C AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The 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 text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' shall be available for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects) are each hereby reduced by $3,000,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 335, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—89

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Dent
Duncan
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Thornberry
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—335

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Berkley
Bordallo
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Harman
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Pierluisi
Roybal-Allard
Stark
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1352

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART C AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The 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 text of the amendment is as follows:

Part C Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' shall be available for the Ethanol from Agriculture project, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects) are each hereby reduced by $500,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 102, noes 318, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

AYES—102

Adler (NJ)
Akin
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)

NOES—318

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Bordallo
Buchanan
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Honda
Lucas
Maloney
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Pierluisi
Schock
Souder
Space
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1355

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 584, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chair, I was unable to participate in the following vote. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall vote 584, on agreeing to the Flake of Arizona Amendment No. 4—H.R. 3183 Making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies, FY 2010—I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall 584. If present, I would have voted "nay."

PART C AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The 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 text of the amendment is as follows:

Part C Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. __. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' shall be available for the Fort Mason Center Pier 2 project, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects) are each hereby reduced by $2,000,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 125, noes 301, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]

AYES—125

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Boozman
Boustany
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger

Harper
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)

NOES—301

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Brady (TX)
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Olver
Pierluisi
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1358

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART C AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The 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 text of the amendment is as follows:

Part C Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' shall be available for the Whitworth University Stem Equipment project, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects) are each hereby reduced by $300,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 341, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 586]

AYES—81

Bachmann
Bean
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Bright
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Wilson (SC)

NOES—341

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)

Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Coble
Costa
Faleomavaega
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Murphy (CT)
Pierluisi
Roybal-Allard
Schrader
Taylor
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1401

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART C AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The 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 text of the amendment is as follows:

Part C amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Projects—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' shall be available for the Boston Architectural College's Urban Sustainability Initiative, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects) are each hereby reduced by $1,600,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 111, noes 316, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

AYES—111

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Hall (TX)
Harper
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)

NOES—316

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Braley (IA)
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Pierluisi
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1405

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

SEC. ____. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy'' shall be available for the Energy Conservation and Efficiency Upgrade of HVAC Controls project, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects) are each hereby reduced by $500,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 290, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

AYES—133

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schauer
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—290

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Buyer
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Gutierrez
Lucas
McMahon
Miller, Gary
Pierluisi
Ruppersberger
Schrader
Taylor
Waxman
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1407

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

SEC. ____. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction'' shall be available for the Pier 36 Removal project in California, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by $6,220,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 299, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

AYES—128

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)

NOES—299

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Bordallo
Coble
Faleomavaega
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Pierluisi
Souder
Taylor
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1411

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

SEC. ___. CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECT ELIMINATED.—None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability'' shall be available for the Automated Remote Electric and Water Meters in South River project, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for Congressionally Directed Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Projects) are each hereby reduced by $500,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 119, noes 308, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

AYES—119

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—308

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt

Stark	Tsongas	Weiner
Stupak	Turner	Welch
Sutton	Van Hollen	Wexler
Tanner	Velázquez	Whitfield
Teague	Visclosky	Wilson (OH)
Thompson (CA)	Walz	Wolf
Thompson (MS)	Wasserman Schultz	Woolsey
Thompson (PA)	Waters	Wu
Tierney	Watson	Yarmuth
Titus	Watt	Young (AK)
Tonko	Waxman	Young (FL)
Towns		

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman	Faleomavaega	Miller, Gary
Barrett (SC)	Graves	Pierluisi
Bordallo	Lucas	Taylor
Coble	McKeon	Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1414

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010''.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, 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. 3183) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 645, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Pursuant to House Resolution 645, the question on adoption of the amendments will be put en gros.

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

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.

□ 1415

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SIMPSON. In its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Simpson moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3183 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 31, beginning on line 11, strike ''Nuclear Waste Disposal'' and all that follows through page 34, line 8.

Page 40, beginning on line 23, strike ''Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal'' and all that follows through page 41, line 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit strikes all funds for Yucca Mountain Geological Repository. I think it's time to get everyone on the record about where they stand.

This motion would fulfill the President's stated intention to ''terminate'' Yucca Mountain. It would support Speaker PELOSI's anti-nuclear stance, and it would probably make Senator REID very happy.

Some on the other side of the aisle may question the intent of this amendment, but there is no gimmick here. The motion does exactly what I described. Even more, it provides each of us with the opportunity to show where we stand on this critical issue of a permanent geological repository at Yucca Mountain.

Let me tell my colleagues what else this amendment would do.

First, most of our districts are either storing or producing spent nuclear fuel. Currently, 104 nuclear reactors provide 20 percent of the Nation's electricity needs. Spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste is being stored on-site at 121 locations across 39 States, sites that were never intended for long-term storage. These are sites in your districts.

I personally know that this fuel is safe where it is today. However, the Secretary of Energy has admitted that even with his blue ribbon panel a permanent geological repository will be necessary.

By voting for this amendment, we would ensure that this material stays where it is for the next 25 to 50 years or perhaps longer. And it would add additional delays and costs to the development of a permanent geological repository to be built in any State other than Nevada.

Second, it would rob our constituents of potential jobs and tax revenue. For those of you who have metal workers or pipe fitters or welders or scientists in your districts, this amendment would curb their ability to gain and secure high-paying jobs operating nuclear power plants that can sustain 700 permanent jobs, while new plants generate as many as 2,400 construction jobs. Our constituents need these jobs, and our country needs the power these nuclear plants create.

As I said, 20 percent of the electricity is produced by nuclear power. What you may not know is 72 percent of the non-carbon emitting electricity is produced by nuclear power.

Third, killing Yucca Mountain would bring over $22 billion of liability against the Federal Government; $22 billion is just an estimate. Some have estimated as high as $50 billion. This is money which the Federal Government will owe to the industry because we have failed to live up to our responsibilities.

We have signed contracts with these companies to take this waste off their hands. And because of political deals like that between the President and Senator REID, we have failed. As a result, the taxpayers will have to pay $22 billion or more in fines and penalties.

Colleagues, these are the ramifications if you support killing Yucca Mountain. You see, the President and Senator REID's plan to kill Yucca Mountain has no alternatives. It is only a study, a blue ribbon commission. This project has been studied to death. We have spent $10.5 billion on it, 1.5 million documents. Over 50 studies by the National Science Foundation have been done on this Yucca Mountain. We know it is scientifically sound.

The President's decision was a political bow to the Senate majority leader, not one based on good science or good policy.

I make this motion to recommit so that none of us here can claim that we don't know the facts. I want all of us to have the opportunity to be on record today. We can vote for this motion to fill the President's and Senator REID's plan to kill Yucca Mountain. This will keep nuclear waste scattered across the country for the foreseeable future, potentially costing taxpayers $22 billion or more in liabilities, jeopardizing the stability of the electrical system, lose jobs and tax revenues in our districts, and kick the can down the road on the location of a permanent geological repository that will still have to be built. Or we can defeat it, supporting good policy and ensuring that science, not politics, rules the majority of our decisions here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in 2002 this body voted overwhelmingly in favor of approving the Yucca Mountain site location. I'm not here to urge you to vote for or against this motion to recommit. The choice is up to all of us, but none of us can or should remain on the sidelines.

Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 15 seconds to my friend from Nevada, Mr. HELLER.

Mr. HELLER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I looked in the dictionary recently for what the definition of ''boondoggle'' was. It was a wasteful, impractical project or activity. It's a perfect, perfect understanding of what Yucca Mountain is.

I will tell you, I support the motion to recommit. I would urge my colleagues to do the same. We've spent billions and billions of dollars on a project over the last 20 years. We're going to spend billions and billions and billions more for projects that will never happen.

Boondoggle—''a wasteful or impractical project or activity''—Webster's Dictionary.

Government Accountability Office report on Yucca says: Gross mismanagement, faulty science and research, and contract mismanagement.

Major Issues Unresolved: Problems with the quality assurance program, implications that some U.S. Geological Survey employees falsified scientific data, hazardous and flawed design changes, transportation safety issues, likely groundwater contamination, and inadequate earthquake protection.

Congress finally needs to have a serious discussion about studying reasonable alternatives to Yucca, which is an uncertain and dangerous plan.

If you're concerned about the safety of American citizens and the wise stewardship of tax dollars, then join with me to finally end the Yucca Mountain project and support this Motion to Recommit.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. With the indulgence of my colleagues, I'll take a few minutes to explain why we are in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a notion that was given to you by my dear friend from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON). For those of us who support nuclear energy and wanted to see it pull forward, as the ranking member knows and I know, the Speaker allowed that this form of energy go forward and balance with other interests that we have in the formation of alternative energy, et cetera. So we're here with a balanced bill today because of the Speaker's leadership and willingness for us to go forward.

When the Secretary of Energy appeared before us, he told us that Yucca Mountain was off the table and that the administration wanted a blue ribbon committee to be formed that would not include Yucca Mountain. Well, this bill says that that blue ribbon committee will be formed, but Yucca Mountain will also be considered with any other site that's being considered.

I agreed with my friend from Idaho when the Secretary said that $197 million that is used to continue the licensing for Yucca Mountain was not wanted. I wanted to zero it out because that way I would give my colleague from Arizona more floor time by giving him more earmarks. But the staff said no, and they persuaded me.

They said we need the $197 million to be in this account so that we will not breach the contracts that we have, as my good friend MIKE SIMPSON told you, because then what we would do, we would probably increase the problem—we would increase the probability of billions of dollars being spent in liability, the likelihood the government would lose, so you would put this government further into deficit. It would provide an opportunity for all of us, including my Republican colleagues, to provide more opportunities for trial lawyers.

And so for those two reasons, I said let's keep the $197 million to continue the licensing, continue pushing nuclear energy as a form that we need in this country and that we protect Yucca Mountain to the extent that we don't create a greater deficit and we don't create a slush fund for more lawsuits.

So with that, I ask you to vote against the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. 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 votes on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 30, noes 388, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 591]

AYES—30

Baird
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Brown, Corrine
Chaffetz
Conyers
Doggett
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Farr
Harman
Heller
Hirono
Honda
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kilroy
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McCotter
McGovern
McKeon
Moore (WI)
Paul
Schakowsky
Shea-Porter
Souder
Titus
Woolsey

NOES—388

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Coble
Costello
Davis (AL)
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Moran (VA)
Rush
Taylor
Welch
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1443

Mr. HOLT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. KUCINICH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. 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 320, nays 97, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

YEAS—320

Abercrombie
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—97

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Chaffetz
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Doggett
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Heller
Hensarling
Hoekstra
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nye
Olson
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Boehner
Castor (FL)
Coble
Costello
Davis (AL)
Graves
Lucas
Miller, Gary
Neal (MA)
Paul
Taylor
Welch
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1453

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, on vote 576, I intended to vote ''yes,'' and on 577, my intention was to vote ''no.''

