Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—28

Akin
Bachus
Bono Mack
Chandler
Davis (IL)
Doggett
Dold
Gonzalez
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Meehan
Miller, Gary
Paul
Rangel
Rush
Schock
Sessions
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1526

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 113 and 114, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEST) laid before the House the following resignations as members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: In order to rejoin the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I hereby resign my seat on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the Natural Resources Committee, effective today.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SARBANES,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my resignation from the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (SST), effective immediately. I have been pleased to serve on the SST Committee during the 112th Congress. However, this resignation is necessitated by the recent vacancy on, and my assignment to, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Thank you.

Best Regards,

MARCIA L. FUDGE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 590

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Ms. Fudge.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Sarbanes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING RESTRICTIONS FOR ACCOMACK COUNTY LAND PARCEL

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, 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 the bill, H.R. 2087.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 587 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2087.

□ 1529

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2087) to remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia, with Mr. GARDNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2087, an authentic, no-cost jobs bill aimed at removing government hurdles to economic development.

This bill by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) would allow Accomack County in Virginia to move forward with plans to develop—and, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this very explicitly—not 32 million, not 320,000, not 320—a 32-acre parcel of land adjacent to a NASA airstrip into a technology and research facility.

Currently, the parcel has a restriction limiting use of the property to recreational purposes. This was a condition placed on the property when the county obtained the deed through the Federal Land to Park program in 1976. Unfortunately, the park has been of little benefit to the community. Though the county has made diligent efforts, the park has fallen out of use and is currently overgrown and unmaintained.

Now Accomack County has found a better way to serve its citizens, and has determined that with this legislation they can create hundreds of short-term and long-term jobs.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, again, this property is already owned by Accomack County, not the Federal Government. Congress created the program that allowed the county to take title to this land. The

purpose at that time was to help communities like this do exactly what the bill says it should do. Congress has the authority to do this, and it should have the common sense to allow the county to do this.

But there have been concerns raised that this bill would create a precedent leading to an avalanche of these types of requests. Let's be clear: This is simply one specific proposal dealing with one parcel of land totaling 32 acres—not 32,000, not 320 million, just 32 acres.

To put this into perspective, there are nearly 170,000 acres of land that have been transferred to State and local governments through the Federal Lands to Park program. Nothing in this bill would affect those other acres. This bill is narrowly focused, involves an extremely small area of land, and, frankly, it's unfortunate that this bill is even before us today.

However, I will state that there absolutely are instances in which communities and States would be better off if the Federal red tape on private land ownership was lifted, just as there are instances where reducing Federal landownership would be beneficial to local communities and States. Yet here we are debating this specific bill, and it is simply not reasonable to argue that the sky is going to fall if this bill affecting, again, Mr. Chairman, just 32 acres in Accomack County becomes law.

With unemployment still over 8 percent, Congress should be looking for every opportunity possible, no matter how big or how small, to create new American jobs. Gas prices are rapidly rising and families and businesses are struggling to make ends meet. Now more than ever, Congress should make it a priority to eliminate hurdles to economic development; and, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what this bill does.

The gentleman from Virginia has given us an opportunity to immediately help a community with a plan to create jobs. We need to pass this legislation today, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2087.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the legislation.

The Federal Lands to Parks program is one of the most successful parts of our National Park Service. For those parts of the country that are not blessed with the Grand Canyon or Sonoran Desert, this program provides local government with excess Federal lands at no cost, provided the land is used for recreational purposes.

Over the years, nearly 1,500 parcels of land have gone to local governments for free but with deeds that ensure they are used for the public good. This land isn't foisted upon these local governments. Instead, local governments actively work with the Park Service to obtain land for ''historical, natural, or recreational interest.''

I should note for clarification, as we go forward with this debate, that this is not county land. This is Federal land. The county is allowed to control this land as long as it is used for the recreational purposes in the agreement. If this were county land, we would not be here. The county can't sell the land. The county can't lease the land. The county can't rent the land. The county does not own the land. This bill gives Federal land away for free.

Examples of successful projects include: 195 acres that went to the City of Ogden, Utah, for the Ogden Nature Center, Rodeo, and Fairgrounds; 97 acres that went to Brigham City, Utah, for the Brigham Intermountain Golf Course; 103 acres to the County of Walla Walla, Washington, for the Fort Walla Walla Park; 307 acres to the City of Aurora, Colorado, for the Aurora Reservoir Park; and 2.57 acres to the Town of Hot Sulfur Springs, Colorado. All of these entities took the same deal as Accomack County in 1976. They expressed their desire for the land, advocated for the transfer, and freely agreed to a deed that ensured that the land would be used for recreation or revert back to Federal ownership.

Over the years, as local governments have fought development pressures and budget shortfalls, the Park Service and the General Services Administration have developed a land exchange process to enable some flexibility for communities. They can enter into a land exchange that requires the replacement land be of equal recreation and fair market value. Alternatively, the county can return the land to the Federal Government and purchase it for fair market value through the GSA process. The sponsor of the legislation and the county involved have rejected both of these options. Instead, the county is actively promoting a development plan that includes these lands in question while waiting for an act of Congress to clear the deed.

