



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2011

No. 84

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 13, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM McCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this day we ask Your blessing on the men and women, citizens all, whose votes have populated this people's House. Each Member of this House has been given the sacred duty of representing them.

O Lord, we pray that those with whom our Representatives met during this past week in their home districts be blessed with peace and an assurance that they have been listened to.

We ask Your blessing as well on the Members of this House, whose responsibility lies also beyond the local interests of constituents while honoring them. Give each Member the wisdom to represent both local and national interests, a responsibility calling for the wisdom of Solomon. Grant them, if You will, a double portion of such wisdom.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. RIGELL 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.

EXPRESSING DEEP CONCERN OVER THE PRESIDENT'S STANCE ON JOB CREATION

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the President said this about our most recent new jobs numbers that were greatly disappointing: "People and the markets are still skittish and nervous, and so they pull back because they're still thinking about the traumas of just 2½ years ago."

Mr. Speaker, I want the President to know that American entrepreneurs and job creators are not looking to the past. Entrepreneurs and job creators by their very nature are looking to the future, and all they see, Mr. Speaker, is the perfect storm of uncertainty based on the President's fiscal policies: They see an EPA that is a hindrance—not a partner—in job creation; they see a nationalized health care that's creating uncertainty about health care costs and where that's going; they see a mountain of debt that continues to

grow each and every day; and they see local bankers who aren't hiring local account executives to reach out to small business owners, but they're hiring those account executives to go out and look at regulations that are just continuing to pour down on our small banks.

Thomas Friedman wrote this in the New York Times this weekend; he said: The epidemic of uncertainty is one of the principal problems undermining U.S. job growth today.

We can do better, Mr. Speaker. Let's support and unlock the greatest job-producing engine the world has ever known: the American small business owner.

HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY PROMOTES JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Friday marks the 1-year anniversary of the current administration's "Recovery Summer." The 3-month "victory lap" was designed to celebrate the fabricated success of the so-called "stimulus" plan. The reality of this victory lap is failure. Since passage of the stimulus, America has lost 1.6 million jobs.

Sadly, earlier this month, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced more families are without jobs. The failed economic policies of this administration, with skyrocketing gas prices promised by the President, have slowed the growth of small businesses. These are America's primary job creators, especially the hospitality industry of hotels and motels which have promoted job opportunities for millions of persons across the country.

Tragically, over 14 million Americans are now without jobs. House Republicans presented the "Cut and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4045

Grow" congressional plan. It's common sense. First cut spending, then the economy will grow. That is the best way to produce jobs by small businesses.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask whether Congress can raise itself to the standard of accountability of your home State, the State of California, that was set there recently.

On April 15 of this year, I introduced the Congressional Pay Accountability Act of 2011, a bill that requires Congress to pass a budget and appropriations bills before the beginning of the fiscal year. If we don't, we don't get paid.

I introduced this bill because if Congress is unable to perform its basic fundamental duties—to pass the budget and appropriations bills—we aren't doing our job and should be held accountable and should not get paid.

Recently, I read that California voters approved a ballot measure that requires the same thing of their State legislators—pass a budget or don't get paid. California voters, facing one of the worst budget crises in U.S. history, spoke up and said that they wanted to hold their elected officials accountable.

As America faces the worst debt crisis in its history, I hope Congress can stand up and declare that we, too, want to be held accountable.

Ask yourselves: If California can do it, why can't Congress do it?

□ 1410

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. 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 H.R. 2055, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RE- LATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 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. 2055.

□ 1412

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. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. MCCLINTOCK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 2, 2011, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 2, line 8, through page 60, line 9.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 9, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(decreased by \$25,000,000)".

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor this afternoon to present an amendment that would transfer \$25 million from one of the accounts, that is the NATO Security Investment Program, to the Military Construction Army National Guard Account. I take this action for several reasons.

First, in our State of Florida, we have at least two projects that are very important to the operation of the National Guard. Our men and women who belong to the National Guard, not only in Florida but across the Nation, deserve an upgrade in their facilities. We have several projects that have gone on for years and years. One of the projects I understand has had difficulty in the contract falling apart. Nonetheless, whether it is in Florida, again, in south Florida, central Florida, or in any State, we should adequately fund the account that protects and provides the accommodations necessary for the facilities for our National Guard. So here we want to plus-up by \$25 million from the NATO Security Investment Program to our National Guard facilities. Across the country I hear the same thing—that National Guard facilities, many of which are two or three times older than those who are serving there, need replacement.

So this is a general amount, \$25 million, but I believe that it can help boost up the facilities account that is so important for Florida and for the Nation. I am willing to work with the committee in any fashion to plus-up this account. I am not trying to pick on NATO, although I believe that there is room in their budget to transfer

these funds without doing any damage. I would ask my colleagues to consider this amendment.

I thank the committee. I usually don't get into other folks' turf, particularly military construction. I deal mostly with transportation in the House, and I understand the difficulty sometimes when other Members come in and try to manage some of the important dollars that are made available. I know the difficult choices that the committee has in trying to assign appropriate dollars, particularly for defense facilities construction.

Again, I won't just take up the House's time in unnecessary conversation, but it is a simple matter. We transfer \$25 million from the NATO security investment account to fund military construction for our National Guard. We have the need across the Nation. It is evident in every State where we have National Guard activities. This isn't a great amount, but I think it can make a significant difference on a number of projects throughout the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would decrease the NATO Security Investment Program by \$25 million and increase the Army National Guard account by \$25 million. We support the Guard and our Reserves wholeheartedly, but I want to join Chairman CULBERSON in some concerns that I have about the amendment.

The MilCon portion of this bill for the most part is flat-funded, and the resources provided in this title were distributed, we believe, in a very judicious manner. The bill funds the Guard account at the budget request level, which makes the needed investments in Guard facilities.

In addition, I am concerned that the offset that the gentleman has chosen could cause shortfalls in the NATO Security Investment Program, which in turn could cause further delays in the NATO Security Construction Program. The Security Investment Program provides support for many of the important operations that we are involved in, including our current operations in Afghanistan. I believe that we have to get the NATO program back on track because it will ultimately save us money in the long run.

□ 1420

While I agree with the spirit of the amendment, I do have some concerns about the gentleman's amendment. I won't oppose it at this time, but I hope that we will be able to work through those concerns as we work through this process and as the bill goes to the Senate and it comes back and we can deal with these concerns in conference.

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

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Florida, our distinguished chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that we need to do everything we can to support our National Guard. I look forward to working with the gentleman in conference.

We will accept the amendment, again, as an expression of our support for making sure that our National Guard and Reserve components have all the support they need. But we'll work with the chairman in conference to see if we can find the best source of funding for this addition plus-up on the National Guard. We, of course, want to make sure that they're not only taken care of in the State of Florida but around the Nation.

I know the chairman shares my concern with border security. The National Guard plays a vital role in helping our Border Patrol agents and in helping all of our law enforcement and Homeland Security folks in securing the border. So we want to make sure those elements of the National Guard's role in securing our Nation's borders are fully funded as well.

So we will accept the amendment at this time.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Thank you.

Again, I want to thank Mr. CULBERSON for his leadership and for his willingness to work with us, both sides of the aisle. Again, if it is necessary to take funds from another account—and we chose NATO in this instance for this amendment—we would welcome any assistance in plussing-up our National Guard facilities and construction accounts.

So, again, thank you so much for your leadership—I know you have difficult choices and I know the people that serve in our National Guard are grateful for your leadership—and also for accepting the amendment at this time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, again, we accept the amendment and move its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or to make a grant to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal or State law within the preceding 24 months.

SEC. 415. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce Executive

Order 13502 (41 U.S.C. 251 note), FAR Rule 2009-005, or any agency memorandum, bulletin, or contracting policy that derives its authority from Executive Order 13502 or FAR Rule 2009-005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, strike lines 16 through 21.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. This is a simple, straightforward amendment.

During the committee markup of the Military Construction bill, under the able leadership of the subcommittee chairman, an amendment was offered by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona to deny funding to the President's Executive order dealing with project labor agreements. The matter was accepted by voice vote. It was accepted by voice vote because, quite frankly, I couldn't rustle up enough votes in the committee to overturn it.

However, this continues a pattern that we've seen in this Congress. I believe we've had on the floor four votes on whether or not Davis-Bacon should be the law of the land. In each one of the cases, the proponents of Davis-Bacon have been successful, the last one garnering 52 Republican votes. This would be the third vote by those who would wish to do away with project labor agreements that will occur on the House floor. In the previous two, again, the proponents of project labor agreements have prevailed. In the last instance, 28 Republicans were, in fact, supportive of project labor agreements.

Mr. Chairman, basically, project labor agreements are those agreements wherein someone who is doing a construction project determines that they want to have an all-encompassing universal agreement that covers the construction from start to finish. If union labor is involved, it denies unions the ability to strike. It denies the contractor the ability to lock out. Wages are set. Terms are set. Conditions are set. And, quite frankly, the project labor agreements have been resounding successes.

As a matter of fact, project labor agreements, 90 percent of them are used by private industry. Some of the biggest users of project labor agreements are the Disney Corporation and, in fact, Walmart. So neither of those companies have ever been sort of identified as big labor-loving organizations.

Now, this is a backdoor piece of language in line 16 to 21 because it doesn't attack project labor agreements. What it does is, if you go back and look in February when President Obama enacted this Executive order, he said: I don't know which is going to be better and which is going to be cheaper, based upon the size of the project, where the project is located, what it is we want to get done.

So funds are appropriated to the agencies. Say it's the Department of Veterans Affairs and they're going to build a new hospital. You say, Department of Veterans Affairs, you study which is going to bring that project in at the best quality, the best price, on time, and giving the taxpayer the best bang for his or her buck.

Well, this amendment strikes that funding. And so it doesn't say you can't use project labor agreements. What it does say is that the agency can't make that comparison. And if you're not making that comparison to find out which is better for the taxpayer, which is in fact going to cause the project to come in at the lowest cost and with the best quality and under time, then it has nothing to do with saving the taxpayer money.

We hear a lot about these are tough times and we have to tighten our belts. I agree with that. I voted for that consistently. But that is just union bashing. This is just saying we don't want to know whether a project labor agreement can develop a project that is cheaper, of better quality, and under time.

Quite frankly, although there are studies on both sides, there is an organization called ABC. They have a study that shows that it adds so much cost. You have a study by organized labor that says it reduces so much cost. I choose not to look at either of those because each of those folks and organizations, quite frankly, have some skin in the fight and have some incentive, if you will, to look at the data one way or another.

I would go with our nonpartisan, bipartisan Congressional Research Service, which last October was asked to study this issue, and they indicated, quite frankly, that the jury is out and, if anything, the data indicates that they really can't say and they can't find any convincing data as to whether or not project labor agreements save money or don't save money, which really is the genius of the President's Executive order because it says you should study it.

Quite frankly, the CRS goes on to indicate that in those areas of the country where there's a lot of organized labor, the project labor agreements tend to bring these projects in on time, under cost, with better quality. In those areas of the country which aren't heavily unionized, the opposite is, in fact, true.

So with the jury being out and all of us wanting to achieve the greatest savings for the taxpayer and build good, quality projects in the military construction account which benefits our men and women in uniform, why would we deny the departments the opportunity to study which way is cheaper, better, more effective, and with a better quality? So there's only one reason. It's to continue this constant drumbeat of: We hate unions. And that's not a good reason to have this language in the bill.

I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. This is a straightforward vote to the House about whether or not we will, on behalf of American taxpayers, vote to impose union collective bargaining requirements on any private company doing business with the Federal Government. The Executive order that our bill does not fund and the amendment attempts to strike, language in our bill which does not fund this Executive order, the Executive order says that “in awarding any contract in connection with a large-scale construction project, the administration may require the use of a project labor agreement.”

□ 1430

A project labor agreement, under the Executive order’s own definition, means a pre-hire collective bargaining agreement with one or more labor organizations. So the Obama administration through this Executive order is attempting to unionize any private company in America that wants to do business with the Federal Government. That’s just an outrage.

Again, in looking at a Wall Street Journal editorial from April 14 of 2010, it reiterates data that is widely available and that has been repeatedly verified: that only about 15 percent of the Nation’s construction workers are unionized. So from now on, under this Executive order, the other 85 percent of America’s construction workers will have to give up the opportunity to work on a Federal project, or not be unionized.

This is just a blatant attempt by the Obama administration to impose union collective bargaining on any private company in America that wants to do business with the Federal Government. If indeed the idea were to reduce the costs, that’s fine. We are in an era of austerity unlike anything this Nation has ever experienced. We confront record debt, record deficit, record public debt held by foreign nations. This is unlike anything we have ever seen before.

As I showed when we debated this bill earlier, just before the break, every single dollar of Federal revenue that comes in the door is already spent on existing social welfare programs. In fact, 104 percent of Federal income is obligated to pay for the existing social safety net. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, veterans’ benefits, and interest on the national debt consume 104 percent of our Nation’s income. Therefore, America is living on borrowed money, and it is our obligation as stewards of the Treasury to ensure that we do not waste any of these precious dollars and that we cut spending everywhere we possibly can so that we do everything within our power to limit the atrocious debt burden that we are pass-

ing on to our children and grandchildren. This is an unacceptable direction the Nation is taking because of uncontrolled spending by previous Congresses.

Why would we voluntarily, knowingly, allow our kids and grandkids to pay, as The Wall Street Journal points out and as the Veterans Administration discovered, and why would we voluntarily pay 12 to 14 percent more for construction contracts? In a study they did, the VA discovered, when they looked at the construction costs for hospitals in three of five markets, the cost of construction would jump by as much as 9 percent. The Beacon Hill Institute at Boston Suffolk University in 2006 said, when you impose these project labor agreements, it will increase school construction costs by 12 to 14 percent. Why would we voluntarily do that?

This amendment must be defeated. This amendment is an effort to prevent Congress from saving precious tax dollars. If this amendment passes, the Obama administration will be able to impose collective bargaining on any private company that wants to do business with the Federal Government. I strongly urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as much as I agree with many of the objectives expressed by the chairman in his discussion just a few moments ago, particularly that we want to make the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars, I think the very arguments that he makes support why we need to have project labor agreements.

This has nothing to do with union or nonunion workforce standards. The project labor agreements do not mandate or predetermine that a workforce has to be union or nonunion. It allows for the project owner, such as the government or a private sector entity, to establish workforce standards that both union and nonunion workers have to meet in order to be hired by contractors and subcontractors under the project labor agreements.