CONDEMNING THE ATTACK ON THE AMIA JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER IN BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 156) condemning the attack on the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in July 1994, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 156

Whereas, on July 18, 1994, 85 people were killed and 300 were wounded when the Argentine Jewish Mutual Association (AMIA) was bombed in Buenos Aires, Argentina;

Whereas extensive evidence links the planning of the attacks to the Government of Iran, and the execution of the attacks to Hezbollah, which is based in Lebanon, supported by Syria, sponsored by Iran, and designated by the Department of State as a Foreign Terrorist Organization;

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, the State Prosecutor of Argentina, an office created by the Government of Argentina, concluded that the AMIA bombing was ''decided and organized by the highest leaders of the former government of . . . Iran, whom, at the same time, entrusted its execution to the Lebanese terrorist group Hezbollah'';

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, the State Prosecutor of Argentina concluded that the AMIA bombing had been approved in advance by Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamene'i, Iran's then-leader Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, Iran's then-Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Velayati, and Iran's then-Minister of Security and Intelligence Ali Fallahijan;

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, the State Prosecutor of Argentina stated that the Government of Iran uses ''terrorism as a mechanism of its foreign policy'' in support of ''its final aim [which] is to export its radicalized vision of Islam and to eliminate the enemies of the regime'';

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, the State Prosecutor of Argentina identified Ibrahim Hussein Berro, a Lebanese citizen and member of Hezbollah, as the suicide bomber who primarily carried out the attack on the AMIA;

Whereas, on November 9, 2006, Argentine Judge Rodolfo Canicoba Corral, pursuant to the request of the State Prosecutor of Argentina, issued an arrest warrant for Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, a former leader of Iran and the current chairman of Iran's Assembly of Experts and of Iran's Expediency Council, for his involvement in the AMIA bombing and urged the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) to issue an international arrest warrant for Rafsanjani and detain him;

Whereas, on November 9, 2006, Argentine Judge Rodolfo Canicoba Corral, pursuant to

the request of the State Prosecutor of Argentina, also issued arrest warrants for Ali Fallahijan, a former Iranian Minister of Security and Intelligence, Ali Akbar Velayati, a former Iranian Foreign Minister, Mohsen Rezaei, a former commander of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC), Ahmad Vahidi, a former commander of the elite Al-Quds Force of the IRGC, Hadi Soleimanpour, a former Iranian ambassador to Argentina, Mohsen Rabbani, a former cultural attaché at the Iranian Embassy in Buenos Aires, Ahmad Reza Asghari, a former official at the Iranian Embassy in Buenos Aires, and Imad Moughnieh, a leading operations chief of Hezbollah;

Whereas, on March 5, 2007, the Executive Committee of INTERPOL unanimously supported the issuance of Red Notices for Hezbollah operative Imad Moughnieh and for Iranian officials Ali Fallahijan, Mohsen Rezaei, Ahmad Vahidi, Mohsen Rabbani, and Ahmad Reza Asgari, thereby allowing arrest warrants for those individuals to be circulated worldwide with an eye to their arrest and extradition;

Whereas, on November 7, 2007, the General Assembly of INTERPOL upheld the Executive Committee's decision to support the issuance of six Red Notices in connection to the AMIA case;

Whereas, on February 12, 2008, Hezbollah operative Imad Moughnieh reportedly was killed in Syria;

Whereas in June of 2008, the Government of Saudi Arabia hosted an international Muslim conference that was reportedly attended by Iranian officials Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, against whom an Argentine arrest warrant has been issued, and Mohsen Rezaei, against whom both an Argentine arrest warrant and INTERPOL Red Notice have been issued;

Whereas the Government of Saudi Arabia reportedly made no attempt to detain or arrest Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani or Mohsen Rezaei during their time in Saudi Arabia, and the two departed Saudi Arabia without incident;

Whereas, on May 22, 2008, Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman filed a request with Argentine Judge Ariel Lijo for the arrest of Carlos Saul Menem, who was president of Argentina at the time of the AMIA bombing, and four other former Argentine high officials in connection with the AMIA case;

Whereas Mr. Nisman claimed in his request for an arrest warrant that Menem and the other four officials had attempted to cover up the involvement of a Syrian-Argentine businessman, Alberto Jacinto Kanoore Edul, in the AMIA bombing;

Whereas Argentine investigators have stated that prior to the AMIA bombing, Mr. Kanoore Edul was in contact with at least two men who have been identified as suspects in the AMIA case;

Whereas Mr. Nisman stated in an article published on May 29, 2008, that his request for arrest warrants against Argentine nationals in the AMIA case ''does absolutely not change the accusations against Hezbollah and Iran . . . To a certain degree, it reinforces them, because [suspect Alberto Jacinto] Kanoore Edul has many links with Islamist extremists'';

Whereas, on December 16, 2008, at the AMIA Special Prosecutor's request, the presiding Argentine judge in a civil suit against the Iranian suspects and Hezbollah ordered the attachment of six commercial properties in Argentina allegedly owned by former Iran cultural attaché and named suspect Mohsen Rabbani;

Whereas in December of 2008, the judge also requested that select European governments freeze up to $1 million in bank accounts allegedly belonging to former Iranian leader Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani and another Iranian accused of involvement in the attacks;

Whereas between October of 2008 and March of 2009, nearly a dozen Iranian properties have reportedly been seized in the Buenos Aires area in connection with a civil suit presented by an unnamed survivor of the AMIA bombing;

Whereas in May of 2009, former IRGC commander Mohsen Rezaei, against whom both an Argentine arrest warrant and an INTERPOL Red Notice have been issued, announced his intention to seek the leadership of Iran;

Whereas in May 2009, Argentina issued an international arrest warrant for Samuel Salman El Reda, a Colombian citizen of Lebanese descent who Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman believes was the top local connection in the AMIA attack;

Whereas Mr. Nisman believes El Reda had connections to Hezbollah and the Tri-Border area, a zone between Argentina, Paraguay, and Brazil suspected of being a haven for Islamic radical groups;

Whereas during the past several years, the Government of Argentina has made significant advances in the AMIA investigation and other counter-terrorism efforts;

Whereas the issuance of an Argentine arrest warrant for an attaché of the Iranian Embassy in Argentina in connection with the AMIA case, indicates that Iran has used its embassies abroad as tools and extensions of radical Islamist goals and attacks;

Whereas according to news reports published in June of 2008, intelligence agencies in the United States and Canada have warned of significant evidence that Hezbollah, with the support of the Government of Iran, plans to launch a major attack against ''Jewish targets'' outside the Middle East, and that possible targeted areas include Canada and Latin America;

Whereas, on January 27, 2009, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said, ''I'm concerned about the level of . . . subversive activity that the Iranians are carrying on in a number of places in Latin America . . . They're opening a lot of offices and a lot of fronts, behind which they interfere in what is going on in some of these countries.''; and

Whereas, on March 17, 2009, Navy Admiral James Stavridis, Commander, United States Southern Command, indicated that he shared Secretary Gates's concern, explaining ''We have seen . . . an increase in a wide level of activity by the Iranian government in this region . . . That is a concern principally because of the connections between the government of Iran, which is a state sponsor of terrorism, and Hezbollah'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) reiterates its strongest condemnation of the 1994 attack on the Argentine Jewish Mutual Association (AMIA) Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, honors the victims of this attack, and expresses its sympathy to the relatives of the victims;

(2) applauds the Government of Argentina for its ongoing efforts in the AMIA bombing investigation;

(3) urges the Government of Argentina to continue to dedicate and provide the resources necessary for its judicial system and intelligence agencies to investigate all areas of the AMIA case and to prosecute those responsible;

(4) expresses grave concern regarding the Government of Saudi Arabia's failure, when given the opportunity, to detain Iranian officials against whom Argentine arrest warrants or INTERPOL Red Notices are pending in connection with the AMIA case;

(5) urges all responsible nations to cooperate fully with the AMIA investigation, including by making information, witnesses, and suspects available for review and questioning by the appropriate Argentine authorities, and by detaining and extraditing to Argentina, if given the opportunity, any persons against whom Argentine arrest warrants or INTERPOL Red Notices are pending in connection with the AMIA case, including Iranian officials and former officials, Hezbollah operatives, and Islamist militants;

(6) encourages the President to direct United States law enforcement agencies to provide support and cooperation to the Government of Argentina, if requested, for the purposes of deepening and expanding the investigation into the AMIA bombing; and

(7) urges governments in the Western Hemisphere, who have not done so already, to draft, adopt, and implement legislation designating Hezbollah as a terrorist organization, banning fundraising and recruitment activities, and applying the harshest penalties on those providing support for activities involving Hezbollah and other such extremist groups.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERMAN

Mr. BERMAN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BERMAN:

Amend the preamble to read as follows:

Whereas, on July 18, 1994, 85 people were killed and 300 were wounded when the Argentine Jewish Mutual Association (AMIA) was bombed in Buenos Aires, Argentina;

Whereas extensive evidence links the planning of the attacks to the Government of Iran, and the execution of the attacks to Hezbollah, which is based in Lebanon, supported by Syria, sponsored by Iran, and designated by the Department of State as a Foreign Terrorist Organization;

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, the State Prosecutor of Argentina, an office created by the Government of Argentina, concluded that the AMIA bombing was ''decided and organized by the highest leaders of the former government of . . . Iran, whom, at the same time, entrusted its execution to the Lebanese terrorist group Hezbollah'';

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, the State Prosecutor of Argentina concluded that the AMIA bombing had been approved in advance by Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamene'i, Iran's then-leader Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, Iran's then-Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Velayati, and Iran's then-Minister of Security and Intelligence Ali Fallahijan;

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, the State Prosecutor of Argentina stated that the Government of Iran uses ''terrorism as a mechanism of its foreign policy'' in support of ''its final aim [which] is to export its radicalized vision of Islam and to eliminate the enemies of the regime'';

Whereas, on October 25, 2006, the State Prosecutor of Argentina identified Ibrahim Hussein Berro, a Lebanese citizen and member of Hezbollah, as the suicide bomber who primarily carried out the attack on the AMIA;

Whereas, on November 9, 2006, Argentine Judge Rodolfo Canicoba Corral, pursuant to the request of the State Prosecutor of Argentina, issued an arrest warrant for Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, a former leader of Iran and the current chairman of Iran's Assembly of Experts and of Iran's Expediency Council, for his involvement in the AMIA bombing and urged the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) to issue an international arrest warrant for Rafsanjani and detain him;

Whereas, on November 9, 2006, Argentine Judge Rodolfo Canicoba Corral, pursuant to the request of the State Prosecutor of Argentina, also issued arrest warrants for Ali Fallahijan, a former Iranian Minister of Security and Intelligence, Ali Akbar Velayati, a former Iranian Foreign Minister, Mohsen Rezaei, a former commander of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC), Ahmad Vahidi, a former commander of the elite Al-Quds Force of the IRGC, Hadi Soleimanpour, a former Iranian ambassador to Argentina, Mohsen Rabbani, a former cultural attaché at the Iranian Embassy in Buenos Aires, Ahmad Reza Asghari, a former official at the Iranian Embassy in Buenos Aires, and Imad Moughnieh, a leading operations chief of Hezbollah;

Whereas, on March 5, 2007, the Executive Committee of INTERPOL unanimously supported the issuance of Red Notices for Hezbollah operative Imad Moughnieh and for Iranian officials Ali Fallahijan, Mohsen Rezaei, Ahmad Vahidi, Mohsen Rabbani, and Ahmad Reza Asgari, thereby allowing arrest warrants for those individuals to be circulated worldwide with an eye to their arrest and extradition;

Whereas, on November 7, 2007, the General Assembly of INTERPOL upheld the Executive Committee's decision to support the issuance of six Red Notices in connection to the AMIA case;

Whereas, on February 12, 2008, Hezbollah operative Imad Moughnieh reportedly was killed in Syria;

Whereas in June of 2008, the Government of Saudi Arabia hosted an international Muslim conference that was reportedly attended by Iranian officials Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, against whom an Argentine arrest warrant has been issued, and Mohsen Rezaei, against whom both an Argentine arrest warrant and INTERPOL Red Notice have been issued;

Whereas the Government of Saudi Arabia reportedly made no attempt to detain or arrest Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani or Mohsen Rezaei during their time in Saudi Arabia, and the two departed Saudi Arabia without incident;

Whereas, on May 22, 2008, Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman filed a request with Argentine Judge Ariel Lijo for the arrest of Carlos Saul Menem, who was president of Argentina at the time of the AMIA bombing, and four other former Argentine high officials in connection with the AMIA case;

Whereas Mr. Nisman claimed in his request for an arrest warrant that Menem and the other four officials had attempted to cover up the involvement of a Syrian-Argentine businessman, Alberto Jacinto Kanoore Edul, in the AMIA bombing;

Whereas Argentine investigators have stated that prior to the AMIA bombing, Mr. Kanoore Edul was in contact with at least two men who have been identified as suspects in the AMIA case;

Whereas, on December 16, 2008, at the AMIA Special Prosecutor's request, the presiding Argentine judge in a civil suit against the Iranian suspects and Hezbollah ordered the attachment of six commercial properties in Argentina allegedly owned by former Iran cultural attaché and named suspect Mohsen Rabbani;

Whereas in December of 2008, the judge also requested that select European governments freeze up to $1 million in bank accounts allegedly belonging to former Iranian leader Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani and another Iranian accused of involvement in the attacks;

Whereas between October of 2008 and March of 2009, nearly a dozen Iranian properties have reportedly been seized in the Buenos Aires area in connection with a civil suit presented by an unnamed survivor of the AMIA bombing;

Whereas in May of 2009, former IRGC commander Mohsen Rezaei, against whom both an Argentine arrest warrant and an INTERPOL Red Notice have been issued, announced his intention to seek the leadership of Iran;

Whereas in May 2009, Argentina issued an international arrest warrant for Samuel Salman El Reda, a Colombian citizen of Lebanese descent who Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman believes was the top local connection in the AMIA attack;

Whereas Mr. Nisman believes El Reda had connections to Hezbollah and the Tri-Border area, a zone between Argentina, Paraguay, and Brazil suspected of being a haven for Islamic radical groups;

Whereas during the past several years, the Government of Argentina has made significant advances in the AMIA investigation and other counter-terrorism efforts;

Whereas the issuance of an Argentine arrest warrant for an attaché of the Iranian Embassy in Argentina in connection with the AMIA case, indicates that Iran has used its embassies abroad as tools and extensions of radical Islamist goals and attacks;

Whereas, on January 27, 2009, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said, ''I'm concerned about the level of . . . subversive activity that the Iranians are carrying on in a number of places in Latin America . . . They're opening a lot of offices and a lot of fronts, behind which they interfere in what is going on in some of these countries.''; and

Whereas, on March 17, 2009, Navy Admiral James Stavridis, Commander, United States Southern Command, indicated that he shared Secretary Gates's concern, explaining ''We have seen . . . an increase in a wide level of activity by the Iranian government in this region . . . That is a concern principally because of the connections between the government of Iran, which is a state sponsor of terrorism, and Hezbollah'': Now, therefore, be it

Mr. BERMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 658

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the minority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list, Mr. Speaker, will be, as usual, disclosed by the end of business today.