The enactment of this bill creates an unacceptable and dangerous precedent for every other project out there.

The reason the Federal land management agencies refuse to give away Federal land is because Congress requires the agencies to seek legislation to sell or transfer Federal land. Do you know why? Because a pesky little document called the United States Constitution requires Congress to make laws with respect to the disposition of Federal land. This would encourage local governments to run to Congress and cash in on a gift the Federal Government shared with local communities.

This legislation should be rejected. I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington.

I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to come before this body today and make the case that this is wonderful and strong legislation that should be moved forward for one purpose: job creation in the Commonwealth of Virginia and, specifically, in Accomack County.

It, indeed, is a jobs bill. It reflects common sense. It reflects common ground. It came out of committee with bipartisan support. And I think most importantly, Mr. Chairman, it reflects the collective wisdom and the will of the hardworking taxpayers of Accomack County.

Here is why, Mr. Chairman, this bill, if passed and enacted, will create jobs: You see, the folks of Accomack County have not asked the Federal Government for something. They've simply asked the Federal Government to get out of the way so that the greatest job-producing engine the world has ever known, the American entrepreneurs, and Accomack County can get to work in a very responsible way of developing this property that is immediately adjacent to the Wallops NASA facility there.

It is, I think, a clear contrast of two basic philosophical approaches to job creation. One looks to this institution and to Washington to see that this institution is the primary driver of job creation. As a lifetime entrepreneur, Mr. Chairman, I reject that approach and, instead, have adopted all of my life and believe we need to bring to this body the mindset that the best thing to do to get our economy going again is to eliminate the hurdles. This is a very practical hurdle that is holding back job creation in a county that desperately needs jobs.

Mr. Chairman, 16 percent of the hardworking families in Accomack County live under the poverty line. About 90 percent of the property that's in Accomack County is agricultural.

□ 1540

It is without a doubt a poor county, and this bill simply removes a deed restriction. My friend behind me just a few moments ago said, Do you have a picture of this? I said, Well, we didn't bring it down to the floor, but we could have. It's just overgrown. There's nothing there. There's a dilapidated dugout facility, and that's it. There's no parking, there's no infrastructure, there's no buildings.

Accomack County has a plan. Americans are resourceful. They'll figure their way out of this in spite of Washington. The board of supervisors has a wonderful plan for the Wallops Research Park; but it only works, Mr. Chairman, if this deed restriction is removed. Thirty-two acres. Great potential for the folks in Accomack County.

I want to close, Mr. Chairman, by recounting a conversation that I had just a few moments ago. I actually called the person back. I wanted to make sure I had her permission to share this story. I trust she's listening now.

Mr. Chairman, her name is Kathy Wert. Her husband is a builder in Accomack County, and their business has been hurting because of the economy. Jim's a friend of mine, and I know his business is hurting. Kathy used to work for him in accounting. She's been out looking for work because the construction business is so depressed. And we all know that. I called Kathy and said, I would like to reference you here. Do I have your permission? And she said, Yes, you do.

This is just one family. There are hundreds and hundreds of families in Accomack County. I wish my colleagues on the other side who are opposing this bill could look them in the eye and explain to them why we can't remove this deed restriction. It's a classic example, Mr. Chairman, of a paternalistic Federal Government, an oppressive Federal Government, holding back job creation.

We're all American taxpayers. This idea of transferring it from one to another, $800,000 or more from a poor county, this is what is wrong with America, Mr. Chairman. Even though this is a relatively small bill in the big scheme of things—32 acres—when the Federal Government owns almost one-third of all the land in the United States, that, too, is a problem. Maybe we'll get around to that one day, Mr. Chairman; but until then we're just talking about 32 acres.

So I would ask my colleagues on the other side to reconsider, and I would ask them to vote in favor of this, and let's get some hardworking folks in Accomack County back to work.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, it's inconceivable to me that with all the challenges we have that are facing our Nation, this body is taking up legislation today having to do with a 32-acre parcel of land in Virginia. Is this really the best we can do at a moment when our economy is still underperforming? At a moment when we're still sending brave Americans to die in an immoral war that's gone on for nearly as long as my grandson Teddy has been alive?

We still have more than 8 percent unemployment in this country. We still have families and entire communities wondering what happened to the American Dream. We have people losing their home through no fault of their own. We have people wondering how they're going to pay next month's bills, never mind the daunting cost of sending their child to college. We have families wondering why the very health care reforms they needed are about to go on trial at the U.S. Supreme Court. We also have people who, more than ever, are depending on safety-net programs like Medicare and Medicaid, which have a big fat target on their backs put on by the Republican budget plan that was just unveiled today.

A good start would be to pass the Senate transportation bill to rebuild our infrastructure and put our people back to work. And then, how about getting down to the business of ending the war in Afghanistan, which is killing our people, undermining our national security, and diverting the money that we need to meet human needs right here at home. I can't believe that the American people want us to debate a bill about 32 acres of land in Virginia—not when we still have thousands of troops in harm's way, fighting a war that is doing nothing to keep America safe and nothing to protect our vital interests.