This is a model that increases the efficiency and the quality of construction projects. Of course the ultimate objective is that we will have a workforce that will ensure construction projects are built correctly the first time so that we won’t have cost overruns, so that they are built on time, so that we won’t have to extend the contracts, and so that we won’t have safety problems because of having unskilled workers. Basically, in the awarding of these contracts, these project labor agreements will make sure that the government’s money is spent well. We want to get the most bang for taxpayer bucks. We want to make sure we make the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

There has been study after study after study that illustrates how the use of these project labor agreements does not extend costs to the taxpayers or to other projects—rather, that they often save money. In fact, in most cases, they do save money because, as a result of having a higher skilled workforce, they don’t have to worry about equipment being broken; they don’t have to worry about the waste of resources and materials; they don’t have to worry about the contracts not being performed on time. It’s to the contrary. If you’re worried about protections, project labor agreements will prohibit strikes or work stoppages by any kind of construction workers on the project. They will establish a single procedure for handling workforce disputes.

It is a tool for ensuring that large and complex projects, as many of our government projects are, are completed on time. It allows for the employment of local citizens. And right now, with the unemployment rate as it is and with so many of our skilled workers out of work, it allows for flexibility.

The Executive order, which seems to be the source of the complaint, really does not require that they be used. It gives the government the option of making a decision that is in the best interest of the American taxpayers. Certainly, we want to do everything that we can possibly do to make sure that we come in on budget or under budget, with the highest quality, with the safest work environment, and that we are able to employ the people in our communities to get the job done. As much as we need to improve employment, to increase the number of people who are working, these project labor agreements just add another tool to allow, in the awarding of taxpayer funded contracts, the most efficient use of those dollars. So I join the gentleman in support of this amendment. I think it is well thought out and that it’s a benefit to the taxpayers.

With all due respect to my colleague on the other side who is opposed to this amendment, I think, when it is all said and done, the bottom line is these project labor agreements in this Executive order, while not requiring the use of project labor agreements, will be an added tool in our arsenal to get the most bang for taxpayer bucks to enhance what we do for our country, for our citizens whom we put to work, and to make sure that the conditions and terms of their employment and the work that they do is done with appropriate standards.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my colleague from Ohio for introducing this amendment and, once again, for this dialogue on an important issue.

I will remind my colleague that, although he brings up the fact that this has been decided in the Chamber twice already in other similar circumstances, it's not really the same because, last Friday, of course, we found out that our unemployment rate is rising in the country. It's now 9.1 percent again. We only created 54,000 jobs, not the 200,000 jobs we'd hoped we would create and certainly much fewer than the 150,000 jobs we need to create in order to get back to full employment. That's how many we need to create every month.

What this amendment means, very simply, is that we are going to have to spend 10 to 20 percent more on every single project that ends up in a project labor agreement—and more projects will. If more projects wouldn't, then the advocates wouldn't care about whether we put this provision in. It clearly will result in project labor agreements, so let's review what a project labor agreement does.

First and foremost, it increases the cost 10 to 20 percent on every project. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you or I or people in my congressional district were going to contract to build something around their homes, they wouldn't put a provision in normally that says that we're only going to hire union contractors.

□ 1440

They will go out. They will get the bids. They will go out. They will seek to find out what the reputations of the bidders are, and then they will make the decision based purely on price and quality and value whether or not to make that deal, not whether someone is a member of a union or hires union laborers; but that's what a project labor agreement does.

So let's talk about jobs a little bit. What is our important role here in Congress? Our role in Congress is to try to get our unemployment rate up. Well, if we save 10 to 20 percent on every job, we certainly can do more construction jobs. I just met over lunch with one of the people in my district who is an electrical contractor and he's not unionized, and he asked me to come down here and he said, please, go to the floor today and ask so that those 80 percent, or 7 percent, of us who are contractors who are not unionized can get a piece of that pie so that we don't have to fire our employees.

Mr. Chairman, it's simple. If we can save 10 to 20 percent on every project, we can hire 10 to 20 percent more people to do more projects. And again, the sad fact is our unemployment rate is 9.1 percent. It's going up, not down. The number of new jobs created last month, 54,000, going down, not up. We've got to reverse that, and we've got to do it by being efficient and being smart with our dollars, and one way is to not require project labor agreements.

Finally, let me address the issue of local citizens. I want these contracts to go into the First Congressional Dis-

trict of Maryland; but, Mr. Chairman, I don't have a lot of union contractors in my district. There are a lot of districts that don't have a lot of union contractors. So if we want local contractors to be employed, if we want local citizens to get jobs, our local unemployment rates to go down, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest we defeat this amendment, which will frequently require that in order to qualify for a contract you have to hire out of district. You may have to go to another State. That's not good for anyone, certainly not good for the folks in the First Congressional District of Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio for bringing this issue up, but we do need to revisit this issue because we don't live in the same world we lived in one week ago. We live in a world where the talk of the double-dip recession is sincere and it's serious and our unemployment rate going up, not down; the number of jobs going down, not up. The last thing we should do is to take those hard-earned taxpayer dollars and to use them, and I will say to waste them, in some circumstances, on project labor agreements.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman's amendment would strike the provision in the bill prohibiting the use of project labor agreements on any project funded in this bill. PLAs are a benefit to both employers and unions. They provide uniform wages, benefits, overtime. A PLA sets the terms and conditions of employment for all workers on site, including work conditions and rules. In addition, a PLA prohibits strikes and work stoppages. A PLA provides a single collective bargaining unit which allows for easier management of a project.

Executive order 13502 only encourages executive agencies to consider the use of project labor agreements. There is no requirement to use a PLA. It should be up to the agency and project manager if the use of a PLA is appropriate for their particular project. And I was pleased that the chairman, Mr. CULBERSON, read the language and it says "may," not "shall."

Two weeks ago during the consideration of the FY 2012 Homeland Security appropriations bill, an amendment was offered to prohibit the Department from allowing project labor agreements, and it was defeated. We should support the option on the use of PLAs.

I urge the adoption of the LaTourette amendment.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the distinguished ranking member very much; and, you know, Mr. HARRIS from Mary-

land is a wonderful new Member, and I enjoyed his remarks very much and his passion, and it would be a compelling argument if his facts were correct.

The difficulty is no one on this floor would support project labor agreements if the evidence was that project labor agreements increased the cost of a construction project by 10 to 20 percent. The study cited by Mr. CULBERSON, the chairman of the Subcommittee, by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, concluded that the effect of PLAs on construction costs was strongly influenced by the degree of unionization in an area. In highly unionized cities, the costs of a PLA are less and the project comes in under cost, under time, better quality. And those that don't have, as apparently the First District of Maryland doesn't have as many unions, the evidence does, in fact, come in; in some of those cases costs can increase by 5 to 9 percent, not 10 to 20.

But the problem with this language is, it doesn't condemn project labor agreements. This is an appropriations bill. What this amendment does is deprive the agency of the funds to study in your area—my area happens to be heavily unionized, so Cleveland, Ohio—prevents the VA from studying whether or not use of the PLA would save the government money or cost the government money.

And I've got to tell you, if the conclusion is that it's going to cost the government money, it's like "I Love Lucy" and Ricky Ricardo. I mean, I'm sure that somebody is going to ask the head of that agency, you know, you've got a lot of explaining to do why you went with a program that's going to cost the government more money.

That isn't what this is about. This is union bashing. This isn't costing or saving money. It's just we don't like unions, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment, and I completely agree with him. I don't think there's any evidence that except for some of the people like the Wall Street Journal who say this, I don't see any evidence of it; and as the gentleman says, if there was evidence, Congress would not approve of project labor agreements.

So I, again, rise in strong support of the LaTourette amendment and urge that it be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm here today in opposition to this amendment, and I've heard a lot of the compelling arguments here today as to why this amendment should be adopted.

Well, first, let me remind the Members that the Appropriations Committee passed the language that's in this bill right now that restricts funding from going to projects that require

project labor agreements. That's all this does, and I think we should all be for it. We should all be for free markets. We should all be for capitalism, for the best contractor competing against the best contractor and putting up the best price for the project.

Now, they said that there were reports cited in *The Wall Street Journal*, and I just happen to have what *The Wall Street Journal* cited, and they did cite the independent study that was commissioned by the Department of Veterans Affairs that says in the study, the Obama project labor agreement would likely raise the VA construction costs for hospitals by as much as 9 percent in three of the five markets. So it's clear that there is a study by an independent organization there that says costs will go up.

Now, can we not accept that as evidence enough that we do not need project labor agreements as a mandate to receive the funding for projects throughout this Nation? I mean, we live in a day and a time in which the debt and deficit are out of control, and it seems to be what we spend our arguments about and our debates about is spending, and that's an important topic. But the number one issue facing this Nation right now is the economy and the job losses.

Mr. HARRIS, he was so eloquent as he was talking about unemployment, 9.1 percent now. We all know that. We're here on the celebration of the 1 year since the beginning of the summer of recovery, and yet we don't see any recovery.

These project labor agreement requirements by the executive order were placed in effect in 2009; and as Mr. BISHOP referenced, you know, this was good for jobs, good for creating local jobs. Well, where are the jobs? They do not exist. In essence, we've had 2 years of a failed experiment, Mr. Chairman; and I think it's time to say, you know what, look, the experiment didn't work, let's put it up on the shelf, and let's try something new. Let's go back to what we know works and that's empowering the private sector, empowering the free markets, allow competition to thrive, allow costs to come down and the quality of goods to go up.

I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, when I go home, it pains me to see the new "For Sale" signs that are up, the new "For Rent" signs that go up each and every time, and I'm sure we see it in each and every one of our districts as we go home. And oftentimes previously, 4 or 5 years ago, you might see a vacancy in a shop because they had moved out, because they had expanded their operations and they were moving up. But now it's just the opposite. We know that businesses are not moving out and expanding as much as they once did. Instead, they're shutting down and closing the doors and that "For Rent" or "For Sale" sign goes up.

It's time to reverse that back, and we know how to do that. It is so simple; it is so clear. Why it binds this Congress

up, I have no idea, when our Nation was founded on such great principles as we have been founded on and yet over the years we feel like we can manipulate the marketplaces, just like the project labor agreement requirements are going to do as well.

Mr. Chairman, I say we defeat this amendment, and we think about that 1-year anniversary here of that summer of recovery declaration from last year. And I know there was a lot of hope that that summer of recovery would occur; but the one thing that is true, Mr. Chairman, is you cannot change the facts, and the facts are clear. Americans are ready to be empowered with new jobs and employment. The only way we can do that, though, is to empower the private sector, and let's get government out of the way to do it.

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

□ 1450

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

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the LaTourette amendment. But before I get into the details, I would like to speak to the comments that were just made.

I happen to have the privilege of serving currently on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and I would say to any Member of Congress who would like to know about the thousands of jobs that were, in fact, created and maintained through the American Recovery Act, I would be more than happy to give them a copy of that document. Let me move into, though, the topic that is at hand, which is really the LaTourette amendment, which is not in reference to the American Recovery Act.

I strongly speak in support of this amendment because, one, it protects American jobs; two, it completes projects safely; and, three, it oftentimes saves the taxpayers money. The LaTourette amendment ensures that funds for large-scale construction projects utilize the most cost-effective and efficient process for the awarding of Federal contracts. Section 415 of H.R. 2055 prohibits agencies from being able to use all available methods to ensure that Federal contracts are cost efficient, including the utilization of project labor agreements.

Our ranking member, Mr. DICKS, just recently spoke a few moments ago about section 415, and I will only reiterate two points: One, section 1, subsection (b) says, "Accordingly, it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage executive agencies to consider requiring the use of project labor agreements." Section 3, subsection (a) says, "In awarding any contract, executive agencies may, on a project-by-project basis." And then finally, section 5 says, "This order does not require an executive agency to use a project labor agreement."

So, if we're going to speak on the floor of this House, it's important, if we're going to talk about facts, let's actually say those facts. So this dispels the myth that Executive Order 13502 makes requirements in the awarding of Federal contracts.

Now let's talk a little bit about those project labor agreements.

There is no substantial evidence that says that PLAs decrease the number of bidders on a project or increase the costs of construction projects. In fact, project labor agreements promote cost-effectiveness and efficiency in those construction projects. Having project labor agreements prevents labor disputes; it eliminates project delays and, thereby, helps us to get the projects done.

We can all talk about facts and figures and dates and sections, but I would like to talk about what's happening in my district. I know from firsthand experience that project labor agreements work. In California, we have seen project labor agreements negotiated and implemented with incredible success.

There have been many who have talked about project labor agreements. Here are just a few of the many examples of successful project labor agreements in California:

One, the construction of the L.A. Metro's Blue Line; number two, the expansion and renovation of the Los Angeles World Airports; the recent Middle Harbor Project at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, which are the largest ports in this country; and then, finally, the \$2.2 billion Alameda Corridor Project. That was a project that was completed on time and under budget.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask respectfully that Mr. LATOURETTE's amendment would be found in order and that all of our colleagues will join in support of it.

Finally, I would just like to say, for those who say that PLAs drive up the cost of construction, if they would say that, then we would simply ask: Why is it that Walmart is increasingly using PLAs and Toyota Motor Corporation has built every one of its North American manufacturing facilities under a project labor agreement?

So, when we talk about this, Mr. LATOURETTE has been a leader on this issue. I strongly support his amendment. I stand in lockstep.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. First of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman very much. I want the body to know that Ms. RICHARDSON was going to offer this amendment and, over the weekend, permitted me to offer it as a member of the committee. I appreciate that very much. She is certainly a champion of PLAs.

I want to address the gentleman from Georgia's observations because he is

exactly right, and it doesn't change anything that I said.

The VA said that you should study both PLAs and non-PLAs based upon the area of the country. Now, he is correct. The VA study said that in three of the five that they studied, PLAs would have increased labor costs. It doesn't say anything about the benefit from having increased quality, on time, and all that other business.

But what happened to the other two? In 40 percent of them, the answer is either there was no difference or they reduced costs, which is exactly the point. The amendment strikes out the language inserted in the bill by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) that would prevent an agency from studying which way gets you the bigger bang for the buck. Why would we want to do that?

I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. RICHARDSON. All of us in Congress are looking for ways to rein in the deficit.

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. I strongly support the LaTourette amendment.

PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENT ACTIVITY IN CALIFORNIA 1984 THROUGH MARCH 2010

This is a working list maintained by Kevin Dayton, Government Affairs Director of Associated Builders and Contractors of California. Identification comes from primary documents as well as secondary sources that include web sites, union publications, and newspaper articles. PLAs on private projects are often not publicized, so this list may not include all PLAs imposed on refineries, power plants, industrial facilities, and housing projects.