In addition, we will consider H.R. 2920, the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009; the 2010 Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development Appropriations Act; the 2010 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act; and possibly the Food Safety Enforcement Act of 2009.

In addition, Members ought to be advised that on Tuesday, July 21, we will take the official photograph for the 111th Congress. We don't have a time on that, but we will try to give Members time for that as soon as possible. I imagine it will be sometime after the first votes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he could give me some indication of the progress on the offer of compromise to move forward on appropriations bills to get us back closer to what has been the precedent of this House in terms of open rules in consideration of expending taxpayer moneys.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the question.

As the gentleman knows—he and I discussed this issue—it's my understanding that Mr. BOEHNER and the Speaker are having ongoing discussions with respect to that. I know the Speaker is having ongoing discussions with the committee as well. Hopefully, whatever happens between Mr. BOEHNER and the Speaker will be disclosed to you as well as to me.

Mr. CANTOR. I would note, as we are almost nearing the end of the July session and with three appropriations bills left, there is yet limited opportunity, but still some, and the minority stands ready and willing to work with the gentleman, with him and his desire, as

is mine, to return to an open process in appropriations rules.

□ 1500

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield just briefly.

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I want to say to the gentleman that I want to continue to work with him towards—whether it's on these appropriations bills or other bills—so that we can try to effect a degree of comity that I know both you and I would like to reach.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that. I would ask the gentleman if he could give us some sense of where we are in terms of the health care reform bill working its way through the committee process right now. As the gentleman knows, I'm on the Ways and Means Committee; and we completed our markup on the bill last night or in the early hours this morning. The other two committees I know are hard at work in terms of delivering their products. But I did note that the gentleman was reported as having said in the press—I believe it was this morning in his response to a question about the Congressional Budget Office's commentary and analysis of the health care proposal. Mr. Speaker, if I could loosely paraphrase the gentleman's remarks, I believe he said, We need to go back to the drawing board as far as the scoring of the bill is concerned. I would like to inquire about what the gentleman had in mind as far as that's concerned.

Mr. HOYER. As you know, the President, the Speaker and I and others have indicated that we expect this bill to be fully paid for. Obviously scoring will be the litmus test by which we determine whether it is paid for. When Mr. Elmendorf made the statement before the Budget Committee in the Senate, he was speaking more of the bending of the curve, which is going to be longer term than whether or not we determine whether the bill is paid for. But in my view, we need to do both. Of course the bill he was talking about was the Senate bill. The House bill has not yet been fully scored. But if, in fact, that score shows that it is not fully paid for, what I meant by ''going back to the drawing board,'' we will then have to assess how we can get the bill to a place where it is scored as a fully-paid-for bill, consistent with PAYGO. That's our pledge. That's my intent, that's the Speaker's intent, and we will work towards that objective.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. I know the gentleman does share all of our concerns as well as, I'm sure, the President's concern that we actually do something to bring down health care costs while at the same time preserving the quality of care that the Americans who do have health care coverage right now receive. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, does he expect the House and the American public to have 72 hours to read the entire bill once the committee process has concluded and prior to the bill's coming to the floor for a vote?

Mr. HOYER. I would think the Members and the public would have more than 72 hours to read the bill. Now obviously there may well be changes as it moves along. I served in the State legislature. I'm not sure if the gentleman served in the State legislature.

Mr. CANTOR. Yes, I did.

Mr. HOYER. In our State legislature, the process was a little different. You got the bills on your desk, and the amendments were either highlighted or in italics or underlined, depending upon what the stage of consideration of the bills was so that Members could well have read the bills before they got there weeks ahead of time and then see what amendments are made in the bills as it went through second reader and third reader. We have that here, but it's not as transparent a process because it's a much more quick process as we go from the second to third reader.

The fact is that I think, as I said, Members and the public have now got the draft of the bill, as introduced. The gentleman referenced that the Ways and Means Committee, a committee on which he serves, completed its work I think about 2 a.m. this morning. Education and Labor completed its work at 6 a.m. this morning. Energy and Commerce, which has a greater portion of the bill, will probably complete its portion of the markup, we hope, on Wednesday of next week. They'll be marking it up on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. We expect there to be a substantial number of amendments offered. I don't know how many will be adopted or what changes will be made to the bill.

The point I want to make, therefore, is that when we say that this bill, however many pages it is, 500, 1,000, 1,500 pages, however long it is, essentially most of that bill is ready for review as we speak. There will be changes. There will be amendments as the process goes forward. But the public really ought to have an understanding, as I'm sure you would want them to have, that the bill is largely on the table now so that what you're really going to be giving notice of is amendments as they occur, which are much shorter and will be able to be read much more quickly.

Now having said that, the gentleman mentioned 72 hours. I certainly have indicated that we're going to have it in place, as a final draft, 48 hours in place. That's our intent. That's what I intend to do. That's why the committees have worked so hard this week and why the Energy and Commerce Committee is going to be working so hard and is hoping to complete its work by Wednesday so that we will not be considering the bill itself until at least a week after that. So my expectation is that there will be substantial time available for review of the bill.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that. I know the gentleman shares my concern with the reality that took place around the stimulus bill and around the 300-some-odd page amendment to the cap-and-trade bill that was rushed to the floor, having come out of the Rules Committee with an extensive manager's amendment without the ability for anyone in this House to read the manager's amendment and the bill in its entirety. I do think—and I think the gentleman would agree with me—that it is in the interest of the American public, and it is their right to know that we do give adequate time for the Members to read the bill as well as for the American public.

Mr. HOYER. There has been much talk about the 300-page amendment. And very frankly, I think that process was not one which was optimal. I would prefer not to repeat that process. Obviously we were driven by the fact that we were at the end of the session. We wanted to complete the bill so that people would have an opportunity, as we moved forward, to have plenty of time to work on the health care bill, which we knew was coming. But I must say that about half of that manager's amendment was the so-called GREEN Act which had been introduced literally I think months before but certainly weeks before and was available for review.

But the gentleman has a good point. I want him to know that the Speaker and I both are committed to making sure that we have at least a couple of days—we think it will be more—but a minimum of 2 days, a full 2 days to review both the bill and any amendments that might be attached to a manager's amendment. Obviously that may not be the case. Other amendments might be offered on the floor.

Mr. CANTOR. Well, I thank the gentleman for that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I will then turn to the issue surrounding the stimulus debate and really a related issue to what the gentleman had referred to as far as the scoring on the health care bill and that is the continuing concern over the exploding debt and what we are doing in this Congress and the impact that expanding the debt load of this country will have on America's families. I do know the gentleman has indicated a notice for a PAYGO bill for next week. I would like to ask the gentleman whether this bill will be identical to that which has been introduced by the members of the Blue Dog Coalition. I think the chief sponsor on that bill might be the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HOYER. I was a cosponsor of that. As a matter of fact, I introduced the bill. Mr. HILL was a sponsor, along with a number of others. Your colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) was a cosponsor of that bill, Mr. MILLER from California was a cosponsor of that bill and Mr. WELCH from Vermont was also a cosponsor. So it is a pretty broad spectrum of our membership, indicating that there is a real commitment to paying as you go. We believe that's an important principle.

As I'm sure the gentleman knows, PAYGO was first adopted in 1990 as a result of a conference that was held out at Andrews Air Force Base. Mr. Darman was representing President Bush. He was then the head of OMB, and there was a bipartisan agreement to adopt the statutory PAYGO. In fact, we did that. In 1997 Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Clinton entered into an agreement on statutory PAYGO that we passed in a bipartisan way in 1997. When it was to be reauthorized in 2002 and 2003, it was allowed to lapse. I think that was unfortunate. My premise is it was allowed to lapse because making the tax cuts that you wanted to propose in '03; and indeed in '01—you waived it in '01—would have been impossible, from your perspective, to pay for those cuts. So statutory PAYGO did not apply over the last 6 years. I think that, to some degree, has led us to the deficits.

Of course in the last administration Vice President Cheney made the observation that Ronald Reagan had taught us that deficits don't matter. I think the Vice President's observation was certainly not right in terms of that Ronald Reagan taught us that deficits don't matter; but Ronald Reagan certainly taught us that deficits add up and create large debt. As you know I like to say so often, we went from a $5.6 trillion surplus in January of 2001, which President Bush observed was the estimate in March of '01, to what is now an $11 trillion debt. Unfortunately because of the status of the economy, we've added to that. I believe, and I think my colleagues believe, that this is a critical problem that we have to address. And I know you agree with that as well. We believe that this is one way to do so. It was helpful in 1990 when it was adopted in a bipartisan way. It was helpful in 1997 when it was adopted in a bipartisan way. I am very hopeful that it can be adopted in a bipartisan way this coming week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Without delving into a rehash, perhaps, of past fiscal practices or whether Vice President Cheney's remarks may have been taken out of context, I would ask the gentleman again, is the bill that will be brought to the floor identical to that which he indicates he signed on to and that which is being sponsored by the chief sponsor, the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HOYER. I know exactly what it is. It's not identical. There have been some changes which will be included in a manager's amendment. I will make sure that that manager's amendment is available no later than Monday. Essentially what it does is it ensures that it is consistent with the PAYGO rule that we have here in the House and it does somewhat modify it as to the tax cuts that will be effected, that will mirror the budget that was adopted by this House earlier this year. It also directs that CBO scoring be controlling so that we have a neutral arbiter, not an administration, whether it's a Democratic or Republican arbiter, as to what the costs are. Those are the major changes that I think make it more consistent with what the House's position has been in the past.

Mr. CANTOR. I will just end my comments by indicating that I have read some reports which say—perhaps inaccurately reported or not—that the bill that you expect to come to the floor will not include the discretionary spending cap. The cap certainly would be a necessary thing to limit the double-digit increases that we're seeing in spending this Congress and the appropriations bills that have been coming to the floor. So I will indicate to the gentleman that we certainly will be supportive of those types of commonsense spending caps.

Mr. HOYER. That's very interesting. They weren't in in 1990, they weren't in in 1997, and they weren't in in any proposal you've made to date.

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman knows we are in extraordinary economic times, and we have got tremendous job loss, and we've got a debt burden that continues to amass that may very well impact the ability for an investment-led recovery.

□ 1515

I would indicate to the gentleman we stand ready to work with him in trying to return to some sense of fiscal sanity in this body.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 20, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 21, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVIL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CORRECTING ENGROSSMENT OF H. RES. 469

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of House Resolution 469, the Clerk be directed to strike the words ''born and'' from the first whereas clause on page 1.

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

There was no objection.