We have important issues to debate, Mr. Chairman, big problems to tackle, Americans who need our help, and an overseas conflict that must end. This is a moment of great urgency. Why isn't the majority acting like it?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the cosponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the chairman of the committee for giving me the opportunity to speak and the gentleman from Virginia for giving me the opportunity to cosponsor this bill. The gentleman from Virginia, of course, is from the southern end of the Delmarva Peninsula. I represent the middle part adjoining Accomack County.

We heard a lot during the State of the Union Address. The President stood just a few feet in front of you, Mr. Chairman, and talked about shovel-ready jobs and infrastructure. Mr. Chairman, there are shovel-ready jobs ready to go. This land adjoins Wallops Island, the launch facility which now is one of the places that launched private and public vehicles into space. It doesn't get any better than that for a poor county like Accomack.

The chairman of the committee mentioned an 8 percent unemployment rate. Well, Mr. Chairman, I wish that Worcester County, where half the employees in this industrial park will work, had an 8 percent rate. The unemployment rate was 15.6 percent in Worcester County.

The President stood there and said, We've got to get Americans back to work. Mr. Chairman, we need to cut through the red tape, just like the President said, and get projects like this going. There's no loss of recreation area. Accomack County has offered to, in fact, find another 32 areas to have the recreation area. So let's not pretend there's a loss. Let's not pretend this land doesn't belong to Accomack County. They hold the title. Like a poor stepchild they are coming to Uncle Sam begging for permission to create some jobs in Accomack County. And like the mean old uncle, Uncle Sam has said, No. There's red tape involved. We have a bureaucracy. You have to fill in all the blanks. You have to do this. Mr. Chairman, the 15.6 percent of Worcester County who are unemployed don't have the time for this red tape. We must do it.

The gentleman called this unacceptable and dangerous. Mr. Chairman, you're right, 15.6 percent unemployment is unacceptable. It's dangerous to our economy. The gentlelady said it's inconceivable that we're here. I couldn't have said it better. How could our Federal bureaucracy have failed so poorly?

We need to pass this bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I have no doubt that these issues are important to the people involved. I have no doubt that the people who support and oppose this bill care deeply about it. It's a local issue, and I come from a locality and therefore understand. But the fact of the matter is that our country is in some seriously grievous harm because, yes, we do have an exorbitant unemployment rate. It's been going down. We've been adding private sector jobs. But there's still too many people unemployed. And yet the majority has not taken the time on the floor today to deal with how we're going to get all Americans back to work. They're taking time to figure out how they're going to do an earmark after they've said there's no earmarks.

This is remarkable. I'm actually not against earmarks, Mr. Chairman. I'm for them—I think they're a good thing—but the majority has said no earmarks. Yet this is about the second time in the last couple of weeks we see them floating their earmarks right on through.

H.R. 2087 would allow a county in a particular Representative's district to acquire full ownership of a little less than 32 acres of Federal land worth more than $800,000 for free. That's an earmark. Yet the rest of us can't get them. But if you are among the favorite few, you can. That's wrong. That's unfair. That's unjust. And it's particularly unjust, given the grievous problems that we're facing as a Nation.

We should be voting on a real jobs bill to create good jobs all across America, but apparently that's not what we're going to be doing with our time today. We're going to be talking about a narrow provincial interest and trying to give away Federal land for free for a particular interest in a particular locality. We should be talking about how we're going to save and protect Medicare guaranteed for all Americans, which is a threat, given the Ryan budget. But, no, we're talking about a narrow, small-town interest, which I think is important but that the majority in their infinite wisdom has said we can't do because that's an earmark.

The GOP has wasted the last 441 days that they've been in charge, and has failed to produce a single jobs bill.

□ 1550

In fact, they're trying to cut jobs. The transportation bill would lead to

losses of over 500,000 jobs. Now, I definitely sympathize with the folks who are out of work in the Member's district, I mean in the county where this earmark is going to be taking place. I do. I'm very concerned about the unemployed. That's why I wish we had a real jobs bill as opposed to these giveaways of Federal land, and we really don't know who it's going to be benefiting at the end of the day.

The bottom line is we have real problems in America. We've got transportation needs, we've got environmental needs, and we've got health care needs. We've got real debate to take care of. But if we're going to be debating those things, we've got to be on the floor, taking the time up to do those things, not dealing with disguised earmarks for certain people because they happen to—I don't know. I don't know why they get privileged treatment over people like me who don't get to offer earmarks anymore.

I'll say this, Mr. Chairman: at the end of the day, America is a country that needs the attention of this Congress so that everybody can get a job that pays well across this country. And we're not doing that. We're failing. What we're doing is we're allowing one county in one Member's district to acquire the full ownership of a valuable piece of land for free. And that's wrong.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, Congressman MCDERMOTT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, when we came into this session, there was a lot of talk in this House about the fact that we needed jobs, lots and lots of talk on the other side about how they were going to take care of this economy and we were going to finally get some jobs. There hasn't been one single bill put out here in 441 days. We are still waiting for a jobs bill from the Republican leadership.