LARGE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPLEMENTED

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority—Blue Line—1984.

San Joaquin Hills Transportation Corridor—1993.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California—Eastside (Domenigoni) Reservoir Project—1994.

Contra Costa Water District—Los Vaqueros Reservoir Project—Three Components—1994-1995.

Contra Costa Water District—Ralph D. Bollman Water Treatment Plant Upgrade—1995.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California—Inland Feeder Project—1996.

San Francisco International Airport Expansion and Renovation—1996.

U.S. Department of Energy—Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories—National Ignition Facility—1997.

Sacramento Regional Transit District—South Corridor Extension—1998.

Alameda County Transportation Authority—Alameda Corridor Project—1998.

Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Construction Authority—Gold Line—1998.

Los Angeles Department of Public Works—Hyperion Full Secondary Treatment Plant—1998.

Port of Oakland Maritime and Aviation Expansion and Renovation—1999.

Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation District—Seismic Retrofit Phase I—1999.

San Diego County Water Authority—Emergency Storage Project—1999.

Los Angeles World Airports Expansion and Renovation—2000.

Contra Costa Water District—Multi-Purpose Pipeline Project—2000.

Los Angeles Department of Public Works—East Central Interceptor Sewer and North-east Interceptor Sewer—2000.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Pier 400 Phase II—2002.

San Jose International Airport Expansion and Renovation—2002.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California—Capital Program—2003.

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District—Affholder, Inc. (a general contractor) signed for Lower Northwest Interceptor Northern and Southern Sacramento River Tunnel Crossings—2004.

San Diego County Water Authority—Policy to Consider PLAs for Projects Over \$100 Million—2005.

Contra Costa Water District—Brentwood Water Treatment Plant—2005.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Berths 90-91 Cruise Terminal Baggage Handling Building—2006.

Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District—Three contractors signed for Napa River Flood Protection Project—2006.

City of San Francisco—Measure A—Water System Improvement Program (Hetch Hetchy)—2007.

Contra Costa Water District—Alternative Intake Project—2007.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Berth 408 Liquid Bulk Petroleum Terminal—2008.

Port of Long Beach—Middle Harbor Project—2010.

NEGOTIATIONS APPROVED

East Bay Municipal Utility District—Supplemental Water Supply Project—1999.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—All Future Projects on Port Property—2008.

PROPOSED

Temperance Flat Dam—Madera/Fresno Counties—2002.

Contra Costa Water District—Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion—2003.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Berth 93C-94 Boardwalk—2003.

San Francisco International Airport—West Field Cargo Redevelopment Project—2003.

City of Santa Paula—Wastewater Treatment Plant—2008.

City of Long Beach—Airport Expansion—2009.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority—Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension—2009.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

Los Osos Community Services District—Wastewater Project—2003.

San Diego County Water Authority—Twin Oaks Valley Water Treatment Plant—2005.

Palmdale Water District—All Work—2007.

Central Marin Sanitation Agency—Wet Weather Improvement Project—2007.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority—Terminal 2 Expansion—2009.

PROHIBITED BY PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER 13202

Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation District—Seismic Retrofit Phase II—2001.

East Bay Municipal Utility District—Walnut Creek-San Ramon Valley Improvement Project—2001.

Sacramento Regional Transit District—Folsom Line Extension—2001.

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority—Interstate 405 Improvements—2006.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—Highway Improvements to Harry Bridges Boulevard—2010.

MUNICIPAL

IMPLEMENTED

City of Los Angeles—Convention Center—1990.

Contra Costa County—Merrithew Memorial Regional Medical Center—1994.

City of West Sacramento—Palamidessi Bridge—1995.

City of Concord—Police Station—1995.

City of Sacramento—Sump 2 Improvement Project—1998.

City of Concord—Concord Avenue Parking Garage—1999.

Contra Costa County—Family Law Center—2001.

Contra Costa County—All Work Over \$1 Million (revised—original policy never implemented)—2002/2003.

Solano County—Government Center and Parking Garage—2002.

City of San Jose—City Hall/Civic Center—2002.

Contra Costa County—Two Small Renovation Projects in Richmond and Antioch—2002.

Contra Costa County—New Discovery House Facility—2003.

City of San Mateo—New Main Library—2004.

Santa Clara County—Valley Specialty Center Bid Package 2—2004.

City of Carson—All General Contracts over \$125,000, All Specialty Contracts over \$25,000—2005.

City of Santa Cruz—West Coast Santa Cruz Hotel and Conference Center Redevelopment—2005.

Santa Clara County—Gilroy Valley, Fair Oaks, and Milpitas Health Centers; New Crime Lab—2005.

Santa Clara County—Required Staff Analysis of PLA Benefits for Projects Over \$10 Million—2005.

Los Angeles Department of Public Works—New Police Headquarters, Metro Detention Center, Harbor Area Police Station and Jail Facility, Fire Station 64, Hollenback Police Station, Main Street Parking/Motor Transport Division and Aiso Street Parking, Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) Systems—2005-2009.

Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach—2005-06, 2006-07 Site Improvements—2005.

City of San Fernando—All General Contracts over \$150,000, All Specialty Contracts Over \$25,000—2005.

City of San Mateo—New Police Station—2005.

El Camino Hospital District—Measure D—Hospital Bldg. Replacement and Central Utility Plant—2005.

City of Milpitas—New Library, Parking Garage, and Other Midtown Projects—2006.

Solano County—All Work Over \$10 Million (Threshold Increased from \$1 Million Estab. in 2004)—2007.

City of Richmond—Civic Center—2007.

San Joaquin County—New Administration Building—2007.

City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency—All Work—2008.

City of Milpitas—Senior Center—2008.

City of Brentwood—Civic Center—2009.

Solano County—321 Tuolumne Street/Solano Justice Center and 355 Tuolumne Street Renovation—2009.

City of Vallejo—Downtown Parking Garage—2009.

Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District—Future Capital Improvement Projects—2010.

City of Brentwood—Parking Garage—2010.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Corporation Yard—2010

NEGOTIATIONS APPROVED

City of Long Beach—All Work—2005, 2007.

Alameda County Medical Center—Highland Hospital Acute Care Tower Replacement—2008.

Alameda County—All Work—2008.

Santa Barbara County—All Work—2010.

PROPOSED

City of San Diego—New Central Library—1999.
 City of San Jose—Convention Center Expansion—2002.
 City of Union City—Intermodal Station Mixed Use Development Project—2002.
 City of Alhambra—West Main Street Corridor Redevelopment—2005.
 City of South El Monte—All Work—2007.
 City of Los Angeles—All Work—2004, 2008.
 City of San Leandro—All Work—2009.
 Various Projects in Ventura County (Santa Paula, Fillmore, Oxnard, Piru)—2009.
 City of Long Beach—Airport Expansion—2009.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

City of Sacramento—Sewer Maintenance Building—1996.
 City of Pinole—City Hall—1996.
 City of Redding—Civic Center—1998.
 City of Sacramento—All Work—1998.
 City of San Francisco—All Work—1998.
 City of West Hollywood—All Work—1999.
 City of San Diego Convention Center Expansion—1999.
 City of Fresno—All Work—2000.
 Sacramento County—Sacramento International Airport Parking Garage—2000.
 City of Sacramento—Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant Replacement Intake—2000.
 City of Santa Rosa—The Geysers Recharge Project—2000.
 City of Santa Rosa—Downtown Hotel and Convention Center—2000.
 City of West Sacramento—City Hall/Civic Center—2001.
 City of San Diego—SeaWorld Hotel and Expansion—2002.
 City of Cupertino—New Library—2003.
 City of Watsonville—Civic Center—2004.
 City of Gardena—Gardena Transit Facility Project—2006.
 City of Fairfield—All Work—2007.
 Washington Township Health Care District—Measure FF—Central Plant and Hospital Expansion—2007, 2008.
 Imperial County—Green Retrofit Program—2009.

TERMINATED

San Francisco Housing Authority—All Work—1994-2003.
 Orange County—All General Contracts over \$225,000, All Specialty Contracts over \$15,000—2000-2005.
 Solano County—All Work Over \$1 Million (Threshold Increased to \$10 Million on 5/22/07)—2004-2007.

PROHIBITED BY PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER 13202

City of Richmond—Former Ford Motor Assembly Building.
 City of Richmond—Bay Area Rapid Transit Village.
 City of Richmond—Former Port Terminal One.
 City of Vallejo—Downtown Parking Garage (not built during Bush Administration)—2000.
 Orange County—Resurfacing of Santiago Canyon Road.
 Los Angeles County/USC Medical Center Replacement Project—2003.
 San Mateo County Youth Services Center—2004.
 City of Pasadena City Hall Restoration—2004.
 Orange County—Glassell Street Bridge Replacement Project—2004.
 City of Hayward—Water Pollution Control Facility Improvement Project—Phase 1—2005.
 Union City—Union City Intermodal Transit Village—2006.
 Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District—MetroBase Project—2006.

PROHIBITED

City of Fresno—All Work (ordinance)—2000.
 City of Antioch—All Work (sense of the council resolution)—2002.
 Orange County—All Work (ordinance)—2009.
 San Diego County—All Work (ordinance)—2010.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR ABANDONED PROHIBITIONS

Riverside County—All Work (ordinance)—2010.

PROPOSED PROHIBITIONS

City of Chula Vista—All Work (June—2010 ballot initiative for proposed ordinance)—2009.
 City of San Diego—All Work (qualification for Nov. 2010 ballot initiative for charter amendment)—2009.
 City of Oceanside—All Work (June 2010 ballot initiative for new charter)—2009.
 City of Roseville—All Work (proposed June 2010 ballot initiative for proposed charter amendment)—2009.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLEMENTED

Los Angeles Unified School District—Proposition BB, Measure K, Measure R, Measure Q—1999-2009.
 West Contra Costa Unified School District—Measure E, Measure M, Measure D—2000-2005.
 Vallejo City Unified School District—Measure A—2001.
 Los Angeles Community College District—Proposition A—2001.
 Rialto Unified School District—District High School #3—2001.
 San Mateo Community College District—Proposition C—2002.
 San Mateo Union High School District—San Mateo High School Modernization Phases I and II—2002.
 Rancho Santiago Community College District (Orange County)—Measure E—2003.
 East Side Union High School District (San Jose)—Measure G, Measure E—2003, 2008.
 Solano County Community College District—Measure G—Certain Larger Projects—2004.
 Oakland Unified School District—Measure A after February 2004 (adopted by administrator)—2004.
 Peralta Community College District—Vista Campus (Measure E)—2004.
 Hartnell Community College (Salinas)—Measure H—Five Small Contracts—2004.
 Pittsburg Unified School District—All Work Over \$1 Million/Measure E—2005.
 City College of San Francisco—Proposition A after February 2005—2005.
 Albany Unified School District—Measure A—2005.
 Rio Hondo Community College District (Whittier)—Measure A—2005.
 Compton Unified School District—Remainder of Measure I—2005.
 Sacramento City Unified School District—Remainder of Measures E and I—2005.
 San Jose/Evergreen Community College District—2006.
 Mt. Diablo Unified School District—Pilot Project—Prototypical Classrooms 2006 Groups 1 and 2—2006.
 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District—Seven Projects Funded by Measure B—2006.
 San Leandro Unified School District—Measure B—2007.
 Mt. Diablo Unified School District—Certain Projects Over \$2 Million for One Year—2007.
 Foothill-DeAnza Community College District—Measure C—2008.
 College of Marin—Two Large Projects Funded by Measure C—2008.

San Francisco Unified School District—Proposition A (2006)—2008.

Mt. Diablo Unified School District—Classroom Projects and HVAC Work—2008.
 John Swett Unified School District—Measure A—2009.

San Mateo Union High School District—Half of Measure M—2009.

San Diego Unified School District—Proposition S (Original and Revised Versions)—2009.

Alum Rock Union Elementary School District (San Jose)—Measure G—2009.

Fremont Union High School District—All Outdoor Athletic Facilities—2009.

Hayward Unified School District—Measure I—2009.

Peralta Community College District—Berkeley City College Build-Out, Phase 2—2009.

Sacramento City Unified School District—All Projects More Than \$1 Million—Four-Year Renewal—2009.

Riverside Community College District—Remainder of Measure C—2010.

NEGOTIATIONS APPROVED

Alisal Union School District (Salinas)—New High School—Not Built.

Contra Costa Community College District—Measure A (2006)—2006.

Centinela Valley Union High School District (Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Lennox)—Measure CV—2009.

San Gabriel Unified School District—Future Construction—2010.

PROPOSED

West Valley-Mission Community College District—Measure H—2005, 2008.

San Juan Unified School District—Measure C—2005.

New Haven Unified School District—Measure A—2005.

Konocti Unified School District—Measure G—2005.

Allan Hancock Joint Community College District—Future Construction—2005.

Natomas Unified School District—Measure D—2006.

Napa Valley Unified School District—Measure G—2007.

Jefferson Union High School District—Measure N—2007.

Sweetwater Union High School District—Proposition O—2007.

San Diego Community College District—Proposition N—2007.

Alisal Union School District—Measure A (2006)—2008.

Southwestern Community College District (Chula Vista)—Measure R—2010.

San Bernardino City Unified School District—Future Construction—2010.

Pasadena Unified School District—Future Construction 2010.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

San Diego Unified School District—Proposition MM—1999.

Sacramento City Unified School District—Six Summer 2000 School Projects—2000.

Grant Joint Union High School District (Sacramento)—2001.

Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District—2001.

Sonoma County Junior College—Measure A—2002.

John Swett Unified School District (Crockett)—New Elementary School—2002.

University of California at Merced—New Campus—2002.

Ohlone Community College District—Measure A—2002.

Oakland Unified School District—Measure A through February 2004—2002.

Contra Costa County Community College—Measure A (2002)—2002.

Ventura County Community College District—Measure S—2003.

Foothill-DeAnza Community College District—Measure E—2003 (?).

San Jose Unified School District—Measure F—2003.

Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District—Measure C after February 2004—2004.

Berryessa Union School District—2004.

Rialto Unified School District—Measure H—2004.

San Joaquin-Delta Community College District—Measure L—All Work—2004, 2010.

Hartnell Community College (Salinas)—Measure H—CALL Building—2004.

City College of San Francisco—Proposition A through February 2005—2002.

Washington Unified School District—Measure Q—2004.

Cabrillo Community College District (Aptos)—Measure D—2004.

Chino Valley Unified School District—Measure M—2004.