A NEW AMERICAN TRAGEDY

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there have been some real tragedies because of the way the economy, in general, has been handled and how the automobile industry, in particular, has been handled.

I received a letter from a lady named Jane Denney from Wabash, Indiana, in my district. She talks about how her family has owned an automobile dealership for the last 75 years. Her husband was the head of all the mechanical work there. He was a service manager. And General Motors was sending all kinds of equipment there and all kinds of supplies, urging and almost mandating that they buy that. They also mandated that they consider buying a Pontiac dealership there, which they did buy.

Then, after they bought the Pontiac dealership and bought all this equipment, General Motors contacted them and said they were going to do away with their dealership, and they did not indicate in any way that they would make restitution for the expenses that these people had to bear. They owe money for the dealership. They owe money for the supplies. They owe money for all of this, and the rug has just been jerked out from under them.

That is an American tragedy, something that should not happen. And the way this government and this administration has handled this and the way the auto companies have handled this is a real tragedy.

Dear Mr. Burton: Thank you for speaking out for the auto dealerships today. My husband's family recently were told they would be closing after 75 years. My husband is the service manager and GM keeps sending him essential tools which he must pay for and cannot send back for new cars they will not send him. They have parts they had to stock but GM won't buy back. In recent years they bought the local Pontiac dealership because GM wanted they to. Now they owe for it and won't be paid by GM for the franchise. I am a teacher and also feel the ISTA was treated unfairly. I cannot believe this is happening in the USA. I am glad I voted for you and appreciate your speaking out for us. I feel so powerless again all that is happening. God bless you.

A CASE FOR THE HIPPOCRATIC OATH FOR CONGRESSMEN

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the economy is in a tough situation, 9.5-plus percent unemployment, 14.7 million people are unemployed. Actually, the number is higher than that.

Since January, 1.9 million foreclosures have occurred. People are losing their homes. Foreclosures are up 9 percent since this President took office.

And today we take up the welfare for wild horses. That's right. We are going to spend $700 million for wild horses' habitat. But how about the habitat for Americans? We have got the health care effort to socialize medicine. And do you know who gets hurt? The seniors get hurt. We owe them so much better.

We got the bailout. Goldman Sachs had record profits the second quarter. Well, isn't that special? It looks like Geithner is wrong. If it is good for Goldman Sachs, it is not good for the country.

We owe the American people better than what we are giving them. We should take a pledge like doctors and do no harm. We are doing too much harm.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEXLER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 156.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PROBLEMS WITH UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I want my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to listen to what happens when you have socialized medicine. This is a Canadian story I'm going to tell you about. In fact, there is more than one.

This is from Shona Holmes. She is a Canadian. She says that after suffering from crushing headaches and vision problems, she was diagnosed with a brain tumor 4 years ago. She was told if it wasn't removed, she could go blind or even die.

American doctors at the Mayo Clinic said to me, you have a brain tumor pressing on your optic chasm, and it needs to come out immediately. Holmes was told by her doctor in Canada that she had to wait 4 months before she could see an endocrinologist and 6 months for a neurologist.

She is a Canadian, and she says that the doctors at the Mayo Clinic where she turned to got to her right away because they couldn't get to her fast enough in Canada. She ended up having to pay about $100,000 because they couldn't take care of the problem in Canada, as that health care system was supposed to do. She and her husband were forced to put a second mortgage on their home and borrow money from family and friends.

Here is another story: a prime example is the Kingston General Hospital in Ontario where they have staggering delays. Senator MCCONNELL in the other body claims that on average there is a 340-day wait for knee replacements and a 196-day wait for hip replacements. The chief of staff of that hospital says, In our Canada health care system, we are looking at what we have to do to prioritize patients. They are on somebody's waiting list if they have a problem. They have to wait.

Another Canadian, Rick Hession, has a heart condition that could cause a stroke. But he has a 3-month or more wait for an operation to correct it.

Socialized medicine, government-controlled health care, does not work. It costs a lot of money, you have to wait, and they ration care. This is the program that the Democrats are promising. And all of these white areas are new agencies of government that you're going to have to go through to get your health care.

It is going to cost between $1 trillion and $3 trillion over the next decade. That is money we don't have, money we are going to have to print or borrow. It is going to cause inflation.

So we not only have a health care problem we are going to create that will be much worse than anything we face today, something that is going to be equivalent to what they are doing in Canada and England, which does not provide care for those people, but it rations care and it costs through the nose.

The American people need to know these facts. And my colleagues on the Democrat side are trying to rush this through before the August recess so the American people won't know what all this means. I think it is a tragedy. We need more time so the American people can realize what they are going to have to experience if we get a socialized, Canadian-style health care program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the House Democratic health care reform proposal. The United States currently spends per capita almost double the money on health care as any other industrialized nation on Earth.

Despite all of this spending, 45 million Americans languish without health care coverage. Every day, 850 Floridians and 14,000 Americans are added to the ranks of the uninsured. Since 2007, the number of Floridians without coverage has grown by 15 percent. Those who do have coverage face skyrocketing premiums, co-pays and fees.

In recent years, the average premium paid by a family in Florida has spiked by $1,400. If we continue down this path, by 2017, health care spending will consume 20 percent of our Nation's gross domestic product.

The staggering cost of health care in America is simply unsustainable. Businesses cannot compete, and millions of Americans go without care or receive care in emergency rooms and hospitals that taxpayers pay for.

For 60 years, Americans have demanded health care reform; and for 60 years, Congress has failed to deliver on this most basic need. With President Obama in the White House, the time for reform has come. We must not let the opportunity to achieve comprehensive health care reform pass us by. This legislation will finally provide quality and affordable coverage to every American.

This proposal will deliver all of the following: a guarantee of no insurance denials for preexisting conditions; a reduction in the doughnut hole in Medicare part D to help seniors afford prescription drugs; a cap on out-of-pocket expenses so families will not have to go into bankruptcy as a result of medical emergencies; and, finally, a robust public option that will drive costs down by competing with private plans.

The skyrocketing cost of health care poses a systemic risk to our economy. The health care reform package with a strong public option is a much better deal for the American people than this unsustainable status quo.

We are on the verge of finally bringing health care costs under control and improving the long-term economic health of our country. Shame on us if we lack the courage to seize this historic opportunity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NATIVE AMERICAN INDIANS' HEALTH CARE: GOVERNMENT MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been running a universal nationalized health care system in the United States for over 100 years. Just ask those folks that live on Indian reservations.

Socialized medicine doesn't work, and America has already proved it by the way it has mistreated Native American Indians. They are treated under the Indian Health Services Program, a universal government-run health care system for Indians.

There are long waiting lines for service, doctors are scarce, the quality of medical care is poor, it costs too much, and it results in rationed health care. When the government is running health care, people die. Now the administration is forcing universal health care on everybody.

Let's look at some of our history on American-run health care: when Stephanie Little Light took her daughter, Ta'Shon Rain, to the Indian Health Service Clinic in Montana, which she was required to do since she is under the universal health care Indian program, the doctor said her little 5-year-old girl was just depressed. She had stopped eating and stopped walking. The little girl kept complaining to her mom that her stomach hurt. And after going back to the government-run health care clinic 10 more times, Ta'Shon's lung collapsed.

She was air-lifted to a private, non-government hospital in Denver where they told her mom she had terminal cancer. The little girl who loved to dance and sing and dress up in Indian costumes always wanted to see Cinderella's World at Disney World. A charity sent the whole family there, but Ta'Shon didn't get to see the castle when they got to Florida. The little girl had died in her hotel room. The mother says she still cries when she remembers how her daughter was always in pain before she died.

There are more examples. The doctors at the Indian Health-run clinic told Stephanie there was nothing wrong with her daughter, that she just had all of this in her mind.

This is a tragic example of medical health care run by the United States Government. There is a big difference between good intentions and what really happens in the real world. When there are no doctors left and the taxpayer money is gone and when bureaucrats control health care, people die. Is this what we are to expect under the new nationalized health care system?

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, they say on these Indian reservations don't get sick after June because that's when all the Federal money runs out. So they ration health care.

The Indian Health Service Agency calls itself, get this, a ''rationed health care system.'' How's that for truth about socialized medicine?

Rhonda Sandland lives on Standing Rock Reservation in North Dakota. She'd had a terrible case of frostbite on both her hands, and her hands had turned purple. The pain got so bad that she could not even dress herself. She visited the Indian Health Service clinic over and over again. Rhonda says she didn't get any help there until she threatened to kill herself because of the pain. The clinic then decided to cut off five of her fingers. Lucky for Rhonda there was a private doctor that just happened to be visiting the reservation. He prescribed her medicine that she needed, instead of cutting off her fingers. She's okay today.

Victor Brave Thunder was not so fortunate. He felt real bad and he went to the same government clinic as Rhonda. They misdiagnosed the fact that he had heart failure, and gave him Tylenol and cough syrup. He later died.

Marcella Buckley has access to all the free government health care she can stand. Once again, she's required to go to the government Indian Health Care Services. Marcella had stomach pains and went to the government clinic on her Indian reservation for 4 years. She was given a whole host of reasons for her stomach pain, including the fact, they said, she might have a tapeworm. Eventually she found out she had Stage 4 stomach cancer, and it had spread all over her body. Now she seeks treatment at a private provider.

On another Indian reservation, Ardel Baker went to her government-run clinic because she had chest pains. They sent her in an ambulance to a private hospital where she noticed that they had put a note on her chest in the ambulance. And the note read, ''Understand that Priority 1 care cannot be paid for by us at this time because of funding issues.'' So they put a note on her, send her on her way to a private hospital because they can't take care of her. Ardel managed to survive that ordeal, thanks to private medicine.

But it was too late for Harriet Archambault. Harriet died when her hypertension medicine ran out. She tried five times to get an appointment to refill that medicine. Government bureaucrats nowhere to be found. So she died before she could ask for that sixth appointment at that government clinic.

Mr. Speaker, these are examples of government-run medical malpractice against the Indians right here in America. Government-run health care never works. Even in America we've proven it doesn't work.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will just close by saying this: If you love the way we run the Postal Service, and you love the way that we run FEMA, and you love the compassion of the IRS, you will love the new nationalized health care system. Just ask the American Indians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCOTTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BERKLEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WORLD'S GREATEST DELIBERATIVE BODY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KOSMAS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate being recognized to address here on the floor of the House of the House of Representatives. This has often been described as the world's greatest deliberative body. And here, in these Chambers, we engage in this debate and this dialogue.

But the dialogue that comes to these Chambers is a dialogue that's designed to be filtered through our committee system, through our subcommittees, through our full committee process, whether it be the appropriations subcommittees and committees and on to the floor, or whether it be through our standing committees. And what we've seen happen instead is that this process is under the process of a wrecking ball that's been taken to the traditions of

this House. And each day that goes by, it seems that there's another one of those opportunities to expand this deliberative body and, instead, it's diminished by order of the Speaker, by order of the Rules Committee; shut down the process to the point today where we had the gentleman from Oregon brought a privileged resolution to try to be heard on an amendment that would have otherwise been in order under 220 years of tradition of this House, but, instead, it was shut down by the Rules Committee, the committee that serves up here in this little hole in the wall in a room so small that a few Members can come in. Once in a while there's room for their staff. I have never seen press in the room. There is no camera in the room, and there will be no tourists that are allowed to go in there and watch the real debate that takes place, if it takes place at all in this Congress, in the Rules Committee. It's been changed that way in order to avoid the light of day, the press, the C–SPAN cameras and, in fact, even some of the recordkeeping that is a little bit different there than it might be if it were up in front of everybody in front of the television cameras. And it is of great frustration to most Members of this Congress to see what's being done to this debate and deliberative process.

So these debates that take place here on the floor, we used to have some good debates, some engaging debates, some times when people actually changed their minds when they heard the other side of the argument. That's what makes this the greatest deliberative body in the world. But now the debate's been reduced to something that takes place behind closed doors, I believe, by order of the Speaker, and amendments are shut down time after time after time. At least a dozen of mine were struck through just in the last couple of days. And I have sat up there waiting my turn to testify in the Rules Committee to the extent where I really want to bring up a laptop and some other kind of book work so I can make my time count. And if you get up and go to get a bite to eat or something to drink, then you might lose your turn altogether.