Now, I don't want to dismiss the piece of legislation we're discussing here. I'm sure it's very important to have 32 acres of Virginia, and perhaps maybe there will be 100 jobs there. Those are important jobs for those people. We are in favor of that.

What's hard to understand is the Republicans' idea of priorities. Mr. Chairman, I can't understand how the Republican leadership could let the highway bill expire in 11 days and end highway construction in the United States of America and bring out instead a bill for 32 acres in rural Virginia that—most of us would have a tough time finding Accomack County on a map. There are 550,000 people working on rebuilding infrastructure in this country in the highway system, and the Republican leadership won't bring it out because they've got a fight inside. They've got a fight inside. They've got a bill that is so bad that it bankrupts the highway trust in 2016 and creates a $78 billion funding shortfall over the next 10 years. That's the highway bill that they won't bring out here. I understand why they won't bring it out here. They'd get chewed up by the fiscal irresponsibility.

They have a bill sitting on the desk from the Senate they could bring up tomorrow, and we could ensure construction jobs all over this country for 550,000 people. But no, we're out here with this little—the last speaker said, it's really interesting, all the jumping, shouting, and waving of arms, we're not going to have any more earmarks in the House of Representatives. Earmarks are evil. They're evil things created by the devil, and we have wiped them out.

Now, if this ain't an earmark, I don't know what is. If you put a bill out here for 32 acres in two Members' districts, that's an earmark, folks. That's an earmark. And I'm not saying earmarks are bad. Frankly, I went to three of them last weekend in my district. One was the restoration of the King Street Station in the railroad system. Another one was an addition to the Wing Luke Museum, which is a national monument. These kinds of things make sense, and I think this piece of legislation makes sense, and it will probably go out of here without a single vote against it.

But it can't go out without somebody saying, where are your priorities? Where are they? Why is it that the leadership of the Republicans can't get their people in line to get a highway bill out here when it's 11 days from the day it expires? What is the matter? Well, I think really what it is, it's driven by the ideology that is creating most of the problems in this 2 years in terms of recovery. Nobody wants to give President Obama one single success, and they will kill the highway department and the highway construction fund and everything else if they can just make sure they don't reelect President Obama. That's what it's all about. It's very clear.

We see it going on tomorrow. It begins over across the street in the Supreme Court. They've spent 3½ years fighting providing health care for all Americans—3½ years fighting it, not trying to improve it, not trying to make it work better, but trying to repeal it. That's what's going on in this city. In fact, thousands of people have got health care now that didn't have it. The fact that you can now keep your kids on your policy to the age of 26 has added millions of young people to those who are insured against health problems. There are people who have health care in spite of the fact that they have a preexisting condition.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. They've got their health insurance because the bill that the President got through the Congress with our help was one that made it possible for you to get insurance if you have a preexisting condition. Now there are thousands of people who have benefited from that in this country, but not one single attempt has been made by the Republicans in 3½ years to do anything to make that work better. All they want to do is destroy it.

This is the party of destruction—the destruction of the infrastructure of the country, the destruction of an attempt to do the health care. You can go right down the list—441 days, no jobs bill—and what we get out here is this earmark. It would really be kind of laughable if it weren't so serious.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I advise my friend that I have no requests for time. If he is prepared to close, I'll close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, as we have heard continually from my friends on the other side of the aisle, before us we have a seemingly innocent piece of legislation that would allow Accomack County to develop a mere 32 acres of land for an aerospace park. One might even wonder why we are taking up valuable time on the House floor in debating this measure.

This is not innocent legislation. This is a Federal land giveaway that under any other circumstance would be considered an earmark. It is also the opening shot of a larger effort on the part of the Republicans to privatize our Federal lands. In 1976, Accomack County made a deal. They received 32 acres of Federal property free of charge. In return, they promised to use the land for public recreation purposes. Now they want a different deal, only they don't want to pay for it. The deal they want is to commercially develop the land they got for free and relocate the displaced recreation activity to a former landfill.

While it is ''just'' 32 acres, it represents what appears to be the Republican platform: that our parks, forests, and wildlife areas are cash cows, assets to sell and develop during these tough economic times.

□ 1600

Presidential candidate Mitt Romney told a Nevada newspaper that he doesn't know what the purpose is of public lands. While in Idaho, Presidential candidate Rick Santorum told the crowd that public lands in Idaho should go back to the hands of the private sector. This theme is not new. In 2005, then-chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources, Richard Pombo, proposed selling national parks to mining companies.

Today, part of the Ryan budget was released. Again, it is proposing to sell off 3.3 million acres of public land. Most recently, an Energy and Commerce subcommittee chairman suggested selling off some of our national parks. We can't get through a meeting of the House Committee on Natural Resources without someone from the majority suggesting that lands need to be transferred to the States, or sold, or fully developed for gas and oil.

My view, and the view of most Americans, is completely different. As renowned documentary filmmaker Ken

Burns put it, our National Park System is America's best idea. Our forests and desert lands represent what is the best in America—a long-term view that we should protect and value the majesty that God has blessed our Nation with for this generation and the generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to defeat this legislation. We need this Congress to affirm to the American people that we value our parks, our forests, and wildlife areas for their inherent value. We value them as places to recreate with our family. We value them as places to hunt and fish. Sometimes we value them for just knowing that they are there, in hopes that one day we can visit.