Napa Valley College—Measure N—2004.

Mt. Diablo Unified School District—Summer 2005 School Projects Funded by Measure C—2005.

Sonoma County Junior College—Measure A after May 2005—2005.

San Francisco Unified School District—Proposition A Work at least through January 2007—2004.

San Joaquin-Delta Community College District—Measure L—One Pilot Project in 2007—2005.

Montebello Unified School District—Measure M—2006.

Del Norte Unified School District—New and Modernization Projects—2009.

Mendocino-Lake Community College District—Measure W—2009.

TERMINATED

Santa Ana Unified School District—Measure C—2000-2005.

PROHIBITED BY PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER 13202

East Side Union High School District—Network Upgrades at Three High Schools—2005.

Los Angeles Unified School District—Networking Projects at Various Schools—2001-2005.

MUNICIPAL POWER PLANTS

IMPLEMENTED

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Carson Ice-Gen Plant—1993.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Proctor & Gamble Company Generation Plant—1995.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Campbell Soup Cogeneration Plant—1996.

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power—Valley Generating Station—2001.

City of Santa Clara—Pico Power Project—2003.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—New Cosumnes Power Plant—2003.

City of Burbank Magnolia Power Project—2003.

City of Pasadena Glenarm Power Plant—2003.

City of Vernon/Malburg Generating Station—2003.

Kings River Conservation District (Fresno) Peaker Plant—2004.

City of Roseville—Roseville Energy Park—2004.

Imperial Irrigation District—Niland Gas Turbine Plant—2007.

City of Vernon Power Plant—Cancelled.

City of Palmdale Hybrid Power Plant—2009.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District—Solano Phase 3 Wind Project—2010.

PROPOSED

Kings River Conservation District (Fresno)—Community Power Plant—2007.

Northern California Power Authority—Lodi Power Plant—2008.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED

Modesto Irrigation District Electric Generation Station—Ripon—2004.

Turlock Irrigation District—Walnut Energy Center—2004.

City of Riverside Acorn Peaker—2004.

City of Victorville Solar Hybrid Power Plant—2007.

City of Riverside Energy Resource Center—Units 3 & 4—2008.

PRIVATE PROJECTS

IMPLEMENTED

Alameda 1 and 2 Residential and Commercial Developments, Alameda

Alameda Point Community Partners Housing and Office Development, Alameda

Alexandria Parking Structure, S.F. Redevelopment Agency (Alexandria Real Estate Equities)

ARCO Refinery Project, Carson (Cherne Contracting Corp.)

Ballpark District, East Square Village, San Diego

Buck Center for Research in Aging, Novato Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians Casino (City of Ione, Amador County)—Proposed.

Carson Terminal Expansion Project (Kinder Morgan Energy Partners)—2004.

Chevron El Segundo Refinery Project (Cherne Contracting Corp.)

Chevron Richmond Refinery Upgrade CIM Downtown Redevelopment, San Jose—2002.

Coast Santa Cruz Hotel Renovation—Not Built.

Community Health Systems Downtown Campus, Fresno

ConocoPhillips 66 Refinery Project, Rodeo ConocoPhillips 66 Conversion to Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel, Rodeo—2004.

Cypress Walk Development, Pacifica (The Olson Company)—Proposed.

Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Dry Cask Storage (PG&E)—2006.

Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project (SGT)—2008.

Diablo Grande Golf Development, Patterson

Dixon Downs Racetrack and Development (Magna Entertainment Corp.)—Rejected.

Downtown Vallejo Redevelopment Project East Housing/Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Alameda (Catellus Development Company)—2007.

Equilon Refinery Project, Wilmington (Cherne Contracting Corp.)

Estrada de Santa Barbara

Ethanol Plant, Goshen (Phoenix Bio Industries)—2005.

Ethanol Plant, Madera (Pacific Ethanol)—2005.

Ethanol Plant, Pixley (Calgren Renewable Fuels)—2005.

Ethanol Plant, San Joaquin County/Stockton (Pacific Ethanol)—2006.

Ethanol Plant, Stanislaus County (Cilion)—2006.

Exxon Clean Fuels Project, Benicia

Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria Casino (Sonoma County)—Proposed.

Genentech Phases I and II, Vacaville

The Getty Center, Los Angeles

Kern River Pipeline Expansion (Williams Gas Pipeline/MidAmerican Energy Holdings)

L.A. Live (Anschutz Entertainment Group)—2005.

Lagoon Valley Development, Vacaville (Triad Communities)—Proposed.

Long Beach Memorial Medical Center Expansion—2005.

Lytton Band of Pomo Indians Casino (City of San Pablo)—Proposed.

Marina Hotel Renovation, Los Angeles Harbor (San Pedro Ownership, Inc.)—2005.

Marine World, Vallejo

Mission Bay Project (Catellus Development Company), San Francisco

Motorplex at Yuba County—Not Built.

Myers Development Retail/Commercial, Bay Area

Pacific Bell Park, San Francisco Giants Baseball Stadium

Pacific Commons (Catellus Development Company), Fremont

Pacific L.A. Marine Terminal, Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach, Pier 400—Berth 408—2009.

Park Station Lofts, South San Francisco (James E. Roberts, Obayashi Corporation)—2006.

Petco Park, San Diego Padres Baseball Stadium (cost \$474 million; received \$300 million subsidy from City of San Diego)

Playa Vista Development, Los Angeles

Poseidon Resources Corporation—Carlsbad and Huntington Beach Desalination Plants—Proposed.

Providence Holy Cross Medical Center (Mission Hills) Expansion—2010.

River Islands at Lathrop (Cambay Development Group)—Proposed.

Roman Catholic Diocese of Los Angeles—Cathedral of Our Lady of Los Angeles

San Diego Ballpark Development Project (JMI Realty and Lennar-San Diego Urban Division)—2005.

San Mateo Marriott Addition (Tarsadia Hotels)

Santee Court, Downtown Los Angeles (MJW Investments)—2005.

Shell Clean Fuels Project, Martinez

Sheraton Grand Hotel, Sacramento (received subsidy from City of Sacramento)

Signature Properties Oak to Ninth Street Project, Oakland

616 East Carson Street Project, Carson (Community Dynamics)—required by city council—2009.

655 Broadway, San Diego (Lankford & Associates)

Staples Center, Los Angeles (cost \$375 million; City of Los Angeles borrowed \$38.5 million for it)

Station District Family Housing, Union City (Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition)—2009.

Sutter Health—Sacramento Medical Center Expansion

Taco Bell Discovery Science Center, Santa Ana

Tongva Casino, Compton—Gabrielino-Tongva Tribal Council

Tosco Refinery Upgrade (Bechtel)

Trans Bay Cable Project, Pittsburg (Babcock & Brown Power Operating Partners)—2007.

United Spiral Pipe Manufacturing Plant, Pittsburg—2007.

Uptown Project, Oakland (Forest City)—2006.

Valero Improvement Project—Refinery Upgrade, Benicia

Westfield San Francisco Center (Westfield Corporation and Forest City)—2005.

Westfield Roseville Galleria Expansion—2006.

Wild Goose Storage, Inc. Natural Gas Storage Expansion Project and Pipeline, Butte County—2002.

Yerba Buena Project, San Francisco

PROPOSED

Roman Catholic Diocese of Oakland Cathedral—2000.

Roman Catholic Diocese of San Bernardino—All Work—2002.

Sutter Health—San Francisco, San Mateo, Vallejo Facilities—2002.

Mitsubishi Liquified Natural Gas Terminal—Los Angeles Harbor—2003.

HCA Regional Medical Center San Jose—2003.

San Diego Chargers Football Stadium—2004.

BHP Billiton Cabrillo Port Liquified Natural Gas Deepwater Port (off Ventura County coast)—2004.

Wood Street/West Oakland Train Station Development, Oakland—2005.

Treasure Island, Treasure Island Development Authority, San Francisco—2005.

Chula Vista Bayfront Redevelopment—Gaylord Entertainment Co.—Abandoned.

Tesoro Refinery Coker Upgrade, Martinez—2006.

Anaheim NFL Stadium—2006.

Orange County Great Park—Lennar Corporation—2006.

New Sacramento Kings Arena—Malcof Sports & Entertainment—2006.

MacArthur BART Transit Village Project (receiving subsidy from City of Oakland)—2006.

Grand Avenue Redevelopment Project, Los Angeles—2006.

Target Store, City of Davis—2006.

Universal City Vision Plan (NBC Universal)—2006.

Hunters Point Development, San Francisco (Lennar/BVHP)—2007.

Candlestick Point Development, San Francisco (TopVision)—2007.

La Bahia Hotel, Santa Cruz (1999—King Ventures, 2007—Barry Swenson Builder)—1999, 2007.

Alameda Street Redevelopment between First & Temple Streets, Los Angeles—2007.

Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer County—2007.

Lane Field Development, San Diego (Woodfin Hotels)—2007.

Marriott Convention Hotel at Ballpark Village (JMI Realty)—2007.

Greenbriar, City of Sacramento (AKT Development and Woodside Homes)—2008.

CityWalk in Oakland (The Olsen Company)—2008.

Douglas Park, Long Beach (Boeing Realty Corporation)—2008.

Santa Ana Renaissance Plan—2008.

TrePac Terminal Expansion, Berth 136-147, Port of Los Angeles—2008.

Placer County Developments: Riolo Vineyards, Curry Creek—2008.

City of Roseville Developments: Creekview, Sierra Vista, Placer Ranch, Brookfield—2008.

Sacramento County Development: Cordova Hills/University of Sacramento (Conwy LLC)—2008.

Sutter Health—Elk Grove Facility—2008.

PrimaFuels, Inc. Biofuel Plant, West Sacramento—2008.

Drexel University New West Coast Campus and Related Development, Placer County—2008.

Delta Shores, City of Sacramento (M&H Realty Partners LLC)—2009.

San Leandro Crossings/Cannery Court (BRIDGE Housing) (receiving subsidy from San Leandro)—2009.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED
Raley Field—Sacramento River Cats AAA Baseball Stadium—1999.

Roman Catholic Diocese of Sacramento—Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament Renovations—2002.

Save Mart Center—Fresno State University—2000.

Thunder Valley Casino—United Auburn Indian Community (Placer County)

Casino—Upper Lake Band of Pomo Indians (West Sacramento)—Cancelled.

Bay Street Emeryville, Phase II

Las Lomas (Los Angeles)—Rejected.

Flying J/Big West Refinery Upgrade (Bakersfield)—Cancelled.

Sacramento Railyards Project (Thomas Enterprises)—2007.

Sonoma Mountain Village (Coddling Enterprises)—2009.

Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center Upgrade Phase 1—2010.

PRIVATE POWER PLANTS IMPLEMENTED

The State Building and Construction Trades Council of California claimed on April 30, 2003 that “of the 35 power plants that have been licensed for construction, 34 have signed Project Labor Agreements for their construction.” As of November 1, 2009, the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California claims that since 1999, developers of 57 of the 63 power plants larger than 50 megawatts built in California have signed PLAs.

Blythe, Blythe (Caithness)—Completed.
Colusa, Colusa County (Reliant Energy)—Not Built.

Costa Costa, Antioch (Mirant)—On Hold.
Delta Energy Center, Pittsburg (Calpine/Bechtel)—Completed.

East Altamont Energy Center, Alameda County (Calpine)—On Hold.

Elk Hills, Kern County (Sempra/Occidental)—Completed.

Fourmile Hill Geothermal Project, Siskiyou County (Calpine)

Hanford, Hanford (GWF Power Systems)—Not Built.

High Desert, Victorville (Constellation Power)—Completed.

High Winds Energy Center expansion, Colinsville (Florida Power & Light)

Inland Empire Energy Center, Romoland (Calpine)—On Hold.

Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System (BrightSource Energy/Bechtel)—Proposed.

La Paloma, Kern County (PG&E/NEG)—Completed.

Los Medanos Energy Center, Pittsburg (Calpine)—Completed.

Metcalfe, San Jose (Calpine/Bechtel)—Under Const.

Midway-Sunset, Kern County (Edison)—On Hold.

Morro Bay, San Luis Obispo (Duke Energy)—On Hold.

Moss Landing, Monterey County (Duke Energy)—Completed.

Mountainview, San Bernardino (Edison)—On Hold.

Nueva Azalea, South Gate (Sunlaw)—Not Built.

Orange Grove Energy Peaking Power Plant (J-Power USA Development)—Proposed.

Otay Mesa, San Diego (Calpine)—On Hold.

Palomar, Escondido (Sempra Energy)—Under Const.

Pastoria, Kern County (Calpine)—Under Const.

Rio Linda, Rio Linda (Florida Power & Light)—Not Built.

Russell City, Hayward (Calpine/Bechtel) Calpine/General Electric)—On Hold.

Salton Sea Six Geothermal Plant (CE Obsidian Energy)—Approved.

San Joaquin Valley Energy Center, San Joaquin (Calpine)—On Hold.

Stirling Energy Systems Solar Two Project, Imperial County—Proposed.

Sunrise Cogeneration, Kern County (Texas and Edison Mission)—Completed.

Sutter Power, Yuba City (Calpine)—Completed.

Tesla (Florida Power & Light)—On Hold.
Three Mountain, Burney (Ogden Energy)—On Hold.

Tracy Peaker Project (GWF Energy)—Completed.

United Golden Gate, San Mateo County (El Paso Merchant)—Not Built.

PROPOSED

Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area expansion (Florida Power & Light)

Solar Thermal Power Plant, San Luis Obispo County (Ausra)—Cancelled.

Beacon Solar Energy Project (Florida Power & Light)—Proposed.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED
Huntington Beach Units 3 and 4 (AES)—Completed.

Valero Energy Corporation Cogeneration Unit I—Completed.

Sun Valley Energy Project, Romoland (Edison Mission)—Under Const.

HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

IMPLEMENTED

Bay Area (Kaufman & Broad)
Brentwood (Pulte Homes)—496 houses—2002.

Foster City (Summerhill Construction)—160 houses

Foster City (Webcor Builders)
Half Moon Bay (Ailanto Builders)—145 houses

Hercules (Hercules Victoria and subsequent developers)—Victoria by the Bay—plumbers & elect.

Oakley Magnolia Park Project (Pulte Homes)

Pacifica (Ryland Homes)—43 houses
San Francisco (HMS Gateway Office).

San Francisco (Waterford Associates)—21 houses

San Francisco (Western Pacific)—74 houses
San Francisco (Saddle Mountain Estates)—74 houses

San Francisco (Greystone Homes)—212 units

San Francisco (Parkside Homes Developers)—156 condos

San Pedro—Pointe Vista (Bisno Development Co.)—Proposed.