So I have, Madam Speaker, introduced legislation that, if the business of this House is actually going to be conducted by the Rules Committee, then let's move the committee to the floor of the House of Representatives. If you're going to change and usurp the genuine authority of the franchise of all 435 Members of Congress who have a constitutional right and duty to express the will and the wishes of their constituents by amending the process, offering amendments, seeking to improve legislation, if the rules are going to be such that they usurp the authority or the franchise of each Member and put it up behind closed doors—and the doors are closed. And as I sat there waiting my turn, last week, well, it's still this week, I had two of my own staff people waiting out in the hallway. They couldn't even get in to hand me a piece of paperwork. I have to send them an e-mail on my BlackBerry and they'll pass the paperwork in because there wasn't room.

The business of the Congress is being conducted either in the Rules Committee, or behind the scenes, behind the Rules Committee, but it's not being conducted on the floor of the House.

So when Members are denied amendments that would be in order under the 220 years of the tradition of the House of Representatives, but the ones that are allowed will be a whole series of amendments offered by the gentleman from Arizona to strike a little funding here, to strike a little funding there, most of which I voted for, by the way, Madam Speaker, it gives the image to the public that there's a legitimate debate going on here, but it is not the legitimate debate. And, in fact, if you listen to the debate, there's no exchange of ideas. There's no clash of the contest of competing ideas. There's not an exchange of dialogue. It's rare to have a Democrat yield when asked to yield by a Republican who simply wants to clarify a fact or make a point that would better bring out something in the debate that would be good for the American public to know.

This process has devolved down to where it can't be called any longer a deliberative process. And the American people do care about whether their voice is heard in this Congress. And it's not being heard in this Congress.

As we've watched things be rushed through, the cap-and-trade bill, which I call the cap-and-tax bill, rammed through here to where a bill was hurried up and rushed, and then, to have an opportunity to amend the bill didn't exist for Members of Congress. It did exist for the manager, apparently, because there was a 316-page amendment that was brought down here and dropped into the record at 3:09 in the morning, to stack that on top of a 1,100-page bill that nobody read.

And the most colossal mistake in the history of the House of Representatives was the passage of the cap-and-trade bill. And it was done so with no Member of Congress having read the bill, not one. And no Member of Congress read the amendment, not one. And if they'd read them separately, they couldn't understand the composition of the bill because the 316-page amendment that was dropped on us at 3:09 in the morning was not integrated into the overall bill. It was impossible to do that. You've got to page forward and back and go back into the code and verify the references and rewrite to get this 316-page amendment blended into and integrated into the overall bill.

And when the question was asked of the Speaker during the debate, is there a copy of the enrolled bill here in the House, there was no copy, Madam Speaker. There was no bill. We were debating something that didn't exist yet. And we passed something that didn't exist yet. And Members were required to vote on a bill that was 1,400-plus pages in its aggregate form, not having ever had it integrated, but that anybody understood the complete context, within the context, the complete content of the overall bill and the amendment. But Members voted anyway. And even though the Speaker said that she was going to provide for sometimes 72, otherwise 48 hours to be able to fully evaluate the consequences or the merits of the legislation that would come before the floor, that didn't happen. It seldom happens.

This place is being run with an iron fist, not with the open kind of a process that was promised when people put their trust in the current majority to run this Congress in a legitimate fashion. It's not legitimate. We can't even put up the front that it's legitimate if we are debating a bill that no one, and I mean no one on the planet, has completely read, and an amendment that no one understands completely how it integrates with the overall bill, and to be able——

We stopped the process here for over a half-hour while we tried to get a copy of the language that was being voted upon. And we never got it done. To the credit of the Clerk, she was actively trying to integrate the amendment into the overall bill, but it could not be done within the time that was available. And even if it had been, it was only symbolic because still, no one would have had a chance to read it.

And I'll even take this to this wild outrageous step of we ought to understand the things that we are voting upon. We should be able to get our hands on it. We should have time to read it, deliberate it, consider it, and pass it out to our constituents, and they should have access to it over the Internet, and they should be able to give us input on how it affects their lives. We can't bring the wisdom of Solomon with us, everyone in here, and instantaneously make a decision and a snap judgment on something there's no opportunity to read.

And it was an embarrassment, I know, for the majority to be debating a huge bill, a colossal bill, a cap-and-trade bill, and not even having one single, not even a symbolic version for somebody to point to and say, This stack of paper is what is going to save the planet—I think, is the position that the Speaker took.

And so the question was asked by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), Madam Speaker, can we message this bill over to—if this passes, this bill that was before us, if it passes the House, if we don't have a bill, can we still message it over to the Senate? Or do we just tell them we sent you over a bill that we passed but it's not ready for anybody to review. It's not been reviewed yet.

That's the fact of what we were dealing with when the cap-and-tax bill was passed. And now it's messaged to the

Senate. Presumably, somebody's put it all in its proper form. But I'm confident that not one Member of this House of Representatives has yet read that bill because now it doesn't pay. They can't shut themselves up and invest the time in reading the cap-and-tax bill because it's already passed the House, nobody having read it and no version of it in its complete form being available to any Member; messaged over to the Senate. I don't know if it was the stack of the bill and then plus the 316 pages in an amendment separately, or if it got messaged over there integrated in a fashion that they could say that they received a complete bill in the Senate. We don't know. And it doesn't really matter to the House Members because we now have another bill that's coming at us so fast and so hard that hardly anyone has a chance to read it, although I do know a couple of Members that have burned a lot of midnight oil and tried to get through it. They have to break it apart and assign it to their staff and read the parts they can as fast as they can, and others will read it and write their little memos on it. That's this health care bill. Oh, my. You should see what we have here now that's been cooked up by the staff.

□ 1545

This work was done urgently and, I think, effectively off of the components of the bill that were available, and I think this might actually be representative of what we have today.

This is the flowchart, Madam Speaker. This is the schematic of what is created by this idea of a public plan for health insurance and to provide health care for the people in America. I have to point out that these white boxes on this schematic flowchart—in places like Australia, they would not call it a ''flowchart.'' They would call it a ''scheme.'' I'll stop a little short of that one; but the white ones are the existing agencies and programs that are there, and the colored ones are the new ones.

So you'll see a number here that's, maybe, oh, about an equal number of new agencies matching up with the equal number of existing agencies. As you read down through this, there are all kinds of components to this that ought to scare any freedom-loving person, but the one I'd direct your attention to, Madam Speaker, is down here at the bottom, these two circles that are in purple in the blue background.

Now, the left-hand circle is this: It takes the traditional health insurance plans—the white that's existing—and now they'll have to qualify, and they'll have to qualify so that they'll meet the Obama standard for new health insurance companies. So, if you're an American citizen with a health insurance plan that you like and if you want to keep what you have for a little while, you can keep what you have, but the insurance company will have to comply with the new standards that will be written by the existing or future health insurance czar. Surely, we have one or will have one. We have 32 czars. We couldn't have nationalized health care without a health insurance czar.

So that czar will be writing the rules—it's not in the bill—on what it takes for the traditional health insurance plans to qualify to become the qualified health benefits plans. That's the private side. That's your health insurance if you're an American citizen—a person who has a plan that's not either Medicaid or Medicare. They have to qualify. It changes every one of them, potentially meeting a new standard that would be set by the health insurance czar. The health insurance companies, the ones that survive, will be fewer than the 1,300 we have today, the 1,300 competing against each other, the insurance companies that are providing different models to try to get the investment dollar in there, the premium dollar, from the people of whom 70 percent are happy with the health insurance plans that they have. We won't have 1,300 when they're done complying with the White House health insurance czar standards. We'll have less. I don't know how many less, and nobody knows, because we don't know what the standards will be; but these private companies then will have to compete with the newly created, if this bill passes, public health plan. The public health plan will be the Federal health insurance plan that is there to compete against the private plans.

Now, why would they want to do that? Why would they create a whole plan for the government to run with taxpayers on the hook if they've got 1,300 health insurance companies today that are more than happy to get out there and to continue to compete in the marketplace? What would be the merits?

Well, the only ones that I can determine are—if you really wanted to establish a national health care plan that didn't have competition, if you wanted everybody on a single-payer plan, if you wanted to have nationalized health care, if you wanted socialized medicine, you can't do that without first creating some kind of a public health model, and that is what this new public health insurance model would be. Over time, it would, I believe, compete and would push out of the marketplace every one of these health insurance programs that we know today because the government would subsidize.

I'll give you an example of how this works. Since we don't have insight into this in the United States on Federal competition against the private sector with regard to health insurance, here is a model:

Flood insurance, the flood insurance that we used to have that was property and casualty insurance for people who were living in flood plains or for people who were afraid that they'd be flooded. They would buy their insurance in years back and would pay the premiums. If they got flooded, the flood insurance companies would come to their places and they'd take a look at the damage. They'd write them checks and they'd settle it out. That's how it works in the insurance industry in a lot of different ways. In the property and casualty at least it does.

The Federal Government decided that there wasn't enough competition in the flood insurance business, so they set up Federal flood insurance years back to compete against the private-sector flood insurance plans that were there. Actually, yesterday I checked into this, and I was not able to discover a single company in America that is selling flood insurance in competition against the Federal Government. The Federal Government has established a monopoly now in flood insurance. Now, two things can happen if you have a monopoly. You can price it way out of the marketplace, and if you have a captive market, you can do that, or if you have a marketplace that you're trying to market to in your government, then you can undersell your costs by lowering the premiums below the actual costs, which is what the Federal Government has done.

So, today, the Federal flood insurance program, the only existing flood insurance program in the United States of America, is the flood insurance program that's $18 billion in the red. That's $18 billion in the red because it's government. We should not be surprised at this. The government came into the marketplace subsidized by tax dollars, and it lowered the premiums for flood insurance, but by lowering the premiums, they took the private sector competition out of the marketplace. They went off to do other property and casualty. They cleaned the field out and became the monopoly holder of all of the flood insurance of America. Yet they still couldn't set the premiums at the risk. They set the premiums at, apparently, what their bureaucrats thought they should be at, and they're $18 billion in the red.

Now, imagine what that would be like if it were the post office and if everybody had to go and buy a stamp. We are critical of the post office when they can't hold their balance sheet in the black, and they are marginally in the red today.

That's the government program flood insurance, running in the red at $18 billion, and that, Madam Speaker, I predict, is what will happen with our health insurance in America.

So, when President Obama says, If you like your health insurance, don't worry; you can keep it. You can't keep it if it doesn't exist. How could anybody have kept their flood insurance if there are no companies selling flood insurance except the Federal Government's flood plan?

What if the health insurance czar writes the specifications for these companies to qualify at such a standard that they can't compete with the public plan? Why would the health insurance czar not write those regulations

so that they would be at an advantage to the newly emerging public health plan? After all, they have to find a way to compete in a marketplace that is competitive.

So the model is there. If people think that I just pulled off the shelf a model that happens to make my case, I would make the point of: show me a model where government has gone in and has taken over where they didn't squeeze out the private sector.

Should we talk about crop insurance, for example? That would be another model. How about student loans for another model? Students loans used to be private. Then the government got into the business, and now they've taken the student loan program down to where only about 25 percent of the student loans are private and the rest of them are government-brokered student loans. We have now the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and many others who simply want to eliminate any student loans except what are government student loans.

When government steps into the private sector, a number of things happen: The quality of the service goes down. The cost of the service goes up because you get inefficiencies that come in with government that would be automatically erased by the competition from the private sector. Then you either get rationing or you get rates that go up or you get taxes that are increased. In the case of flood insurance, it is that taxes have increased to pick up the $18 billion shortfall that is there. So we know the pattern. We know the drill. We should know what this is. We've been through this before, Madam Speaker.

To make the point that we've been through this before, here is my ''deja vu all over again'' chart. The ''deja vu all over again'' chart is the schematic, the flowchart—as the Aussies would say, it's the scheme—from back in 1993. This is HillaryCare. I remember this coming out during that period of time. I have a chart that must exist in my archives, a chart that hung on the wall in my construction office during those years. I would stand and look at that and study it when I would be on the phone while I would be pacing back and forth. I would walk by and look at this chart of HillaryCare. I would look at all of these created agencies and at the interconnectivity of them. It was something that chilled me and that galvanized me. It was one of the significant stepping stones along the way for me to go from the private sector of 28 years in the construction business into the legislative arena because I was so appalled by what I saw them doing to create more government that would be oppressive to the freedoms that I so love and enjoy.