I urge a ''no'' vote, a vote to protect our public lands from this precedent that is being set by H.R. 2087.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle on the debate on this issue is rather interesting. Let me take a couple of the issues that were brought up and try to address them.

First, the issue of an earmark. Now, just to remind our body—we must have a very short attention span—but this House acted not too long ago on the question of earmarks and said we should proceed. That's why we are debating this bill. Why? Because H.R. 2087 does not contain an earmark. It is in full compliance with the earmark definition provided for in House rule 21 in the earmark ban that was instituted by the House Republicans in January of 2011.

Why is that or how is that? Because the House definition of an earmark requires that there be spending in some form directed to an entity. In H.R. 2087, we do not direct any spending of any money in any form. It has no fiscal impact. So, Mr. Chairman, to repeat once again—we had this debate earlier, and the House confirmed that debate, by the way—there is no earmark in this bill. Let me make a couple other observations of the previous speakers that have spoken.

One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came down here and said it's been X number of days—I forget how many he said—without one job bill. Well, he's right, Mr. Chairman. There is not just one job bill. There are a multitude of job bills that have been addressed by this body, generally on a bipartisan basis. I might add, if you go back just prior to our last district work period, we passed some bills, which were a series of bills that had passed with bipartisan support, over to the Senate. I'd advise my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, rather than talking here about a lack of activity, go talk to your colleagues on the other side of the Rotunda over there and say: Move these jobs bills. That's what we ought to be doing.

Furthermore, if there are two big issues that the American people are confronted with today, it's jobs and energy. Way last year, we passed energy bills that created American jobs. Don't come down to the floor and say we have not addressed energy jobs. This House has done its work, generally with bipartisan support, but I will note that those that spoke on that voted ''no.'' I don't know what they want to do—create government jobs? Is that the idea?

So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that, I guess in rhetoric and debate on the floor, you get all sorts of different takes, but the facts are the House has passed job-creating bills. They have passed energy job-creating bills. This bill here potentially falls in line with that. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2087

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

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS.

(a) REMOVAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall execute such instruments as may be necessary to remove all deed restrictions described in subsection (b) relating to the parcel of land described in subsection (c).

(b) DEED RESTRICTIONS.—The deed restrictions referred to in subsection (a) are those restrictions, including easements, exceptions, reservations, terms, conditions, and covenants described in Quitclaim Deed No. 17808A from the United States to Accomack County, Virginia, executed on December 20, 1976, and recorded among the real estate records of Accomack County, Virginia, by the Clerk of the Circuit Court, on pages 292 through 296 of Deed Book 381.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcel of land referred to in subsection (a) consists of approximately 31.6 acres situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia, more particularly described in the metes and bounds description recorded on page 292 of the quitclaim deed described in subsection (b).

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 19, 2012, and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered read.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LUCAS). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

(d) CONSIDERATION.—Any instrument executed pursuant to subsection (a), shall provide that—

(1) in consideration for the land described in subsection (c), Accomack County, Virginia, shall pay the United States the fair market value of the land (on the date of the enactment of this Act) under terms approved by the Secretary of the Interior from revenues generated by the sale, rent, or lease of the land; and

(2) the land described in subsection (c) shall be appraised in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards (including the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice) by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary of the Interior and Accomack County, Virginia.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2087.

This is a very simple amendment. It ensures that Federal taxpayers are compensated for the land that is moving out of public ownership and into private development.

The Federal Land to Parks program provides Federal land to local governments with the agreement through the deed that the lands will stay in public use, primarily for recreation.

Accomack County, Virginia, is actively marketing the development of the land in question to the aerospace industry for hangars and other types of commercial development. The land is valued at over $800,000. Meanwhile, the county is asking Congress to intervene so they can take the land they got for free and develop it without compensating the Federal Government.

The underlying bill is the legislative equivalent of writing Accomack County a check for $815,000. It is only because this is cloaked through a deed amendment that it isn't called an ''earmark.''

My amendment simply requires the county to repay the Federal Government for the fair market value of the lands from the proceeds of the development.

By ensuring the taxpayer is protected, we also send a signal to other local governments that are facing economic or development pressures that their parks, developed through the Federal Lands to Parks program, are not piggy banks to tap into when times get tough.

I understand the challenges that Accomack County faces, but they want this land to not necessarily put unemployed people back to work; they want this land to attract the lucrative aerospace industry to the Eastern Shore, not to build a job-training facility.

I urge support for the amendment. It assures that the taxpayer is protected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona does not help Accomack County create jobs, and that is the underlying purpose of this bill.

Recall that this property was obtained by Accomack County because the Federal Government did not need it or want it anymore. The Federal Government washed their hands of this land. Indeed, there was a deed restriction, but the underlying intent was to benefit the citizens of Accomack County. Today, we are acting again to help those same citizens by allowing them to use the property as they see appropriate.