Vacaville Southtown Project (Western Pacific Housing)—2004.

PROPOSED

Sebastopol (Schellinger Brothers)—157 units—2002.

San Rafael-St. Vincent School for Boys Development (Shappell Industries)—2002.

IMPLEMENTED THEN DECLARED ILLEGAL BY
NLRB

Anatolia-Sacramento County (Sun Ridge)—2714 houses—2002-2004.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE HYBRID PROJECTS

Contra Costa Community College District—San Ramon Valley Center—2004.

This project is covered by the Windemere Development private PLA with U.A. Local 159 Plumbers and Steamfitters Union. The college board of trustees did not vote on this PLA.

Brentwood Union School District (Pulte Homes—Magnolia Park Project)—2004.

This project is covered by the Pulte Homes private PLA with three unions.

West Roseville Specific Plan (Westpark Property)—Roseville City School District—2005.

This development is covered by the Signature Properties private PLA with three unions. The district board of trustees voted to cut language in their documents ratifying the PLA.

Rio School District—RiverPark East Elementary School—2005.

This project was covered by a Shea Homes private PLA.

PROPOSED

City of San Diego Civic Center Complex—2009.

Leading prospective bidder Gerdling Edlen has indicated intent to sign a PLA.

PROPOSED BUT REJECTED OR NOT IMPLEMENTED
Rio School District—RiverPark East Intermediate School—2006.

This project was initially covered by a Shea Homes private PLA.

Solar Project at Fresno Yosemite International Airport—2007.

World Water & Solar Technologies Corp. is building this private project to serve the airport and rental car facilities at the airport.

UNION-ONLY LANGUAGE IN BID SPECIFICATIONS IMPLEMENTED

Capitol Park Safety and Security Improvements—2005.

State Compensation Insurance Fund (State Fund)—Fresno District Office Automation System—2008.

REJECTED

Arvin-Edison Water District—North Canal Spreading Works—1999.

South San Joaquin Irrigation District—South County Water Supply Program Turn-out Facilities—2003.

Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District—MetroBase Project Parking Garage—2005.

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 416. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MEEKS

Mr. MEEKS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to declare as excess to the needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs or otherwise take any action to exchange, trade, auction, transfer, or otherwise dispose of, or reduce the acreage of, Federal land and improvements at the St. Albans campus, consisting of approximately 55 acres of land, with borders near Linden Boulevard on the northwest, 115th Avenue on the west, the Long Island Railroad on the northeast, and Baisley Boulevard on the southeast.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment I have regarding the St. Albans VA Hospital in New York.

First of all, this is clearly a bipartisan bill. I have the support of my good friends PETER KING and MICHAEL GRIMM of New York to stop the enhanced lease process for the St. Albans VA in my district. There is rarely a

time that you have an issue where everybody has come together, and, clearly, here is an issue where members of the community and the veterans have spoken with one voice to say that what is being proposed there is against the best wishes of the veterans and the needs of the veterans and against the wishes of the community, basically changing the whole complexity of the community so that the people that live there would have a terrible injustice and disservice.

Now, I know that the EUL process works in certain areas because part of it is supposed to be where the EUL process works with the community and veterans and everybody agreeing and working together. That is not the case in this scenario.

In this scenario, we have veterans from all over—in fact, we have the Queens County Council of VFWs. We have the Vietnam Vets of America. We have the New York Vets Advocacy Group. We have the Department of New York District 1 VFW, United Council for Veterans Rights, Nassau County VFW, Vets Helping Vets, Inc., all of whom are supportive of this amendment saying that this is not in the best interests of veterans.

The VA has come up with the idea of putting together a facility that doesn't even include a full-service hospital and is not based upon the number of vets that we have coming back from Afghanistan and Iraq. Now, they have put everything on the line for them, and here we have the opportunity to make sure that we do the very best that we can for our veterans. And here the whole community surrounds us, and we want what the veterans want. We want to stand behind them in 100 percent lockstep. And it seems as though, to some at the VA, there is a deaf ear in regard to that.

So we will continue to fight. And what this bill says is that we will stop the EUL process in New York at the St. Albans facility because it is not what is needed. It is not what the vets want. It just seems to me that, instead of working with the community, the VA has chosen to go out and do a high-density residential area, residential building in this facility that is not even just for veterans, which will then have a devastating impact on the local community.

So we're saying no, that shouldn't happen. You can't destroy the very fabric of a great community, and you can't produce something that does not benefit the very vets that we're supposed to be here to help.

So, Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment regarding the St. Albans VA Hospital. I urge that we support our veterans who are absolutely united on this matter.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We will accept Mr. MEEKS' amendment because it's vitally important that all Federal agencies, the VA included, understand that the Member of Congress representing that district, he's their voice.

I represent Houston, Texas. I'm proud to do so. I have an obligation, obviously, to look after the entire Nation. But first and foremost, I am the Representative of the people of District Seven in Houston, Texas, as Mr. MEEKS is the Representative of his constituents in New York. And I think it's vitally important that every Federal agency understand that they need to work with and earn the support of the Representative of that district before they move forward with a major project of any kind.

And as Mr. MEEKS has said, the community is opposed to the direction the VA is taking. And I would join with my friend, Mr. BISHOP. And we strongly support the VA looking to the private sector to partner with the private sector to find innovative, cost-effective ways of providing better services to our veterans by partnering with the private sector.

And certainly, the committee does not want to discourage in any way the VA's expansion of private partnerships to give better service to veterans. We encourage it. We want the VA to look for ways to save money, to provide better service to our veterans, to use the extraordinary expertise of hospitals and medical communities like the Texas Medical Center, which I represent. The work that Mr. BISHOP is doing with Fort Benning and the VA in his district has created a marvelous partnership with private physicians to provide better services. We want the VA to continue that effort.

But it is absolutely essential that the VA understand that they have to earn the support and approval of the community. That means they have to earn the support and approval of the Representative for that district. And in this instance, I hope the VA is tuned in and listening. The VA needs to earn the support and approval of Congressman MEEKS before they move forward with this effort.

So for that reason, we will accept the amendment. And I want to know that the VA is not only returning Mr. MEEKS' phone calls, but they are listening to, responding to, and satisfying the needs of the community, the needs of his constituents, the needs of the veterans that he represents; and that the VA, once they have earned the support of the community, they are going to have the support of Mr. MEEKS. And when Mr. MEEKS comes to the subcommittee and says that the VA has earned his support, the community has earned his support, then the committee will be prepared to move forward and support the VA work at St. Albans.

So for those reasons, we will accept the amendment. And I am looking forward to the day when Mr. MEEKS comes

and tells us the VA is in his office and earning his support and the support of the community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Meeks amendment, which not only affects his district, but affects at least 11 congressional districts that surround his district, all in support of our veterans and fighting men and women who have returned from wars overseas, some of them severely injured and in need of our care, concern, and support at this very moment.

For 7 years now, the Department of Veterans Affairs has pursued a perhaps well-intentioned but a stubbornly wrongheaded plan for the St. Albans Primary and Extended Care facility which is located in the county of Queens. I am very concerned that the VA is proceeding full speed ahead with its plans to lease a property for 34 years, property currently dedicated exclusively for veterans. And what are the veterans supposed to do for the next 75 years without this facility, when there is a rising demand among our veterans for medical services?

The justification—you have to hear this—the justification for the VA's decision stems from an absurd outdated report that relied on data from 2003, 8 years ago, when we were only at the beginning of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have, unfortunately, seen tremendous increases in veterans homelessness, foreclosures, divorce, substance abuse, PTSD and, yes, suicides.

And yet the VA report from all those years ago projected at that time, almost a decade ago, that mental health services for our veterans was going to decrease over the next 20 years. It's been 8 years since that report. And what have we seen during the 8 years alone? And there's 12 years more to go. We've seen increases in all of these problems among our veterans. And yet they cling stubbornly to the data in that report, thinking that these things are going to go down among our veterans. And this, everybody knows, is certainly not going to be the case.

All evidence suggests that returning veterans are going to require a greater significant increase especially in VA mental health services. A Rand Center report alone found that already 18.5 percent of all U.S. servicemembers who have returned already from Afghanistan and Iraq currently suffer from PTSD or depression, and that 19.5 percent suffer from traumatic brain injury.

Where is the Veterans Administration's common sense? To give away this property, which is intended and secured right now for our veterans, is a huge mistake, based on a report that is already discredited by the facts. This is

something that we can't allow to continue.

These are veterans who have sacrificed so much. We have to stand here today on the floor. And I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, colleagues in the majority especially, for seeing through the politics of this and understanding that these are our veterans that we are fighting for; that we, as Members of Congress, understand our constituencies and our needs and their needs.

I want to personally thank Representatives GRIMM and KING, who are among our delegation, as well as the rest of the Democratic members of the delegation in our region, and thank Representative MEEKS for his dynamic and great leadership in bringing this to our attention so that we could stand together as patriotic Americans all, at least on this issue, and fight for the needs of our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to administer or enforce the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, popularly known as the "Davis-Bacon Act."

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

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, the Davis-Bacon Act requires nearly all Federal construction contracts to pay a prevailing wage determined by the Department of Labor. Under the law, construction contractors and subcontractors may not pay their own workers wages lower than the department's pay rate, even if the workers bargain for a wage below the government-set rate.

My amendment blocks application of Davis-Bacon to the Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs appropriations bill. There are two main reasons why the House should block Davis-Bacon.

First, Davis-Bacon wastes taxpayer dollars on overpriced contracts. A recent study showed that, on average, nationwide, the government-set rate is 22 percent higher than the true market rate. For example, if sheet metal workers in Long Island, New York, are paid \$28.79 per hour, while the government-set rate for that area is \$45.40, factoring in the cost of materials and other supplies, studies suggest that the Federal Government overpays for construction contracts by between 10 percent and 15 percent.

Second, Davis-Bacon gives an unfair advantage to union employees. Small businesses, many of which are non-union, lower their prices to compete against larger union firms. The trade-off for nonunion employees is a lower-wage rate but more work. We should not disadvantage nonunion employees who are willing to perform more construction for less money. By eliminating government-mandated wages, we can better allocate resources, increase efficiency, and put hardworking Americans back on the job.

Providing for our national defense and the care of our veterans are critical priorities. Construction projects in the appropriations bill include VA facilities, family housing, schools and infrastructure for our National Guard troops stationed on the border. We owe it to our constituents to stretch every taxpayer dollar and spend wisely.

Blocking Davis-Bacon's application to military construction and VA projects will honor our commitment to fiscal responsibility and to our veterans. Let's let competition determine wages, not the Federal Government. Please support my amendment to block Davis-Bacon.

□ 1510

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for bringing this important amendment. I strongly support this amendment and urge the House to adopt the gentleman's amendment because it will save, again, our children and grandchildren a significant amount of money.

We are in an era of austerity unlike anything America has ever experienced. We are living on borrowed money. Every dollar the Federal Government brings in goes right out the back door to pay for the existing social safety net. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the national debt and veterans' benefits consume 104 percent of America's revenue. Therefore, all the money we appropriate for the entire year for military construction, for the VA, for transportation, for homeland security, for the Defense Department, all of it, is borrowed. Therefore, we need to do everything we can to cut, to save money, to eliminate fraud, waste and abuse and to avoid spending more money than we should.

Here, very straightforward, the gentleman's amendment would save American taxpayers a significant amount of money. It depends on what study you're looking at, but my very capable staff has looked at this and analyzed a whole variety of studies that indicate that there's a whole range of savings. The Chamber of Commerce believes that Davis-Bacon, or paying union prevailing wages in, for example, a free market environment like in Texas, we don't pay prevailing wage. We in Texas on a highway project pay the competitive free market wage.

First of all, not only are we going to save money, but why would we discourage competition? Why, in this terrible

economy, would we prevent contractors, businesses, from coming in and competing for a job?

As on the last amendment, the LaTourette amendment, which I hope the House defeats, that amendment we need to defeat so that we could encourage companies to come in and compete for Federal contracts, this amendment needs to be adopted to encourage businesses to come in and compete for Federal contracts. This would expand the universe of companies that could compete and apply for work. As in Texas, for example, on a highway project, we pay the competitive, best price for bids, and in the Chamber of Commerce's opinion, if we eliminate the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage, it would save about 15 percent on average on project construction. The Cato Institute estimates a 10 percent savings.

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

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you very much.

If I could, Mr. Chairman, point out that the Heritage Foundation estimates that there will be a 22 percent savings to taxpayers by eliminating the Davis-Bacon requirement. The Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University in Boston estimates a 10 percent savings.

This whole variety of savings, if you line them up, for example, we'll just say, for the sake of argument, that there is about a 10 percent savings in construction costs, we as a Nation living on borrowed money should not voluntarily, willingly pay 10 percent more. It makes no sense.

The gentleman's amendment is extraordinarily important. It will save taxpayers a significant amount of money on every construction project. On average, you're going to wind up saving, under the gentleman's amendment, about 10 percent. Ten percent goes a long way on a lot of these massive construction projects. The gentleman's amendment is vitally important in this economy. The adoption of the gentleman's amendment will increase the number of jobs available for people to work on Federal projects. The gentleman's amendment will create jobs and save money for taxpayers. In an era of record debt, record deficit, and record burden that we simply cannot pass on to our kids, it is vitally important that the House approve the gentleman's amendment, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Davis-Bacon Act is a pretty simple concept, and it's a fair concept.

What it does is to protect the government as well as the workers in carrying out the policy of paying decent wages for government contracts.

I noticed that the previous speaker was really concerned about the possibility that Davis-Bacon would raise the cost of the performance of these contracts, but it only requires that prevailing wages in the area where the contract is going to be performed is maintained. For example, if in some of the urban areas where labor costs are very, very high and the prevailing wages are there, the standard of living and the wage payment for that area would be consistent. If it was in a lower wage area, then Davis-Bacon wages would be the wages that were paid in that market. So basically it just allows the workers to be paid at a rate consistent with where the project is being conducted.

The act requires that every construction contract that the Federal Government participates in in excess of \$2,000 has to have this provision defining the minimum wage. It was taken up by this House just a few days ago, and, of course, three times this House has defeated attempts to repeal this Davis-Bacon requirement. It would appear to me that this House has exercised great wisdom three times in this session in preserving the right of workers to earn the wages that are paid in the area where the project is being constructed. That just makes sense. We want our workers to be paid fairly. We don't want the government to overpay. So we won't pay higher wages in an area where prevailing wages are lower. We won't pay lower wages in an area where the prevailing wages are higher, where the cost of living is higher, where the cost of doing business is higher, where the cost of doing the construction would be higher. We want the government to get the best bang for the buck.