This is about freedom. This is about whether we are going to keep and maintain our freedom and expand our freedom or whether we're going to trade that off for a dependency and accept the dependency that comes from a government plan that has a bunch of, I want to say, elitist, liberal-thinking people who think that the American people can't make their own decisions, so they have to make the decisions for us.

It's the same kind of thinking that would take the deliberation of the House of Representatives up in the hole in the wall in the House Rules Committee and let the Rules Committee take the orders from the Speaker's office and not allow it to come down here to be heard in the light of day. They think they know. They think they're smarter than you. They think they can draft a proposal that is a utopian model of health care for the United States of America, and they will tell you they can save money. They don't actually tell you that you're going to get better service, because this is the best health care system in the world. We don't wait in line. We don't have to take a number. We don't get hurt and lay around waiting for somebody to come along and take care of us. We don't stand in line. Americans should not stand in line.

I can think of the times I've had to do that, and it grates on me. I don't like standing in line at TSA to get on a plane. I remember who brought that about. That's the terrorists. We ought to always blame them. I don't like to stand in line with my credit card in order to pay a bill, and the retailers know that. They don't allow lines out there, because you won't make the purchase. You don't want to stand in line either. We will stand in a line sometimes for a concert or for a ball game when we're trying to cram 50,000 or 100,000 people through those gates in a short period of time for a definitive time when something starts. That's about the only time that Americans stand in line.

Canadians, the British, the Europeans, they stand in line for health care. It's appalling the standing in line that they do. Russians stand in line as a matter of course. It's part of their culture. It's the living that they make, apparently. I think they wander around Moscow looking for another line to stand in. They've been so conditioned to stand in lines. They hunch their shoulders, look down, wander around, look up once in a while, find a line, go get in it, and then find out what the reason is.

Americans don't do that. We have freedom. We are a freedom-loving people, and it's our free markets and our free enterprise and the entrepreneurial nature of this and the innovativeness of it. It's also the property rights and the patents and the trademarks that we have that make this country go, and we are the economic growth engine for the world.

Here is an example of the Canadian model—and they're our neighbors, and we love them, and we get along great with them, but the Canadian model would be this, and this came out from Senator MITCH MCCONNELL from the Senate side: The average wait time for someone who needs a knee replacement in Canada—a knee replacement—is 340 days. Can you imagine? Finally, your knee wears out, and you're using a cane or you're on a crutch or you're in a wheelchair or you're sitting around the living room or you're not going back to work. You go to the doctor, and he takes a look at your knee and schedules you for a knee replacement. He looks on the calendar and turns the pages—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 months, 11 months. He turns the page 11 times on the calendar to find the date that he can write your name in. You have to go 340 days to get your knee replacement in Canada.

Yet we would just leap into the abyss of socialized medicine because the President's idea is that the government can do it better than the private sector can? We just have to learn how to do it better than the Canadians, the British or the Europeans?

How about the average time for a hip replacement in Canada? According to MITCH MCCONNELL, the average time is 196 days for a hip replacement. So your hip socket wears out. Now, that's a little tough to do that always with the cane, although it happens. You're on a crutch or two crutches or you're on a cane or you're in a wheelchair gimping around for 196 days. You know, I don't know if you call that ''elective surgery.'' I don't think it is. I think, at some point, for the quality of your life and for your productivity, the necessity is to get the surgery done.

That's rationed health care. I don't know the numbers of how many people died of something else while they were waiting to get their knee joints replaced or their hips or how many of their lives were altered because of it or how much was diminished of the quality of their lives, of the people who had to wait in those lines. That's just joint replacement.

I had a meeting last night with a doctor who does orthopedic surgery in Canada and in the United States. He goes back and forth across the border and does that work. He told of the case of a patient who had come in who had torn up his knee. He said a torn meniscus, and I believe he said an ACL, an anterior cruciate ligament, those two things. It was a knee wreck—swollen and badly painful. He was up there, and he did the examination, and he said, Fine. We'll get you into surgery right away, and we can fix you. We'll patch up that ligament, and we'll patch up the torn meniscus, and we'll fix you.

□ 1600

In America, that surgery would happen, oh, the next day. They might elect to allow the swelling to go down—that could happen—but it could happen also that the surgery could be the same day or the next day if the surgeon decided that was the best thing for the patient. And that would be the criterion, by the way.

But in Canada, he did everything he could to schedule him with the proper

surgeon, and this man had to wait 6 months to be further examined before they could evaluate whether they would schedule him to repair his knee.

So they put him in a brace, sent him out of there on crutches, and 6 months later he showed up at the specialist who examined him and scheduled him for surgery 6 months later. A torn knee, a year wait, almost a year to the day from the date of the injury to the date of the surgery. And then, of course, he has the rehab time on that before he's back and limbered up before he can go back to work.

This individual wasn't productive for more than a year, lost more than a year's wages. Why? Why would we waste this human collateral that we are? The most precious resource that we have in this country is our people. And we need to become the most productive people on the planet.

One of the jobs that we do here in the House of Representatives—we should be doing here—it would be enhancing the overall average productivity of all of our people in this country. And if we do that, we'll also increase the quality of life for everyone in this country.

When we diminish it by disrespect for life, whether it's the unborn, whether it's someone who was injured that would be allowed to lay off over on the sofa or sit in the living room chair and not be going to work when they could be fixed in a short period of time and back into it again, that's what happens in countries that have socialized medicine, national health care, a Federal public payer plan which has been devised in those countries that I mentioned, but not in the United States, in part because the American people from 15 or 16 years ago saw this schematic and they were as appalled and animated by it as I was.

And they got on the phone. They called their Congressman; they called their Senator. And they came to Washington, and they jammed the offices full of people. And they went to the offices of the Members around the country.

They wrote letters to the editor and letters to their Members of Congress. And they got on the radio programs that existed at the time—and some of them did—and the American people had a dialogue about how they wanted their health care to look and what they wanted to maintain.

And they completely rejected this model, this old model from the early 1990s, this alarming model of creating all of this growth in government that nobody can completely understand, maybe Hillary understood what she wanted to do. And look at this: the government agencies and programs interact. Some of these I recognize, Department of Labor. I don't know what PWBA is or NGFSHP, NQMP. I think I knew at the time.

But all of these government agencies created or interacted—look at this. The global budget. This is part of the HillaryCare plan. And I will submit this scary HillaryCare plan is not as scary as the 3–D technicolor modern plan, the ObamaCare plan, that has emerged in this Congress that has the idea that it's going to squeeze out the private health insurance in America.

How about the Bureau of Health Information? They will aggregate your health information. The Health Choices Administration, HCA. Health Choices Administration Commissioner.

We know what's happened. America has run out of patience with czars so we're not going to see very many more czars, I don't believe. I mean, 32 may be like our threshold, the political threshold of the number of czars that we can have in America. So we start naming them ''commissioners'' instead. Commissioners aren't as alarming as czars. Commissioners weren't the precursors to Marxism in the Soviet Union. So we're not as alarmed when we call them ''commissioners.'' So we have the Health Choices Administration Commissioner.

Health choices. What does that mean? That means if the doctor doesn't make the choice that's consistent with the directive of the Health Choices Commissioner, they are going to find the doctor. And we don't know what that amount is yet, but it will be hefty. And if the doctor then doesn't comply a second time—not defies necessarily—but just doesn't comply with the Health Choices Administration Commissioner, the second time the bill provides that he face jail time.

Now, are we going to lock up doctors because they keep their Hippocratic Oath and they do no harm and they order the kind of services that protect people? Are we going to ration health care? Are we going to let the government set this entire standard for the entire United States of America? And why would we do that when we realize that in Canada there are whole companies that have sprouted up in Canada. Just think of them as travel agencies that merged with health care services.

And they realized that the Canadians—there is a law in Canada that prohibits a person from jumping to the head of the line when it comes to health care services. So if you have a bad knee, you're going to wait 340 days. It's against the law to move ahead in the line, jump ahead in the line. Nobody wants to be in a line that's getting longer while you are standing in the back of it.

If you hurt your hip, a 196-day wait. But there are people in Canada that can't wait. They can't wait for a hip. They can't wait for a knee and certainly not for heart surgery, and many do.

So some of the companies, Canada, have a policy that's set up as part of their employment policy. And when they recruit some of their employees, the package will be, Here is your salary package, here's your retirement plan. And by the way, we have this plan for you. If you need heart surgery, we'll package this thing up and we'll fly you down to Houston for heart surgery or Ann Arbor or maybe Rochester, Minnesota, at the Mayo Clinic. This happens on a regular basis.

The travel agencies that merged with the health care-providing agencies provide the turnkey operation. Let's say you need heart surgery in Houston. Companies will set this up for the individual that can't wait in line, can't live for the line to get short enough that he can get the treatment, so they package this up and it will be, Here's your round trip plane ticket from Toronto to Houston. Here's a hotel you will go to, here's your transportation on the shuttle bus from the airport to the hotel. And the clinic is next door. You'll go over for the examination at X time on this morning. If all of these things hold up and they are comparable, then you'll go forward with the surgery at such and such a time at this location.

Here's what it will cost for all of the items: the surgeon, the anesthetic, the operating room, the list of all of the incidentals that go into this. They package it all up, you write one check, and American health care saves your life. So does the entrepreneurial nature that sets up those businesses in Canada to access American health care.

But what a cruel thing to do to the Canadians to adopt their plan or a plan similar to them. ObamaCare health care, where then do the Canadians go when they need health care that's urgent, that's life saving, or turns them back into productive citizens again? They've got their relief valve of the United States today. This scary, multicolor, technicolor—we'll turn this into 3–D I hope one day—model says to the Canadians it could be the end of their options. They could say to the American people that it's a whole series of different things that we've never had to think of before

Why would we give up our freedom? Why would we give up our freedom when 70 percent of us like the health care systems that we have and the health insurance plans that we have? And the argument that comes from the Democrats consistently is there are 44 or 47, or they will often say almost 50, million people that are uninsured in America. Well, I guess if there is a plan for Canadians and they don't have to sign up for it, just show up at the emergency room, if they're not signed up, they're uninsured, too.

If you've got a program that takes everybody, whether they're signed up or whether they're not—I wonder how many people are actually signed up in Canada—but if the number is let's just say 44, maybe on the outside 47 million, I can take you this way, Madam Speaker, and that is that out of those 44 or so million people, you've got to subtract from that the illegals that are here in America.

I don't think anybody seriously wants to provide a health insurance program for people that jump the border illegally and sneak into the United

States and that are working here illegally and violating our laws. I don't think we want to fund that. I don't think we want to give them the Cadillac of what would be left of our health care program. So I would subtract those out of that list.

We can debate what the size of that number is. Some say 11 million. I've been here now—this is halfway through my seventh year. We've been saying 11 or 12 million illegals in America since I arrived here in this Congress. I have gone on down on the border and watched them pour across the border at night, participated in catching a few of them, including a significant supply of illegal drugs that come with them. The number of border crossings that we have had on average since we've been here, the illegal border crossings where we catch them average more than a million a year since I have been in this Congress.

So we've caught over 6 million, probably closer to 7 million who were trying to cross the border and get into the United States.

The Border Patrol, when you ask them what percentage do you catch, some will say 25 percent. That's actually the official line in the testimony before hearings, from the Border Patrol themselves, but when I ask them that question, they will laugh at me. They will say, Oh, no. Not that many. Perhaps 10 percent.

Well, I'll take the 25 percent number and multiply that times the 7 million illegal crossings that we've caught and just say that's three times that number that have actually gotten into the United States successfully if we're intercepting only one out of four.

You've got four, three get across, one we caught. He goes back. That's how that works. And I guess it's three times the number. Three times 7 million is 21 million. That's 21 million that came in. Some died. Some went back. But that's one way to measure how many illegals have come into the country as soon as I have been in Congress. And if you add that number to the roughly 12 million number, now we're up in the 30-some million category.