This deed restriction was put in place 36 years ago, and it no longer serves as a benefit to the county. Just because we could demand that they give the land back to the Federal Government does not mean that we should do it, and demanding that they buy the land they already own makes even less sense. In the same vein in which Accomack County requested this land in 1976, they're back asking us again to help their citizens.

I understand the gentleman is looking out for the Federal Government—and I respect that—out of fear that somehow a small county in rural Virginia might take advantage of it. But I do want to assure my good friend from Arizona that the Federal Government and its countless millions of acres of land can and will go on without these 32 acres.

□ 1610

We hear time and again how grateful we should be for massive Federal ownership in the West and of the bounty of tourist dollars it produces. Now, in this very narrow example of 32 acres, perhaps you will see the blessing of local control and what you can do without Washington's central planning and land management.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment because it is unwarranted and does nothing to produce much needed jobs.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and it is preprinted.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following:

(d) VALUATION OF LAND.—Any instrument executed pursuant to subsection (a) shall provide that, before the restrictions referred to in this Act are removed from the deed referred to in this Act, an independent appraiser shall complete an approximate valuation of the land in each of the following years: 1776 1865, 2013, 2017, 2032, and 2212.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to preface my remarks by indicating, at the close of my remarks and when the debate is concluded on this amendment, I do not intend to call for a vote, largely for the reason that I believe that the ranking member, Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment covers much of what I have offered in this amendment; and second, out of respect for my colleague from Accomack, Mr. RIGELL, who I believe has brought this matter, as many of us may be wont to do in the future, regarding the economic concerns that exist in his community.

I would only add, he cited to 16 percent unemployment earlier today in his presentation on the floor. I could take him to some places in the congressional district that I'm privileged to serve and show him 40 percent unemployment in a rural area that happens to be in the same contiguous area as the Everglades National Park. And I'm sure that I could come back here and offer some measures that would allow for Belle Glade and Clewiston and South Bay and Canal Point to have an opportunity to convert land that is in a national park that was given for that purpose, to leave the reversionary restriction aside and to go about the business of allowing for those counties, Hendry and Palm Beach County and Broward, to be able to utilize the land as they see fit.

Land has a market value at some point. As I understand it—and I stand to be corrected certainly by my good friend and colleague from Washington—the original deed in this property allowed that if the parcel was no longer used for recreational purposes that it would revert to the Federal Government. Well, clearly, that reversionary clause is what we are seeking in this particular measure, in this specific one, to overturn. I believe it's wholly unnecessary but, more importantly, I think it sets a bad precedent of involving Congress in consensually entered agreements.

As I've explained, the county was granted the land on the condition that it be used as a park. And I understand, and understood further, from my good friend Mr. HASTINGS' comments yesterday at the Rules Committee, that the land can't even be accessed—if it were not Mr. HASTINGS, then it was Mr. BISHOP—and, therefore, it is important that they make this change.

Congress shouldn't grant special treatment of something as erratic as market value because the market value of land is always changing. And all I have to do is look at my mortgage and look at how the prices have gone down, as they have all over this country.

I heard the statement yesterday in the Rules Committee that the land is useless. I don't think any land is useless. Mark Twain said that we ain't going to have much more land, just to paraphrase him. They're not manufacturing it; although, I think Singapore may very well take issue with that comment.

It's a park, and it is important that the Federal Government conditioned the transfer of the land to the county in the first place on the promise that it would be used as a park. The county agreed to those terms when it initially received the land, and now, in all due respect, they want to back out.

It's not unexpected to want to alter an agreement when conditions surrounding the deal change. In fact, if the county no longer wants to use the land as a park, there are remedies readily available within the Federal Lands to Parks program that it could choose from.

Consequently, changing the agreement today because of a shift in market value sets a bad precedent. We don't know what the market value of the land will be a year from now; we don't know what it will be 5 years from now; and we certainly have no idea what it will be 200 years from now. Before you know it, every county and every State—and this is why I feel very strongly about this—will be here, asking Congress for the same special treatment as soon as the market shifts in their favor.

My amendment requires appraisals of the land, and I believe that Mr. GRIJALVA's does as well. All I ask is that if we don't want it to be a park anymore, as the county doesn't, then the county should look to the remedies it already has available to them.

I believe the market value will shift. I hope Mr. RIGELL is successful. I believe the measure will pass.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would really like to commend my good friend from Florida on his very unique approach to this bill with this very unique amendment. But make no mistake. If it were to pass, the effect would be to hobble and to kill this job-creating bill, so let's set that aside.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require appraisals to be conducted in each of the following years: 1776, 1865, 2013, 2017, 2032, and 2212. In this amendment as the amendment is written, these appraisals must be done in those years.

We did not have a Federal Government in 1776, for example. In 1865, Virginia was part of the Confederacy. That means, however, if we have a requirement to have an appraisal in each of these years, that would require that we go back 236 years and into the future 200 years before this legislation would go into effect.