These amendments are probably very well-intentioned. We want to save the taxpayers' dollars, but we cannot and we should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish. The repeal of Davis-Bacon, I think, and I think that this House has stated on at least three occasions on this floor during this session of Congress, would be pound-foolish.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I join the gentleman from Georgia in opposing this amendment and associate myself with his remarks.

The Federal Government is in a different position from a private company having construction done, for two reasons: First, one of the greatest social problems we face in this country is the eroding wages of middle class families. We see that even in times when there are sufficient jobs, the average American doesn't make any more on an inflation-adjusted basis than a decade or

two decades ago. The Federal Government should not play a role in pushing down people out of the middle class. We have a social responsibility to work to a return to what used to be the American norm, and that is that each generation does better than the last.

But the second, even from a crudely proprietary position, the Federal Government is in a very different position than a private homeowner, private property owner. I know I was tempted the last time we fixed our home, maybe I should go with the slipshod, cheap-skate company. After all, I'm only going to live there a few more years. Even many private owners, they're only going to own the building for a few years.

So many of us in our daily lives use government-constructed projects from the 1930s. When the government builds something, it is normally going to be owned and operated by the government and used by our citizens for many, many decades. Why do we want slipshod construction? Why do we want those who are not looking to have skilled craftsmen and craftswomen but, rather, are looking to slap it up there in the cheapest possible way?

□ 1520

Our public works need to be built by those with the proper construction skills; it's not a matter of just hiring as many hands as you can as cheaply as possible.

And so I support the gentleman from Georgia and his comments, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Some in the minority continue to try to repeal Davis-Bacon, despite the House being on record supporting the protection of labor standards.

Two weeks ago, the full committee voted to strip the anti-Davis-Bacon provision that was added by the chairman of the subcommittee. A similar amendment repealing Davis-Bacon was offered during the consideration of the FY 2012 Homeland Security appropriations bill. It failed on a vote of 183-234.

I have been a longtime supporter of Davis-Bacon's prevailing wage requirements. It helps ensure that local projects provide local jobs with affordable middle class wages. The law protects the government from contractors trying to win Federal contracts by bidding too low to attract competent workers. I strongly oppose this amendment.

I point out, if there is a problem here, it's because we do not do the wage surveys on a continuing and consistent basis. That is a real problem. That rests with the Department of Labor, and we need to make sure that they're doing their part of the equation.

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

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that the Davis-Bacon Act prevents competition for construction contracts from artificially depressing local labor standards. The Davis-Bacon Act will prevent subverting the prevailing wage laws, which will lead to shoddy construction and substantial cost overruns.

Under the prevailing wage laws, contractors are forced to compete on the basis of who can best train, best equip, and best manage a construction crew, not on the basis of who can assemble the cheapest, most exploitable workforce, either locally or through importing labor from outside.

The Davis-Bacon Act does not require a union wage; it requires prevailing wage based upon surveys of wages and benefits that are actually paid to various job classifications of construction workers, such as iron workers in a community, without regard to whether they belong to a union or not.

According to the Department of Labor, a whopping 72 percent of prevailing wage rates issued in 2000 were based upon nonunion wage rates. A union wage prevails only if the Department of Labor survey determines that the local union wage is paid to more than 50 percent of the workers in that job classification.

Now higher wages and skills result in greater productivity and lower cost. It's so much greater among high-wage, high-skill workers that projects that use high-skilled workers and high-paid workers often cost less than those that use the low-wage, low-skilled workers due to repairs, revisions, and lengthy delays.

The opponents who claim that the government could save billions by eliminating the Davis-Bacon protections ignore the productivity, quality, safety, community development and other economic benefits which contribute to the real cost effectiveness of Davis-Bacon. A study of 10 States where nearly half of all of the highway and bridge work is done in the United States showed that when high-wage workers were paid double the wage of low-wage workers, they built 74.4 more miles of roadbed and 32.8 more miles of bridges for \$557 million less.

Driving wages down will not help balance the budget. The Davis-Bacon Act will improve our local economies and it will result in increased productivity.

I am convinced that, again, we have people with good intentions that want to save us money, but if you pay cheaper wages, you will have to employ less skilled workers. If you hire less skilled workers, they will, in all likelihood, have to have work redone that will have to be repaired. It will extend the

cost, it will extend the time, and ultimately it will cost our taxpayers more money, and we will not get the efficiencies that each and every tax dollar should have because they are hard-earned tax dollars, and our taxpayers don't give them up lightly. But when we do pay our taxes, everybody in this body and across this country wants to make sure that we get the best bang for the buck. Davis-Bacon would give us that result. It has proven that. The studies show that.

I would submit that this amendment is ill-advised and should be defeated.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. May the Clerk read the amendment?

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I had the Clerk read the amendment because it's a simple one-sentence amendment. It says that none of the money in this act can be used deliberately by the President to violate the law, in particular, the War Powers resolution, often referred to as the War Powers Act, which is found in title 50 of the United States Code.

This is the same amendment I offered to the Homeland Security appropriations bill. Some 208 Members of Congress voted for that amendment. The only argument against the amendment at that time was that it wasn't exactly appropriate or relevant to the Homeland Security bill. After all, I was preventing the funding of violation of the War Powers Act with the funds provided to the Department of Homeland Security.

Now that I offer this amendment to the MilCon bill, it is relevant. This is a bill that provides tens of billions of dollars for the Defense Department. And it is necessary and appropriate, if

we are going to adopt a policy that says that money is not going to be appropriated for deliberate violation of our law, that we apply this amendment not only to the Defense Appropriations bill, but to this second bill that funds the Pentagon.

Why is this amendment necessary? Because so many administrations have embraced the idea of an imperial Presidency, the idea that a President can send our forces into battle for unlimited duration, for any purpose, unlimited in scope. This is not what the Constitution and the law provides.

The War Powers Act is the law of the land, and it says the President may indeed commit our forces, but the President must seek congressional authorization and must withdraw within 60 days if that authorization is not provided by the affirmative vote of both Houses of Congress.

In Libya, we face not an attack on the United States, not an attack on our allies. But even in this circumstance, this President, like others, claims that he does not have to follow the law.

□ 1530

The administration has implied that there are substitutes for congressional authorization; they have implied that resolutions by the United Nations, the Arab League or NATO can be a substitute for congressional authorization; and they implied that consulting congressional leaders, a lunch with leadership, is a substitute for the affirmative vote of both Houses of Congress. It is time for us to stand up and say, No, Mr. President, you actually have to follow the law.

Obviously, this amendment is even more apropos to the Defense appropriations bill, but we will be dealing with that weeks from now. The President has been violating the War Powers Act for many weeks. It is time to act today.

Moreover, if we put this amendment only on the Defense appropriations bill and don't put it on this bill, then we invite the administration to try to figure out clever accounting ways to use the billions of dollars provided to the Defense Department in this bill to carry out operations in Libya. We should not invite a loophole hunt. We should put the same restriction on both of the bills that fund the Defense Department.

Now, if we can pass the amendment, the President will, I hope, request an authorization from Congress to take action in Libya, and he will have to accept an authorization that will, I expect, be limited in time and scope. Perhaps it will say that only air forces and not ground forces can be committed. Perhaps it will require renewal every 3 or 6 months. There may be conditions on funding sources. For example, perhaps we use some of the \$33 billion that Qadhafi was stupid enough to leave invested in the United States in ways that we could find and that we have frozen rather than use taxpayer dollars.

Congress will ask some tough questions. And we may put some conditions requiring certain action also by the Benghazi transitional government. We would ask why the Benghazi government has refused to disassociate itself from the al Qaeda fighters and the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group men who are in their midst and why they will not remove from that transitional government those that have American blood on their hands from Iraq and Afghanistan.

This is not just the issue of an aggrandizing President. It is also the issue of a derelict Congress. Continuing military action in Libya should be conducted only consistent with American law. If Congress habitually appropriates funds knowing that those funds will be used to violate the law of the land, then we are complicit in undermining democracy and the rule of law in the United States. The question is not democracy and the rule of law in Libya; the question is democracy and the rule of law in the United States.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I will happily accept it, because it is evident that the administration is in direct violation of the War Powers Act, which requires the President to either certify to the Congress that the United States has been attacked or there is a national security interest of the United States at stake, and, if not, then we need to be notified. I think we are still waiting for the administration to talk to us, to justify, to explain the involvement of U.S. forces in Libya. Now we read over the weekend that the administration may send U.S. forces, our young men and women, into harm's way in Yemen. What are we going to do, Syria next?

The Congress of the United States has an obligation to make sure that, in the stewardship of our precious tax dollars and the responsibility we have to ensure the protection of our men and women in uniform and the people of this Nation, that we are enforcing the War Powers Act, that we are directly involved as a partner in the defense of the United States.

The administration has persistently and consistently refused to involve the Congress in these decisions to send our men and women into Libya and whether or not we are going to go into Yemen. Mr. SHERMAN's amendment is very reasonable and points out that, simply, we are not going to spend any money in violation of the law, we are not going to spend any money in violation of the War Powers Resolution.

The distinguished Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House is unable to speak, but I have to say that Mr. McCLINTOCK's editorial, the positions that the gentleman from Cali-

ornia has taken, I agree with completely.

The action in Libya, as Mr. McCLINTOCK has said, there could not be a more clear violation of the War Powers Act than the President's involvement of American Armed Forces in Libya. The Congress has never been notified. There has been obviously no attack on the United States. There is no strategic interest of the United States at stake in Libya or in Yemen. Where else is he going to send our troops without notifying the Congress and the people of the United States as required by the War Powers Act?

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I want to rise in support of Mr. TOM McCLINTOCK of California's eloquent defense of the War Powers Act, and I urge the House to adopt Mr. SHERMAN's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for a project or program named for an individual serving as a Senator in the United States Senate or as the President of the United States.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, at the start of this Congress, the House made important changes to the way the institution operates. We began by ending earmarks. Americans understood that the practice favored Representatives' pet projects while the taxpayer was left to foot the bill. Earmarks diverted our constituents' hard-earned money to low-priority projects and, even worse, appeared corrupt. Americans started to lose confidence in their government when they saw their Representatives using public funds for personal gain.

In a similar vein, this Congress continued last Congress' prohibition on "monuments to me." Like earmarks, when House Members name Federal programs and buildings after themselves, Americans can't be sure wheth-

er the programs are funded because they are worthwhile or because they benefit a House Member personally.

The appropriations bill we are considering today has a prohibition on "monuments to me" that mirrors the House rules and bans naming programs and buildings after current House Members. My amendment extends that same prohibition to current Senators and the President.

Ending "monuments to me" is an important step to preventing the waste of taxpayer dollars and to ensuring that our appropriations are in the best interests of the public, not the personal interests of elected representatives. I ask you to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

I certainly agree with the gentleman's sentiment. It is important that we as Members of Congress don't spend any money to name anything after ourselves. It is inappropriate. It just ought not be done.

I know that my colleague from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) has also been working on this to prevent the use of taxpayer funds from being spent on monuments built at taxpayer expense to Members of Congress that are still living. This rule is in place for the House of Representatives. It ought to be in place for the Senate and the President of the United States.

POINT OF ORDER

Unfortunately, the gentleman's amendment imposes a duty on Federal agencies in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI, so I regret reluctantly I have to raise a point of order against the gentleman's amendment in that it proposes to change existing law, Mr. Chairman, and therefore constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI, and that the amendment seeks to impose additional duties on a Federal agency or entity.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the relevant executive branch official of the current membership of a body in the legislative branch. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

□ 1540

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. 4 ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and

Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is quite simple. During the 110th Congress there was a section added to the Energy Independence and Security Act that bans Federal agencies from entering into contracts for procurement of alternative fuel sources unless the “lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions” are less than or equal to such emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. This amendment would simply prohibit the government from enforcing this ban on Federal agencies funded by the underlying bill.

I was not yet in Congress when the Energy Independence and Security Act was considered, but section 526 raises concerns over national security, economic security, and it creates bureaucratic uncertainty. Section 526 was added to this bill to stifle the Defense Department’s plans to buy and develop coal-based—or “coal-to-liquids”—jet fuels. Environmentalists allege that this coal-based fuel will ultimately produce more greenhouse emissions than would traditional petroleum resources. This allegation is uncertain at best and does not account for ongoing improvements in carbon-capture technologies in association with CTL technology.

My amendment prohibits funds in the bill from being used to enforce section 526. Section 526 makes it more difficult for our Defense Department to become energy independent and to rely on more domestic and more stable sources of fuel instead of sources located in more unstable, volatile parts of the world. This is very problematic for our Defense Department by creating uncertainty about what fuels DOD can procure, and it discourages development of new sources, particularly reliable domestic sources of energy supplies for the Armed Forces. Section 526 opens DOD up to court or administrative challenges for every fuel purchase it makes. Per a July 9, 2008, letter to Senator JAMES INHOFE from the Pentagon, “Such a decision could cause significant harm to the readiness of the Armed Forces because these fuels may be widely used and particularly important in certain geographical areas.”

Not only have extreme environmental views, policies, and regulations like section 526 burdened American families, hurt job creation, and hurt American businesses, but they are now potentially causing significant harm to the readiness of the Armed Forces. The Defense Department should not be wasting its time studying fuel emissions and should not have to be stifled by the arguments over how to interpret a small section of an energy law. This is an unacceptable burden to continue to place on our Nation’s military, and it is an unacceptable precedent set in regard to America’s energy policy.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman’s amendment.

The United States is the Saudi Arabia of coal. We’ve been blessed by the good Lord with extraordinary resources. We have, apparently, the world’s largest supply of shale gas, shale oil. Yet the administration is doing everything in their power to prevent us from even finding or locating additional shale oil or gas. The administration is doing everything in their power to prevent us from drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, which we’ve done for decades cleanly, safely, economically.

We could create hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of high-paying jobs in the United States if the administration would simply get out of the way and let Texans run Texas, and let the gulf States and the energy community unleash American ingenuity to do what they do best—produce domestic oil and gas cleanly and safely. The jobs that are produced in the Gulf of Mexico in the energy industry across the United States are safe, high-paying, high-quality jobs that the economy and the people of America desperately need.