And it's easy, Madam Speaker, to understand why I think the numbers of illegals in this country are probably greater than 20 million. And we know that the numbers of those working in this country is a number that's over 7 million working in this country at least, and that is a Federal data point number.

But if we cut the illegals out of that list of 44 million of the uninsured, and then if we subtract from that number those that are just in transition between one health insurance plan to another, then we get down to a number that's a little more understandable. And it's a number that comes from two Penn State professors who did a study some years ago. And if I remember correctly, their number was that there was about 10.1 million Americans that are part of the chronically uninsured.

Now, we should be addressing not the illegals, not those in transition between their health care plans because they're going to find another one and they're going to likely stay on that one. There is always that happening while people are looking for the best plan.

But if we really have something to fix, we should be fixing the chronically uninsured, that 10.1 million. And I think I took that and divided it by the population and rounded it up to the nearest percentage point. Take 10.1 million, divide it by 300 million and you end up with a number that's a little over 3½ percent.

So let's give the benefit of the doubt to the liberal utopian people who draw up these schematics that we're trying to fix something like 4 percent of the problem. Four percent of the population is chronically uninsured, and we would tear apart the entire system to try to fix this 4 percent. And what percentage of the 4 percent will be fixed?

Well, according to one of the estimates on how the result of those that would be recruited by this plan would work out, this plan pushes tens of millions off of their own private insurance plan. Puts them on the government plan. And in the end, the result would be such that they ended up—by one measure, 97 percent of America would be insured. But I don't think that includes that—I don't know how they address the illegals.

Well, we have now 96 percent. By the time you take out the chronically uninsured and the illegals, 96 percent of America is now insured. Now, I don't want to argue that of the chronically uninsured, this plan would only get 25 percent of them enrolled. It may not be. But if you want to look for a measure on what's likely to happen, one need go no further than the Medicaid rolls in America. There it is, if you qualify. Sign up for Medicaid. It's a free program. You don't have any responsibilities except to sign up, and you will be covered if you meet the standards of the lower income that's necessary.

But of those that are eligible for Medicaid in America, just slightly over 50 percent of them are actually enrolled. So why would we think that we could enroll the part of that 4 percent of the chronically uninsured; why would we think we could get a higher percentage of them to enroll in a government plan, or furthermore, if they're no more responsible than that, why would we want to? What is the upside?

□ 1615

Aren't there other solutions and better solutions? And the answer to that question of course is yes and yes. There are many better solutions than what's being proposed in this particular outrageous and scary schematic.

We should do many things. We should expand our health savings accounts. One of the best things we did with health care in this Congress in this last decade is to pass health savings accounts, and if a young couple in that year, say at 20 years of age, had invested the maximum amount in their health savings account that year and done so each year—first year was $5,150 and it's indexed for inflation, moving on up. I don't know the number today any longer; I've lost track. But I did do the math on this and build a spreadsheet to do the calculation.

If that couple at age 20 invested the max in their health savings account and did so each year until they reached Medicare eligibility and spent $2,000 of real dollars out of that account in legitimate health care costs for each year, and you accrued that at about a 4 percent rate, which was legitimate at the time I did the math—and it will be legitimate—again, that couple arrived at retirement age with more than $950,000 in their health savings account.

Now, why wouldn't we as a Nation take a look at that, utilize that, and give them a reward for their responsibility and see if we can find a way to make a deal with them that will get them off of the entitlement roll and because they have the assets to take care of themselves? And I would argue this, Madam Speaker.

I would say to that couple, take your $950,000 and buy a paid up Medicare replacement policy and keep the change tax free. Right now, the intent of this Congress is to tax those health savings accounts when either they are spent or when the people that own them die. They want to tax that. I say, if they will take themselves off of the Medicare entitlement rolls, I want them to have the balance of that tax free.

We can work out some formulas where we can actually help them buy that out, but today, let's just say if a couple, similar couple, arrived at age 65 today and they wanted to do an altruistic thing and not be part of the Medicare entitlement, they could buy a Medicare replacement policy for right at $72,000 per patient. So, say, a husband and a wife, for $144,000, could buy a replacement policy. That would be the cost, I should say. I don't know if you can actually buy the policy these days because government has monopolized health insurance for people past the age of 65, but that's the risk, that's the average risk for the health care costs. From 65 until natural death, it would be $72,000 per individual.

So it's reasonable to think that we could set up a Medicare replacement policy that people could buy and let them cash the difference tax free. That would be a great incentive for a lifetime. It's one of the things we can do.

Another thing that we need to do is increase the amount that can be deposited into the health savings account; in addition, medical malpractice. You can look through all of these schematics, this Technicolor schematic of the modern day ObamaCare version or one can look through this black and white

older version of the HillaryCare health care schematic, and you can't find anything in here about the reform of the unnecessary, punitive malpractice litigation that's taking place all across this country.

We all know about the lady that spilled a cup of coffee from McDonald's in her lap, and she was awarded in the initial decision—I forget the number now—$3 or $7 million or whatever outrageous number that was, and I know it went back under appeal, and it lowered the number down, but it surely intimidates people.

A case here in town, it wasn't medical, but it was a judge that sued a cleaners and took one or two of their stores out of business because they lost his pants. And we see businesses out because of litigation that's brought about in that fashion.

How many tests are done in America because the doctor is paying a very high malpractice premium? In order to protect himself from a suit, he has to run a bunch of extra tests because that's what you do in the industry to protect yourself from the lawyers. First, take the oath to do no harm, go out to serve people in a profession that has great honor, and have it be framed by fear of litigation instead of doing the right thing. That's the medical version of a good Samaritan watching someone get run over on the street and not going to help them—well, a formerly likely good Samaritan that's afraid they will get sued because they will reach outside of their profession in an effort to help somebody and they get sued. And doctors run tests every day by the thousands to protect themselves from litigation.

And yet, nothing in the old schematic and nothing in the new Technicolor schematic addresses the medical malpractice insurance. Now, we addressed it in the Judiciary Committee a few years ago, and we put a cap on noneconomic damages of $250,000. That is what they have in California. Not a lot of good things happen legislatively in California, but that's one that did. Proposition 209 was another, just to toss an aside into this dialogue. But we capped it at $250,000 noneconomic damages and let people be made whole. If they were injured by malpractice, they would get the cost of their medical care. They would get real economic loss of income. They would even get a little pain and suffering, but the punitive damages, the things we consider to be punitive damages that were defined in the bill as noneconomic damages, would not be awarded beyond $250,000.

Why would you pay a lady millions of dollars for spilling a hot cup of coffee in her own lap in order to send a message that McDonald's shouldn't serve hot coffee? How many things in this life do we no longer have access to because a trial lawyer's figured out a way to make a living and then the other lawyer's figured out a way to write the rule so that we could avoid that kind of litigation?

How many of us have climbed into a vehicle and gone down the road and decided, I want to program my navigator, and found that your navigator doesn't work while you're moving because some lawyer decided you might get in a wreck for programming your navigator, and then sued the manufacturer for being distracted from your driving? Why is it their fault if you don't have responsibility? But instead, they put the failsafe in so you have to pull off on the side of the road, and a lot of it, they defeat the intent of having that kind of a device.

That's what goes on with health insurance as well. That's what goes on with health care providers. A very high cost in health care in America is because of unnecessary tests that are being run in order to avoid litigation.

So maybe if we had all doctors that were paid by the government, then they would have the sovereign immunity that would come from being Federal employees so they wouldn't be sued. Now, that might be a way where Obama might save some money on health care. I don't want to go there, but it might be the only thing that actually might be legitimate as far as saving money, and then they will argue that they will reduce some of these costs down by providing efficiencies through technology. I will support that.

Let's have better records. Let's have those records be easily and quickly available to qualified people so if you live in Kansas City and you end up in the hospital in San Francisco, they can do a quick bar code off of your driver's license, for example, and access your health care records so they know what you're on for prescription drugs; they know what kind of treatments that you had. You may not be conscious and there may be no one with you. Even if they are, they may not know what you're taking for medication. Let's do that technology.

Do we have to do this in order to utilize more modern technology? We are moving in that direction with the technology anyway. I suppose the health care czar will tell us just what technology we can use and set some mandatory parameters on how we get there. I am nervous about that.

So there are some efficiencies. There are wellness plans that can be incorporated into health insurance programs that are incentives, and if we have those incentives there, people will do the right thing. If you lower my health insurance premium, I'll lose a few pounds and I'll exercise a little more and I'll go in for a checkup a little more, and they will diagnose the problems earlier, and we'll live longer and healthier as a people. That's the free market. That's not a one-size-fits-all socialized medicine plan.

These are the things that we should be looking at to improve our health care systems here in the United States, but going down this path, going down this path of creating the huge bureaucracy, the Health Benefits Advisory Committee, imagine what that is; the Public Health Investment Fund, oh, how they manage your dollars while it's in there. What else do we have? We have the mandate by insurance that goes down to the consumers, the Health Insurance Exchange Trust Fund, the Clinical Preventative Services Task Force. So that's going to be preventative services.

Another thing that happens when you have socialized medicine—I will tell this in a narrative the way I heard it. When this plan went in in Canada, at that time I had a good number of business relationships with friends in Canada, and they gave me the unfolding narrative. One of them—his name was Peter actually—said to me, here's what's going on. They passed a national health care plan in Canada, the socialized medicine plan, and they said you need to be responsible and go to the clinic for your checkups and don't overload the emergency rooms and treat your health care in a responsible fashion and only go when you're sick, don't go when you don't need to except for your regular checkups, be a responsible consumer. That's how it was sold. And by the way, they did the actuarial projections on the cost by expecting Canadians to be responsible consumers.

And he said, so, the first year of the national health care plan in Canada worked like this. People were respectful. They did go to the clinic. They didn't crowd the emergency rooms, and it went along pretty good for the first year. And by the second year, the third year and the fourth year, people weren't willing to take time off from work to go to the clinic when it was convenient for the doctor. So, on the weekends and at nights when they did have time in their schedule, they just went to the emergency room and abused the privilege.

And so Peter explained it to me this way. He said, it was just like a company that for the first time was having a Christmas party and they invited all the employees in to have a dinner and a few drinks and to celebrate Christmas together. And everybody comes and they have one or two drinks and they tell good stories about the boss and pat him on the back, and everybody was just nice and full of love and responsibility and grateful that they'd had a Christmas party that they could celebrate together as a working family, or a family of workers to be more correct.

But he said by the second or third and the fourth year of the socialized medicine plan in Canada, it was like the second, third or fourth year of the company Christmas party. They abused the privilege. They drank too much. They told nasty stories about their boss. And they expected their Christmas party and the bonuses to be an entitlement rather than a bonus.

And so that was the attitude that he described of the Canadians: jamming the emergency rooms when they went

at the times that was convenient for them, not going to the clinics, not being responsible, and that they had abused the privilege. And the costs went up and the service went down and the lines got long and people died in line. That's the tragedy. That's the tragedy of socialized medicine.

I met a man a few months ago in a home improvement center, and he was an immigrant from Germany. And he told me about his hip surgery. It wasn't a sad story. It was matter of fact the way he delivered it. He had to wait about 6 months to get a hip replaced as a German, but he wanted it done badly because it was painful and it limited his options on how he could move around and what he could do. And so he had to travel from Germany down to Italy where the line was shorter, and he was operated on in fewer days than if he had been waiting in line in Germany.

And I listened to that story, and I thought, what would it be like to have to go to another country to get your health care because the lines are shorter? What would it be like to get your health care because there's a line? We're Americans. We don't stand in line. We have freedom. We have fought for that freedom. We have worked for that freedom. We've paid for that freedom. We don't stand in line. We don't make ourselves dependent upon bureaucrats to make decisions on what's better for all of our lives. We go out and make our lives better. That's what we are. That's who we are.

And this color-coded schematic threatens our freedom. It threatens your freedom. It diminishes the spirit and the character of the American people and turns us into dependents. It takes the safety net that we have today and it cranks it up a few notches and turns it into a hammock. And we take less responsibility, and the psychology of who we are as a people are diminished. What about that American spirit, that can-do spirit? That idea that we can do anything?