Now, there may be a misconception or maybe a misidentification, I would tell my friend. I am DOC HASTINGS. I am not Doc Brown, the mad scientist from ''Back to the Future.'' I do not own, nor do I have access to, a plutonium-powered DeLorean that will allow me or Michael J. Fox to complete the complexities of this amendment. I can't go back 236 years; I can't go forward 200 years.

So, notwithstanding some new technology, I have to say, Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, we should defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for just 15 seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, DOC HASTINGS—that is, not Doc Brown—is mindful that we are going to have a future. I just want to comment that there is a future, and we tend to do it around here. As a matter of fact, we do it in budgetary matters; we do it all around.

I appreciate very much my friend pointing out that creativity that I offered. At the very same time, I think Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment is deserving of serious consideration, and I support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1620

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 226, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

AYES—178

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Woolsey

NOES—226

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—27

Akin
Bachus
Bass (CA)
Bono Mack
Burgess
Cantor
Davis (IL)
Doggett
Dold
Gonzalez
Jackson (IL)
Kinzinger (IL)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Meehan
Paul
Platts
Rangel
Rush
Schock
Sessions
Walsh (IL)
Yarmuth

□ 1649

Messrs. PRICE of Georgia, POSEY, COFFMAN of Colorado, BILIRAKIS, ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. AMASH and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ) having assumed the chair, Mr. LUCAS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2087) to remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia, and, pursuant to House Resolution 587, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was 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.

□ 1650

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. In its present form I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2087 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON SALE OR USE OF LAND FOR ADULT ENTERTAINMENT OR BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

Any instrument executed pursuant to section 1(a) shall specify that the land described in section 1(c) shall not be sold, leased, or rented to—

(1) an owner or operator of an adult book, novelty, video, arcade, or live entertainment facility; or

(2) any foreign government that might pose a security threat to the NASA Wallops Flight Facility.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to offer a final amendment to H.R. 2087 that, if passed, would bring the bill promptly back for a vote on final passage. Mr. Speaker, this final amendment is noncontroversial, and it aims to do one simple thing—and that is to protect the land of taxpayers.

The bill, itself, goes against so many things that the majority has said that they would fight for in this Congress. This legislation would provide a local county in Virginia an $800,000 windfall by allowing the county to violate a contractual agreement without any justification. That's the current bill. That's what the bill that you want to pass does. I'm against that. Here in this Congress we did away with earmarks. But when I look at this $800,000 windfall that you are voting on, I say that's an earmark.

This is a very small step in the larger Republican plan to sell off our valuable Federal land, such as National Parks, forests, and public lands to developers. However, even if you're for giving away land the way that's done in this bill, my final amendment would give us the opportunity to ensure that this land would not be owned and used for adult entertainment facilities or sold to or used by a foreign government that could use this to steal our national security secrets.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side: Will you join us in protecting taxpayer-owned land?

The final amendment is very simple and would outlaw the sale or the use of the land for any ownership or operation of an adult book store, a novelty adult store, a video adult store, an arcade or live entertainment facility. I think we can all agree that we should not be giving away Federal property to facilitate adult live entertainment.

In fact, if you're not convinced of that, then let me tell you the second thing we don't want to happen close to that land, and that is that land adjoining this piece of property we're talking about today should not fall into the hands of those who would want to spy on our top secrets. As you probably know, I'm a senior member of both the House Armed Services Committee and the Homeland Security Committee, and every day, I deal with the issues of national security threats.

The issue is the proximity of the NASA Wallops spaceflight facility to the land in question, so my final amendment is aimed at protecting national security secrets from countries like China or Iran. What if a country like Iran or China would purchase that land and eavesdrop on our NASA spaceflight facility?

I am sure that my colleagues would agree that this land is worth protecting. In fact, to remind my colleagues on the other side, this is the final amendment to this bill. It's not going to kill the bill, and it won't take it back to committee. So, if adopted, the bill would be amended and it would go to final passage.

I ask my colleagues to do the right thing to protect our taxpayer-owned land. Regardless of how you feel about the bill, this amendment is one that I believe we should all be behind. I believe that we can all vote ''yes'' on this final amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the author of this motion to recommit clearly did not hear the debate. This land is owned by Accomack County in Virginia. It is not a transfer. It's a deed restriction lift. That's all it is. The land is owned by a county in Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, when we had testimony on this bill in the committee, the government of Accomack County testified, obviously, in favor of it, and they said they wanted this for industrial use. Now, this is local control. Doesn't the other side even trust local control, for goodness sake, in testimony in front of a committee?

I have to say also that history tends to repeat itself. In this body, it tends to repeat itself, it seems like, on a weekly basis. Now, why do I say that? Because the two issues that are facing the American people are jobs and the price of energy. Yet here we have a bill in front of us that would certainly create jobs. And what does the other side do? They want to put up more impediments to it.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. 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 vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 226, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

AYES—180

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz

Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

NOES—226

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—25

Akin
Bachus
Bono Mack
Burgess
Davis (IL)
Doggett
Dold
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Jackson (IL)
Kinzinger (IL)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Manzullo
Marino
Meehan
Paul
Rangel
Rush
Schock
Sessions
Tiberi
Walsh (IL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1716

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

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.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 164, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

AYES—240

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—164

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—27

Akin
Bachus
Bass (NH)
Bono Mack
Cleaver
Davis (IL)
Doggett
Dold
Gonzalez
Jackson (IL)
Kinzinger (IL)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Manzullo
Marino
Meehan
Paul
Perlmutter
Rangel
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schock
Sessions
Tipton
Walsh (IL)
Yarmuth

□ 1725

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. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 115, 116 and 117, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted ''no'' on No. 115, ''no'' on No. 116, and ''aye'' on No. 117.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, due to district business, I was unavoidably back in my Congressional District on March 20, 2012. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 665, the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2011, and "yea" on H.R. 2087, "To remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia."