Mr. FLORES has brought a very important amendment to the floor which would expand the use of petroleum derived from coal. The United States is blessed with abundant amounts of coal. This Federal law, section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act, discourages the production of liquefied gas or fuel from coal—and that’s a vital part of our energy future. We understand, as constitutional conservatives, as the new majority in the House, that the United States needs to continue to invest in alternative technologies for the future. We are all in support of finding new ways to generate electricity to move the United States into the next era of energy beyond petroleum. But in the meantime, in the short term, we need to drill here and drill now. We need to use every available resource that the good Lord has blessed this Nation with in a way that’s obviously clean, safe, ecologically friendly. We’ve done it in Texas for years.

Mr. FLORES has extensive experience in the energy industry. I’m proud to represent the energy corridor of Texas. Houston is to the energy industry what California and Silicon Valley are to the computer industry. We’ve proven time and time again that we can produce oil and gas safely, cleanly. We desperately need to open up drilling in the gulf. This administration has deliberately and systematically shut down drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, which increases our dependence on foreign oil, while

the administration has used our tax dollars and its influence in the International Monetary Fund to attempt to prop up and support Brazilian exploration for oil and gas, discouraging American development of oil and gas. It’s a policy that continues to drive up the unemployment rate and drive down the production of American oil and gas. Mr. FLORES’ amendment will allow us to expand the production of one vital American resource that we have in abundance—and that’s coal.

So I strongly support the gentleman’s amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise today in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment. Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is intended to ensure that any alternative fuel that is introduced to replace conventional petroleum-based fuels must have greenhouse gas emissions that are less than or equal to the fuel it is replacing. That is a commonsense approach. The Department of Defense alone is the single largest energy consumer in the world. Its leadership in this area is critical to any credible approach to dealing with energy independence issues. Section 526 provides an opportunity for DOD to play a substantial role in spurring the innovation needed to produce alternative fuels which will not further exacerbate global climate change.

I would like to congratulate Secretary Mabus, Secretary of the Navy, for his energetic approach to trying to find alternative fuels. I think he, as Secretary, has done an outstanding job. He has put the Navy on a path towards energy independence and reducing the amount of petroleum products that we’re using today.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this very shortsighted amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. The amendment I’ve offered the past week would simply reduce the information technology account in the VA by \$70 million and increase the same account by \$70 million.

□ 1550

My intention is to make it clear to the Department of Veterans Affairs that we must see progress on efforts to integrate the Department of Defense’s and the VA’s electronic medical records.

It is unthinkable that as we seek to make the transition from the military back to the homeland as seamless as possible we have a system as befuddling as the one we have, where a servicemember literally needs a paper copy

of his or her medical records to ensure information isn't lost in transitioning between the two systems. When severely injured patients are released and transferred from Walter Reed to the VA center at Mountain Home in Johnson City, Tennessee, all the information regarding their injuries and transfers can be terribly difficult to access. That shouldn't be the case.

This is why I support Chairman CULBERSON's report language, which recommends that the Department of Veterans Affairs set aside \$70 million of the overall \$3.25 billion in the Information Technology account for the Virtual Lifetime Electronic Medical Record system. I would, in fact, like to strengthen this language by putting it in the underlying bill to ensure this money gets spent on integration.

The VA and DOD maintain the two largest health care systems in the Nation, providing health care to 6 million veterans and to over 1.5 million active duty servicemembers respectfully. Within the VA alone, there are over 1,500 different facilities that provide care to veterans. To provide this care, the DOD and VA both rely on electronic health record systems to create, maintain, and manage patient health information; but the two agencies for years have operated different systems that can't talk to each other.

Let me give you an example: Ten billion dollars has been spent. A soldier leaves the military, and his records can't be transferred electronically to the VA. I had someone in my office just before I walked over here on the House floor who showed where an electronic medical records system would have prevented the delay in treatment of a veteran.

This general lack of cooperation between the two Departments has occurred for years at the collective cost of billions of dollars. I first became aware of this problem when I arrived in Congress and didn't realize it had been worked on for years.

I applaud the Appropriations Committee for highlighting the need for the VLEER in its committee report, and I think this language should be put in the bill to ensure the VA spends the money for this purpose. A lifetime electronic health records system would improve the delivery of care to servicemembers who are transitioning from military to civilian life.

As a physician myself, I know the importance of having an organized and efficient electronic medical records systems. In fact, I helped put an electronic medical records system in my office for over 70 providers and tens of thousands of patients. I do understand the difficulties, and I know how hard it is to be done, but I know the importance of it. I hope the committee will adopt this amendment and work on strengthening it in the final bill to ensure we make clear to the VA that this integration must be a priority.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. We are trying to vote on the Flores amendment. Could you have waited until we had voted on the amendment to make your 5-minute speech? This is totally irrelevant to this debate.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I apologize to the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN OF COLORADO

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide disability compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to any veteran for post-traumatic stress disorder if the required in-service stressor claimed by the veteran is related to the veteran's fear of hostile military or terrorist activity and the places, types, and circumstances of the veteran's service did not include a combat zone.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I stand with the American people in wanting to make sure that our returning servicemembers from Iraq and Afghanistan are taken care of.

The signature wound in this war has emerged to be post-traumatic stress disorder. Since 2008, almost 100,000 claims for disability based on post-traumatic stress disorder have been awarded at a tremendous cost; but the concern is, again, that these veterans are taken care of. In July of last year, new rules were promulgated as to the eligibility criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder. What they did was to no longer require the servicemembers to relate a specific combat occurrence or occurrences to their post-traumatic stress disorders.

It is my belief that these rules are too loosely written and that what we ought to have is more definition to say that someone who has never served in a combat zone should not be eligible for post-traumatic stress disorder disability benefits—not treatment. Certainly, one would be eligible for treatment, but I understand that this amendment will require the Veterans Administration to create a definition and to make decisions on something they currently don't do, which is: service in a combat zone.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly can appreciate the concerns that the gentleman raises that have caused him to offer the amendment. Yet I want to remind the gentleman of the awful incident that occurred at Fort Hood in Texas. There were a lot of our servicemembers who were present who experienced that awful, awful situation. Under this amendment, it would prevent the veterans and servicemembers, once they're discharged, from being able to take advantage of the benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs because they were at Fort Hood as opposed to Afghanistan or Iraq or in some other place of hostility.

Also, I would remind the gentleman that the servicemembers who operate our unmanned aerial vehicles, such as the Predator, which has great capability for causing destruction in war—it's one of our great weapons—actually can see on video, in realtime, the death and the destruction and the dismemberment that is caused by the utilization of that, although they're in Nevada and the weapon is actually making its impact in Afghanistan. Of course, because of that, they would be disqualified.

Under this amendment, I think the gentleman's point is well taken in wanting to make sure that only those people who are entitled to veterans benefits in fact get them, but I think that perhaps there are some problems in the artful drafting of the amendment, which should be clarified. Because of that, I am reluctant to support it, and of course must oppose this amendment.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Reclaiming my time, the chairman has raised a similar issue. I certainly agree with him and understand about the issue of expanding the definition in this amendment to reflect terrorist activity that would be beyond a combat zone. Again, certainly, treatment would be available. We're not talking about that. We're merely talking about disability compensation. I probably disagree with you, as a combat veteran myself, on the ground side of your UAV example.

I realize that the amendment is out of order because of the fact that it really impedes on authorizing versus appropriating. Certainly, it is my intent—and I'd be happy to work with the gentleman from Georgia as well as with the gentleman from Texas—to come up with a definition that makes sure that we take care of those veterans who are most in need.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Sec. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract using procedures that do not give to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans (as that term is defined in section 3(q)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(3)) that are included in the database under section 8127(f) of title 38, United States Code, any preference available with respect to such contract, except for a preference given to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans (as that term defined in section 3(q)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(2)).

□ 1600

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would level the playing field for our Nation's veterans when it comes to contracting with the Federal Government.

After putting their lives on the line and at times their families and careers on hold in the service of our Nation, America's veterans deserve every consideration we can give them to adjust to life once they return. Veteran-owned small businesses are part of the American fabric; and as a government and a people, we must do all we can to encourage them.

Here are a few facts: According to the most recent census, over 2.4 million of our Nation's veterans are now small business owners. Veteran-owned companies now make up 9 percent of all U.S. firms. The Small Business Administration now estimates that one in seven veterans are self-employed or a small business owner. And, finally, nearly a quarter of veterans say they're interested in starting or in buying a small business.

Despite these encouraging numbers, the truth of the matter is veterans are unemployed at a higher level than any of us find acceptable. For instance, the unemployment rate for young veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq reached a staggering 22 percent last year. Mr. Chairman, this number is simply unacceptable. We must work to reduce this number, and it should be the explicit, stated policy of all government agencies to assist veteran entrepreneurs.

As our Nation struggles to achieve an economic recovery, we should be looking to utilize the talent, expertise, and leadership skills of our Nation's veterans. These men and women volunteered to selflessly serve our country and, in order to succeed, must display self-discipline and leadership. It is characteristics and character traits like these that should be nurtured and fostered to help our economy grow again and put people back to work.

Veterans have served our Nation nobly across the world. Now, their in-

novation and expertise can help lead our American recovery. Ultimately, we must all be focused on putting our constituents back to work, and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will help to do that.

This amendment will give veteran-owned small businesses preferences for contracts in this bill equal to any group eligible for preferred consideration, except for service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses. The practice of the Federal Government providing preferences to encourage government to do business with certain groups is well established. This amendment does not diminish preferences to any other group. It simply extends to veteran-owned small businesses the same level of consideration.

The amendment would apply to all Federal contracts authorized by the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Act and would be attached to any portion of State and local projects funded with Federal dollars.

To preserve the integrity of the program, small businesses are considered those defined by the Small Business Administration, and eligible businesses must be registered veteran-owned businesses with the Department of Veterans Affairs. The VA's Center for Veteran Enterprise maintains a database of certified registered veteran-owned businesses. In many cases, this amendment will simply be codifying existing practice and ensure that it will continue to be the policy of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, veterans have sacrificed much for our Nation. It is only fair that, if any group is given preferential contracting status, that veterans receive it as a well. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to express the committee's strong support for the gentleman's amendment.

We are all in agreement that the Nation needs to look first to attempt to hire our veterans who have served this Nation, to attempt to encourage the businesses that are developed and built by veterans to thrive and to prosper; and the gentleman's amendment is a great way to encourage veteran-owned businesses to thrive.

We should, in the work the Federal Government contracts out, do everything we can to encourage the development of, and hiring of, small businesses owned and operated by veterans; and we strongly support the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Let me just say that the gentleman's amendment is very, very well taken. I fully support it; and it works in tandem with some

other legislation, some authorizing legislation that I think the chairman, Mr. CULBERSON, and I, along with Mr. DICKS and Mr. YOUNG and many, many others, on a bipartisan basis, have often called the Hiring Heroes Act, which basically supports our veterans as they come back to make sure that they can be gainfully employed and that they are duly allowed to participate in the economy, to work and to engage in gainful employment.

I think that this amendment, as far as small businesses go, as far as veterans preferences, is very well taken, and I think that we ought to do that, as well as everything else we can possibly do, to make sure that the transition from full-time active service to the civilian population of our country on the part of our veterans is fully supported by this Congress and by the people of the United States.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. Veteran-owned companies are a great asset that we should be further encouraging. These businesses obviously play a positive role in the economy by providing not only jobs, goods, and services, but also are reducing unemployment amongst veterans who are already struggling with the unemployment rate greater than that of the general populace.

Furthermore, the government has done poorly in reaching its 3 percent contracting goal for veterans. For example, agencies' contract awards were below 1 percent from 2003 to 2006. The most recent figures for 2009 show agencies awarded only 1.98 percent to service-disabled veterans. We must do more to ensure that our veterans are transitioning from soldiers to civilians and we are actively encouraging new opportunities for vets.

I believe this amendment will help the Department of Defense and VA to do better. I support this amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) brought a matter to our attention that is very, very important and significant, and I think it's appropriate that we ought to at least examine that in the form of a

colloquy here on the floor as we consider this Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, many veterans have returned home from Iraq and Afghanistan with severe disabilities; and when their service results in a disability, we have a duty to help them. And one way that veterans receive this help is through the use of guide dogs. Now, the way the process works, veterans are assessed and they're trained for orientation and mobility. If a veteran needs a guide dog, information on how to contact guide dog schools is provided. Essentially, the veteran is referred to a nonprofit. There's no funding provided directly from the VA to these nonprofits; and with the costs associated with training these dogs, it takes time to raise the money which, in turn, causes a backlog for veterans, as well as for nonveterans.

□ 1610

We have to look at this issue and see what it is that the Veterans Administration can do to help because these dogs mean so much to those who need them.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the ranking member yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. BISHOP, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has raised a very important matter that we need to look into in the subcommittee as we move into conference. And I want to reassure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the subcommittee and I will work diligently with him to look further into this issue to find ways that we can help make sure that the veterans who need guide dogs and service dogs get them.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. FATTAH and other Members will be very, very appreciative of you. We thank you for your comments, and we look forward to working with all of our colleagues to support our veterans and their families.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to mention a program called Pets for Patriots. I happened to have attended an event here just about a week ago where there is a national organization being created to get pets for our returning veterans and especially for some of those who have very serious injuries. So I think there is a real need for this, and I think it's been demonstrated. And I commend Mr. FATTAH for his diligence and for your help in raising this issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Thank you very much for your comments.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, 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. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2055.