□ 1630

The idea that we can go to the Moon, if we decide we can go to the Moon. What about what happened when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor? We took on a national mission and a two-front global war and put 16 million men and women into uniform and came out of the other side a global power and the only surviving industrial power in the world.

We set the pace with our economy, with our politics, with our culture, with our faith and our values, and an inspiration for the world. The rest of the world looks up to us. They do see what's been accomplished here. And we have taken the talent of every culture in the world and rolled it together in this great melting pot and come out of it with something that is a unique vitality, a unique vitality that doesn't exist in any other people in the world, in part, because we've skimmed the cream of the crop off of every Nation in the world.

The people that came here, came here because they wanted to have a chance at the American Dream. They wanted to have an opportunity to become an American and an opportunity to be independent economically and carve out and pull themselves up by their bootstraps and provide for their own family and sit down at the supper table at night and be proud of what they have accomplished for their day, for their week, for their month, for their life.

And we should be proud of what's been accomplished in this country by the lives of all of those that have gone before us. This is not worthy of their effort and sacrifice. This isn't worthy of a proud and independent people that should be reaching for more freedom instead of giving it up in exchange for dependency.

This is dependency. It goes the wrong way. It takes us to the left. It takes us to a dependency. It takes us to a myopic image of a utopian version where they have always thought—and let's just say in that part of Western Europe your utopian thinkers have emerged. They have always drawn these kind of schematics to come up with a better way to be able to find this utopia on Earth.

They completely and diametrically are opposed to the philosophies of Adam Smith and the philosophies that emerge in the Old and in the New Testament.

The independence that we have to have, the personal responsibility that we have to have, the moral standards of the core of who we are as a people, diminished by this color-coded schematic.

And I pray, Madam Speaker, that the independence of the American people, the spirit that's within us, the inspirational responsibility that we have for the world, will cause us to rise up and reject this model, this model that's not for Americans.

It's not an American thought process to always be taking responsibility away from people and diminishing their freedoms in the process. We need to be about expanding freedom, not diminishing freedom. And when we do that, our spirit rises up to the top. Our energy and our work ethic rises to the top. And we are stronger economically. We're stronger as family. We're stronger as faith. We're stronger as a culture and as a people, and we need to do that to set the inspiration for the rest of the world.

Somebody's got to lead. This is our time, and I challenge the people in this Congress and this country to do the right thing by this policy.

With that, Madam Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAVES (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for July 15 after 4 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of a family commitment.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. WESTMORELAND (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of family medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEXLER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEXLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, July 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 24.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 24.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July, 20, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, John H. Adler, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Robert E. Andrews, Michael A. Arcuri, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Tammy Baldwin, J. Gresham Barrett, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Melissa L. Bean, Xavier Becerra, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, John A. Boccieri, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, John Boozman, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Charles W. Boustany Jr., Allen Boyd, Bruce L. Braley, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bobby Bright, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Ginny Brown-Waite, Henry E. Brown Jr., Vern Buchanan, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G.K. Butterfield, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave

Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor, Anh ''Joseph'' Cao, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Christopher P. Carney, Andr Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Michael N. Castle, Kathy Castor, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Travis W. Childers, Judy Chu, Donna M. Christensen, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Kathleen A. Dahlkemper, Artur Davis, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Lincoln Davis, Susan A. Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Charles W. Dent, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Steve Driehaus, John J. Duncan Jr. Chet Edwards, Donna F. Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Keith Ellison, Brad Ellsworth, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Mary Fallin, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, John Fleming, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Gabrielle Giffords, Kirsten E. Gillibrand*, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bart Gordon, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, Parker Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, John J. Hall, Ralph M. Hall, Deborah L. Halvorson, Phil Hare, Jane Harman, Gregg Harper, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Stephanie Herseth Sandlin, Brian Higgins, Baron P. Hill, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie K. Hirono, Paul W. Hodes, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Duncan Hunter, Bob Inglis, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Steve Kagen, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Patrick J. Kennedy, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Mary Jo Kilroy, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Ann Kirkpatrick, Larry Kissell, Ron Klein, John Kline, Suzanne M. Kosmas, Frank Kratovil Jr., Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher John Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, John Linder, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, John M. McHugh, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, Michael E. McMahon, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Connie Mack, Daniel B. Maffei, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Betsy Markey, Edward J. Markey, Jim Marshall, Eric J.J. Massa, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kendrick B. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Charlie Melancon, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Walt Minnick, Harry E. Mitchell, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Christopher S. Murphy, Patrick J. Murphy, Scott Murphy, Tim Murphy, John P. Murtha, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Devin Nunes, Glenn C. Nye, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Pete Olson, Solomon P. Ortiz, Frank Pallone Jr., Bill Pascrell Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Thomas S.P. Perriello, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Earl Pomeroy, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Adam H. Putnam, Mike Quigley, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, Silvestre Reyes, Laura Richardson, Ciro D. Rodriguez, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers (AL–03), Mike Rogers (MI–08), Dana Rohrabacher, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Sablan, John T. Salazar, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Joe Sestak, John B. Shadegg, Mark Shauer, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Vic Snyder, Hilda L. Solis*, Mark E. Souder, Zachary T. Space, Jackie Speier, John M. Spratt Jr., Bart Stupak, Cliff Stearns, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher*, Gene Taylor, Harry Teague, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Greg Walden, Timothy J. Walz, Zach Wamp, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Diane Watson, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Charles A. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2706. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis & Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees; Export Certification for Plants and Plant Products [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0137] (RIN: 0579-AC22) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2707. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis & Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Movement of Hass Avocados From Areas Where Mexican Fruit Fly or Sapote Fruit Fly Exist [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0189] (RIN: 0579-AC67) received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2708. A letter from the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the nineteenth annual report on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637 note. Public Law 100-583, section 8 (102 Stat. 2969); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2709. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 036-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2710. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 071-09, certification of an application for a license for the export of defense articles or defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2711. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 037-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2712. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 061-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2713. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 040-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense services and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2714. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Government of Belgium (Transmittal No. RSAT-09-1798); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2715. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 072-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2716. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 058-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2717. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 063-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2718. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 055-09, certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2719. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Verification, Compliance and Implementation, Department of State, transmitting A report concerning an amendment to Parts 123, 124, 126, and 129 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), promulgated pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, 22 U.S.C. 2778 et seq, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2720. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's weekly reports for the April 15, 2009 to June 15, 2009 reporting period on matters relating to post-liberation Iraq, pursuant to Pub. L. 105-338, Sec. 7; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2721. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's letter in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2722. A letter from the Senior Vice President & Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2008 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2723. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Home Affordable Modification Program (Rev. Rul. 2009-19) received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2724. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's quarterly report to Congress on the Status of Significant Unresolved Issues with the Department of Energy's Design and Construction Projects (dated June 22, 2009); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

2725. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic & Security Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on their May 20, 2009 public hearing on ''The Impact of China's Economic and Security Interests in Continental Asia on the United States'', pursuant to Public Law 109-108, section 635(a); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

2726. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1831-DR for the State of Florida, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

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. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 3246. A bill to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 3247. A bill to establish a social and behavioral sciences research program at the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 3248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt motor vehicle donations to certain charities from the limitations on such donations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 3249. A bill to strengthen communities through English literacy and civics education for new Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 3250. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, as the ''Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 3251. A bill to repeal certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to Federal employees' official time and labor organization activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 3252. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to agree to an amendment to the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States concerning the establishment of a Border Environment Cooperation Commission and a North American Development Bank; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KIND, Mr. FARR, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 3253. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to promote the use of advance directives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 3254. A bill to approve the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that qualified personal service corporations may continue to use the cash method of accounting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3256. A bill to amend the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 to extend the Rural Community Hospital Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3257. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant family of members of the uniformed services temporary annual leave during the deployment of such members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution expressing support for temporary protected status for Haitian nationals currently residing in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign 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. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring civil rights workers Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner, and the ''Freedom Summer'' of 1964, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama:

H. Res. 657. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Members of Congress who participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) should be automatically enrolled in the public option and be subject to any personal income tax increases levied as a result of healthcare legislation, regardless of their annual gross income; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H. Res. 658. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H. Res. 659. A resolution congratulating Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., on 98 years of serving local communities and enriching the lives of collegiate men throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H. Res. 660. A resolution recognizing the distinguished history of the Laurinburg Normal Industrial Institute; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

117. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 60 MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO REMOVE THE REQUIREMENT THAT STATES MAKE PERMANENT CHANGES TO THEIR 100 PERCENT EMPLOYER-FINANCED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE LAWS TO EXPAND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS TO INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE NOT CURRENTLY ELIGIBLE IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR THE STATE'S PORTION OF ONE-TIME UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT FUNDING AND TO URGE THE GOVERNOR TO USE HER INFLUENCE IN THE CURRENT ADMINISTRATION TO SECURE A WAIVER FOR MICHIGAN FROM THESE REQUIREMENTS; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

118. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 374 urging the Congress of the United States of America to consider requiring that students be offered interest rates on college loans that do not exceed 1%; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

119. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 31 urging the Government of Turkey to grant the Ecumenical Patriarch international recognition and to respect the human rights and property rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

120. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 15 expressing solidarity with Israel in its defense against terrorism in the Gaza Strip; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

121. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 156 opposing the federal ''Freedom of Choice Act;'' and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

122. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 632 affirming states' rights based on Jeffersonian principles; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

123. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 59 MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO AUTHORIZE THE USE OF FEDERAL STIMULUS DOLLARS TO OFFSET THE LOOMING FUTA FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX INCREASE AND TO URGE THE GOVERNOR TO USE HER INFLUENCE IN THE CURRENT ADMINISTRATION TO ZEALOUSLY ADVOCATE FOR SUCH RELIEF FOR MICHIGAN JOB PROVIDERS; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

124. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 505 urging the United States Congress to reduce the 24 month waiting period for participants in Social Security Disability Insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

125. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 13 COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL OF GLACIER NATIONAL PARK; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 197: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 333: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
H.R. 343: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 614: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 653: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 682: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 690: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
H.R. 718: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 816: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 881: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 916: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 953: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1024: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1051: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1074: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1086: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1205: Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1207: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1215: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1269: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 1283: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1392: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 1428: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1458: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1551: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1584: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1670: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1677: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1695: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1700: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1708: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1771: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 1800: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1846: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1868: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1908: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1990: Mr. BOREN and Mr. WU.
H.R. 2000: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2017: Mr. DRIEHAUS.
H.R. 2054: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2139: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 2149: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2194: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2213: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2215: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 2246: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2254: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 2266: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. MINNICK, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2267: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mr. MINNICK.
H.R. 2269: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2296: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 2324: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2406: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 2443: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2478: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2523: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2529: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2534: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 2560: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2563: Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 2564: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2579: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2632: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BOCCIERI, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 2669: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2681: Mr. REYES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2709: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2733: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2746: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 2766: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2770: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2799: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BOREN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 2819: Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 2846: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 2866: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2909: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2943: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2964: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 2969: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 3001: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3017: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3047: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 3116: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3127: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3131: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3140: Mr. CARTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3144: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WAMP, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
H.R. 3147: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3178: Mr. NYE.
H.R. 3200: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3218: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ISSA, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3221: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3225: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. TONKO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HODES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. BARROW, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. WATSON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WATT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. KILROY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. JONES, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr.

FORTENBERRY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. WU, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H. Con. Res. 74: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. BERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MASSA.

H. Res. 267: Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Res. 291: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. TANNER.

H. Res. 333: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 363: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY Mr. OLVER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 383: Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 397: Mr. SCALISE.

H. Res. 433: Mr. WU.

H. Res. 445: Mr. TURNER.

H. Res. 494: Mr. INGLIS.

H. Res. 536: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H. Res. 554: Mr. MELANCON.

H. Res. 611: Mr. BERRY, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 613: Ms. GIFFORDS.

H. Res. 615: Mr. PAUL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H. Res. 619: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 624: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 630: Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 639: Mr. LAMBORN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HASTINGS of Washington, or a designee, to H.R. 1018, the Restore Our American Mustangs Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) or rule XXI.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 4, July 15, 2009, by Mr. DAN BURTON on House Resolution 460, was signed by the following Members: DAN BURTON and STEVE SCALISE

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1, by Mr. LATTA on H.R. 581: DEAN HELLER and MARY FALLIN.