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, 112th Congress and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following Members of the House to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies:

Mr. BOEHNER, Ohio
Mr. CANTOR, Virginia
Ms. PELOSI, California

REPEAL THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, just last week the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office served a devastating blow to President Obama's most frequently uttered promise during debate over the Affordable Care Act: "If you like your present coverage, you can keep it."

The CBO predicted the law would lead to a net loss of employer-based insurance coverage for between three and five million people each year between the years of 2019 and 2022, with as many as 20 million Americans losing their current insurance plans.

Now, as we approach the second anniversary of the Affordable Care Act, the full impact of this law remains unknown. However, a few things are quite clear. Supporters said it would lower costs. It hasn't. They said it would improve quality. It hasn't. The President said you can keep your current plan if you like it. This clearly is not the case.

By the administration's own estimates, the new health care regulations will force most firms, and up to 80 percent of small businesses, to give up their current plans by 2013.

Mr. Speaker, the American people can't afford another year of the so-called Affordable Care Act.

RECOGNIZING THE BETH DAVID CONGREGATION'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Beth David Congregation in my congressional district. This Saturday, March 24, Beth David will hold its centennial celebration to honor its congregation and its founding members.

For the last century, Beth David has been the cornerstone of the south Florida Jewish community. What started out as a congregation of just a handful of dedicated Jewish families has become a dynamic, thriving institution that is the cultural and educational epicenter for Judaism in south Florida.

But Beth David does not just have an incredibly rich history of outstanding service to the Jewish community. No, the congregation has been at the forefront and actively engaging our entire community, tirelessly working to repair the community one mitzvah at a time. And for that I congratulate Beth David, and I thank all of the congregation for everything they have done and everything they have meant to our south Florida community.

I wish them continued success and 100 more years.

REPEAL IPAB

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, we now have reached a landmark, 2 years since the passage of ObamaCare. More and more, the American people have been hearing about something called IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board—the centerpiece to ObamaCare and its inevitable rationing of health care.

This is a board of 15 unelected, unaccountable and not necessarily health care-experienced individuals who will have more power than even Congress, itself, when it comes to deciding what care every American will receive. The board members will not be under congressional oversight and will not answer the phone when you call to complain. Americans agree by 57 percent to 38 percent margins ObamaCare and IPAB should be fully repealed.

So far, Democrats have been unwilling to listen to the outcry from the American people. They will have yet another chance to respond to "we the people's" unhappiness with ObamaCare by voting with Republicans this week to repeal IPAB. And, hopefully, they will be willing to vote to repeal ObamaCare, itself, in its entirety when it is brought up for a vote sometime in the future.

□ 1730

IPAB

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we begin debate on a bill that would eliminate the Independent Payment Advisory Board, one of the most toxic components of President Obama's Affordable Care Act. This denial-of-care board is comprised of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats that will be empowered to cut Medicare in order to meet arbitrary spending targets.

Not only will this result in seniors being denied access to medical care they need, it will also put the government in the middle of the patient-doctor relationship.

Spending cuts proposed by the IPAB will automatically go into effect unless Congress finds alternative cuts of the same amount. And because implementation of the board's recommendations is exempted from judicial review, citizens can't even turn to the courts for help.

As a physician with over 30 years in practice, I can tell you that the President's proposal, which he has repeatedly defended, is wrongheaded and dangerous.

We must act to save Medicare from bankruptcy, which will come as soon as 2016, but IPAB is not and must not be the answer.

ONGOING HEALTH CARE DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOWDY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate the majority leader giving me the time to come down here today, because I've got IPAB on my mind, Mr. Speaker. I say that like everybody knows what that is because we talk about it here in this Chamber all day long. IPAB, a word that was not even in the lexicon of America until the President passed his health care bill.

What is IPAB? I happened to bring down with me today, Mr. Speaker, the front page of the President's health care bill, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act as he describes it. This was the 900-page law that was passed that completely restructured a sixth of the American economy.

The question then is, when we're talking about the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and we're talking about how we change the individual health care decisions that every American gets to make, what do we get for it? What's the value added there? Because I think, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, when folks are talking about what motivates them, it really is affordable care. That's why we named the bill this way, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. We want patients to be protected, to be able to make their own health care choices. We want care to be made available to folks at prices that American families can afford. There are 900 pages in that health care bill, Mr. Speaker.

Now, IPAB, how would we describe it? We would call IPAB the hammer in the health care bill, because there are