□ 1832

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. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 61, line 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

The amendment by Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SHERMAN of California.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 203, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—204

Ackerman	Green, Gene	Neal
Altmire	Grimm	Olver
Andrews	Gutierrez	Owens
Baca	Hanabusa	Pallone
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Barrow	Hayworth	Pastor (AZ)
Barton (TX)	Heinrich	Payne
Bass (CA)	Himes	Pelosi
Becerra	Hinchesy	Perlmutter
Berkley	Hinojosa	Peters
Berman	Hirono	Peterson
Biggart	Hochul	Petri
Bishop (GA)	Holden	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Polis
Blumenauer	Honda	Price (NC)
Boswell	Hoyer	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Israel	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Reichert
Capps	Jackson Lee	Reyes
Capuano	(TX)	Richardson
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carney	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roskam
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ross (AR)
Chandler	Keating	Rothman (NJ)
Chu	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Ciilline	Kind	Runyan
Clarke (MI)	King (NY)	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Kissell	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cleaver	Lance	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Langevin	Sarbanes
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Conyers	LaTourette	Schmidt
Cooper	Levin	Schock
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Costello	Lipinski	Schwartz
Courtney	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
Critz	Loeb sack	Scott, David
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Cuellar	Lowrey	Sewell
Cummings	Luján	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Shuler
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Sires
DeFazio	Markey	Smith (NJ)
DeGette	Matheson	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Matsui	Stark
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Diaz-Balart	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCotter	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McDermott	Tierney
Dold	McGovern	Tonko
Donnelly (IN)	McIntyre	Towns
Doyle	McKinley	Turner
Edwards	McNerney	Van Hollen
Ellison	Meeks	Velázquez
Emerson	Michaud	Visclosky
Farr	Miller (NC)	Walsh (IL)
Fattah	Miller, George	Walz (MN)
Filner	Moore	Waters
Frank (MA)	Moran	Watt
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Garamendi	Murphy (PA)	Welch
Gonzalez	Nadler	
Green, Al	Napolitano	

Whitfield
Wilson (FL)

Woolsey
Wu

Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—203

Adams Gerlach
Aderholt Gibbs
Akin Gibson
Alexander Gingrey (GA)
Amash Gohmert
Austria Goodlatte
Bachus Gosar
Barletta Gowdy
Bartlett Granger
Bass (NH) Graves (GA)
Benishek Graves (MO)
Berg Griffin (AR)
Billbray Griffith (VA)
Bilirakis Guinta
Bishop (UT) Guthrie
Black Hall
Blackburn Hanna
Bonner Harper
Bono Mack Harris
Boren Hartzler
Boustany Hastings (WA)
Brooks Heck
Buchanan Hensarling
Bucshon Herger
Buerkle Herrera Beutler
Burgess Huelskamp
Burton (IN) Hultgren
Calvert Hunter
Camp Hurt
Campbell Issa
Canseco Jenkins
Cantor Johnson (OH)
Capito Jones
Carter Jordan
Cassidy Kelly
Chabot Kingston
Chaffetz Kinzinger (IL)
Coble Kline
Coffman (CO) Labrador
Cole Lamborn
Conaway Landry
Cravaack Lankford
Crawford Latham
Crenshaw Latta
Culberson Lewis (CA)
Davis (KY) Long
Denham Lucas
Dent Luetkemeyer
DesJarlais Lummis
Dreier Lungren, Daniel
Duffy E.
Duncan (SC) Mack
Duncan (TN) Manzullo
Ellmers Marchant
Farenthold Marino
Fincher McCarthy (CA)
Fitzpatrick McCaul
Flake McClintock
Fleischmann McHenry
Fleming McKeon
Flores McMorris
Forbes Rodgers
Fortenberry Meehan
Foxy Mica
Franks (AZ) Miller (FL)
Frelinghuysen Miller (MI)
Gallegly Miller, Gary
Gardner Mulvaney
Garrett Myrick

NOT VOTING—25

Bachmann Grijalva
Brady (TX) Higgins
Broun (GA) Huizenga (MI)
Butterfield Johnson, Sam
Cardoza King (IA)
Dingell Lee (CA)
Engel Paul
Eshoo Rokita
Giffords Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 5 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1854

Messrs. BASS of New Hampshire and ROYCE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. MEEKS, CHAN-

DLER, and DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 413, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 232, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

AYES—178

Adams Frelinghuysen
Aderholt Gallegly
Akin Gardner
Amash Garrett
Austria Gibbs
Bachus Gingrey (GA)
Bartlett Gohmert
Barton (TX) Goodlatte
Bass (NH) Gosar
Benishek Gowdy
Berg Granger
Bilirakis Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT) Griffin (AR)
Black Griffith (VA)
Blackburn Guinta
Bonner Guthrie
Bono Mack Harper
Boustany Harris
Brooks Walden
Buchanan Webster
Bucshon West
Buerkle Westmoreland
Burgess Wilson (SC)
Burton (IN) Wittman
Calvert Wolf
Camp Womack
Campbell Woodall
Canseco Yoder
Cantor Issa
Carter Jenkins
Cassidy Johnson (OH)
Chabot Johnson, Sam
Chaffetz Jones
Coble Jordan
Coffman (CO) King (IA)
Conaway Kingston
Crawford Kline
Crenshaw Labrador
Culberson Lamborn
Davis (KY) Landry
Denham Lankford
Dent Latham
DesJarlais Latta
Dreier Lewis (CA)
Duncan (SC) Long
Duncan (TN) Lucas
Ellmers Luetkemeyer
Farenthold Lummis
Fincher Lungren, Daniel
Flake E.
Fleischmann Mack
Fleming Manzullo
Flores Marchant
Forbes Marino
Fortenberry McCarthy (CA)
Foxy McCaul
Franks (AZ) McClintock

Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—232

Ackerman Grijalva
Alexander Grimm
Altmire Gutierrez
Andrews Hall
Baca Hanabusa
Baldwin Hanna
Barletta Hastings (FL)
Barrow Heck
Bass (CA) Heinrich
Becerra Himes
Berkley Hinchey
Berman Hinojosa
Biggert Hirono
Billbray Hochul
Bishop (GA) Holden
Bishop (NY) Holt
Blumenauer Honda
Boren Hoyer
Boswell Hultgren
Brady (PA) Inslee
Bralley (IA) Israel
Brown (FL) Jackson (IL)
Capito Jackson Lee
Capps (TX)
Capuano Johnson (GA)
Carnahan Johnson (IL)
Carney Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN) Kaptur
Castor (FL) Keating
Chandler Kelly
Chu Kildee
Cicilline Kind
Clarke (MI) King (NY)
Clarke (NY) Kinzinger (IL)
Clay Kissell
Cleaver Kucinich
Clyburn Lance
Cohen Langevin
Cole Larsen (WA)
Connolly (VA) Larson (CT)
Conyers LaTourette
Cooper Levin
Costa Lewis (GA)
Costello Lipinski
Courtney LoBiondo
Cravaack Loeback
Critz Lofgren, Zoe
Crowley Lowey
Cuellar Lujan
Cummings Lynch
Davis (CA) Maloney
Davis (IL) Markey
DeFazio Matheson
DeGette Matsui
DeLauro McCarthy (NY)
Deutch McCollum
Diaz-Balart McCotter
Dicks McDerrott
Doggett McGovern
Dold McKinley
Donnelly (IN) McNeerney
Doyle Meehan
Duffy Meeks
Edwards Michaud
Ellison Miller (MI)
Emerson Miller (NC)
Fattah Miller, George
Filner Moore
Fitzpatrick Moran
Frank (MA) Murphy (CT)
Fudge Murphy (PA)
Garamendi Nadler
Gerlach Napolitano
Gibson Neal
Gonzalez Olver
Graves (MO) Owens
Green, Al Pallone
Green, Gene Pascrell

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann Farr
Brady (TX) Giffords
Broun (GA) Higgins
Butterfield Lee (CA)
Cardoza Paul
Dingell Rokita
Engel Shimkus
Eshoo Shuster

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1900

Messrs. VISCLOSKY, CUMMINGS, and CARNAHAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 414 the Amash amendment on H.R. 2055, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 414, the Amash amendment, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BACA was allowed to speak out of order.)

CHARITABLE GOLF TOURNAMENT

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today we had an event, and it was on behalf of the wounded warriors, sponsored by Disabled Sports USA. These are many of our men and women who are fighting for us, have come back, and we appreciate everything that they’ve done for us.

On behalf of ANDER CRENSHAW, my co-captain on the Republican side, and myself, we want to thank all of the Members who participated, both Members and former Members, and all of the sponsors and individuals involved. It was a tournament for a good cause.

There were no losers. The winners were the wounded warriors and the disabled sports vets who will get an opportunity to revamp their lives, enjoy golf.

This was a match between the Republicans and the Democrats. And I know that last year the Republicans won and retained the cup then, but today, the Democrats ended up winning and retaining the cup.

On behalf of all the Democrats here and the players who participated, thank you very much.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida, ANDER CRENSHAW, my co-captain.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let the record reflect that’s a small trophy that you just held up. But I certainly want to congratulate the Democratic team. It was a great day to make some friends among the serving Members. It was great to see some of the former Members come back and visit with them. As has been pointed out, the real winners were the wounded warriors and the organizations that work every day to help them rebuild their lives.

I want to again congratulate the Democratic team members and thank everybody for their involvement. It was a wonderful day.

Mr. BACA. Thank you very much. With that, it says Speaker’s Trophy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 163, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

AYES—248

Adams	Fleischmann	Lofgren, Zoe
Akin	Fleming	Lowey
Amash	Flores	Luján
Andrews	Forbes	Lummis
Austria	Foxx	Lynch
Baca	Frank (MA)	Mack
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Maloney
Baldwin	Fudge	Manzullo
Bartlett	Gallegly	Markey
Barton (TX)	Garamendi	McClintock
Bass (CA)	Garrett	McCollum
Bass (NH)	Gerlach	McDermott
Becerra	Gibbs	McGovern
Benishek	Gibson	McIntyre
Berg	Gingrey (GA)	McNerney
Bilirakis	Gohmert	Michaud
Bishop (GA)	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Gosar	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	Miller (NC)
Boswell	Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary
Braley (IA)	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Brooks	Griffith (VA)	Moore
Buchanan	Grijalva	Mulvaney
Bucshon	Guinta	Myrick
Buerkle	Guthrie	Nadler
Burgess	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Burton (IN)	Hall	Neal
Camp	Hanabusa	Nugent
Campbell	Hanna	Olver
Capuano	Harris	Pallone
Carnahan	Hartzler	Pastor (AZ)
Cassidy	Hastings (FL)	Paulsen
Chabot	Heinrich	Payne
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Pearce
Chu	Herger	Peters
Cicilline	Herrera Beutler	Petri
Clarke (MI)	Hinchev	Pingree (ME)
Clarke (NY)	Hinojosa	Pitts
Clay	Hirono	Platts
Coble	Holt	Poe (TX)
Coffman (CO)	Honda	Pompeo
Cohen	Huelskamp	Posey
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Coleman (VA)	Hurt	Quayle
Conyers	Inslee	Quigley
Costello	Issa	Rangel
Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)	Reichert
Culberson	Jackson Lee	Renacci
Cummings	(TX)	Ribble
Davis (IL)	Jenkins	Richardson
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Rigell
DeFazio	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Denham	Jones	Rohrabacher
Dent	Jordan	Rooney
Doggett	Kaptur	Ross (FL)
Dold	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Doyle	Kildee	Royce
Duffy	Kind	Rush
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Ryan (OH)
Duncan (TN)	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Edwards	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda
Ellison	Labrador	T.
Emerson	Landry	Sanchez, Loretta
Farenthold	Langevin	Sarbanes
Farr	Larsen (WA)	Scalise
Fattah	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Filner	Latham	Schmidt
Fincher	Lewis (GA)	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Scott (SC)
Flake	Loeb	Scott (VA)

Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stutzman
 Sutton
 Tierney
 Tipton

Tonko
 Towns
 Turner
 Upton
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Webster
 Welch

West
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOES—163

Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Barletta
 Barrow
 Berkley
 Berman
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boren
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Calvert
 Canseco
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Castor (FL)
 Chandler
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Conaway
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Critz
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Davis (CA)
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dicks
 Donnelly (IN)
 Dreier
 Eillers
 Fortenberry
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Gonzalez
 Granger

Graves (MO)
 Green, Al
 Griffin (AR)
 Grimm
 Harper
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Himes
 Hochul
 Holden
 Hoyer
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Israel
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kissell
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lipinski
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Mica
 Moran
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (PA)

Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pascrell
 Pelosi
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Peterson
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Richmond
 Rivera
 Roby
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Rothman (NJ)
 Runyan
 Ruppberger
 Schiff
 Schilling
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Van Hollen
 Walz (MN)
 Wilson (FL)
 Womack
 Woodall

NOT VOTING—21

Bachmann
 Brady (TX)
 Broun (GA)
 Butterfield
 Cardoza
 Dingell
 Engel
 Eshoo

Giffords
 Higgins
 Lee (CA)
 Paul
 Rokita
 Shimkus
 Slaughter
 Speier

Stivers
 Tsongas
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Weiner
 Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1907

Ms. MCCOLLUM changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the last three lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012”.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, 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. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 288, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 288, the question is on retaining the title of the bill beginning on page 25, line 14 relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The question is, Shall that title be retained?

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—409

Ackerman Bilirakis Cantor
 Adams Bishop (GA) Capito
 Aderholt Bishop (NY) Capps
 Akin Bishop (UT) Capuano
 Alexander Black Carnahan
 Altmire Blackburn Carney
 Amash Blumenauer Carson (IN)
 Andrews Bonner Carter
 Austria Bono Mack Cassidy
 Baca Boren Castor (FL)
 Bachus Boswell Chabot
 Baldwin Boustany Chaffetz
 Barletta Brady (PA) Chandler
 Barrow Braley (IA) Chu
 Bartlett Brooks Cicilline
 Barton (TX) Brown (FL) Clarke (MI)
 Bass (CA) Buchanan Clarke (NY)
 Bass (NH) Bucshon Clay
 Becerra Buerkle Cleaver
 Benishek Burgess Clyburn
 Berg Burton (IN) Coble
 Berkley Calvert Coffman (CO)
 Berman Camp Cohen
 Biggert Campbell Cole
 Bilbray Canseco Conaway

Connolly (VA) Honda Neal
 Conyers Hoyer Neugebauer
 Cooper Huelskamp Noem
 Costa Huizenga (MI) Nugent
 Costello Hultgren Nunes
 Courtney Hunter Nunnelee
 Cravaack Hurt Olson
 Crawford Inslee Olver
 Crenshaw Israel Owens
 Critz Issa Palazzo
 Crowley Jackson (IL) Pallone
 Cuellar Jackson Lee Pascrell
 Culberson (TX) Pastor (AZ)
 Cummings Jenkins Paulsen
 Davis (CA) Johnson (GA) Payne
 Davis (IL) Johnson (IL) Pearce
 Davis (KY) Johnson (OH) Pelosi
 DeFazio Johnson, E. B. Pence
 DeGette Johnson, Sam Perlmutter
 DeLauro Jones Peters
 Denham Jordan Peterson
 Dent Kaptur Petri
 DesJarlais Keating Pingree (ME)
 Deutch Kelly Pitts
 Diaz-Balart Kildee Platts
 Dicks Kind Poe (TX)
 Doggett King (IA) Polis
 Dold King (NY) Pompeo
 Donnelly (IN) Kingston Posey
 Doyle Kinzinger (IL) Price (GA)
 Dreier Kissell Price (NC)
 Duffy Kline Quayle
 Duncan (SC) Kucinich Quigley
 Duncan (TN) Labrador Rahall
 Edwards Lamborn Rangel
 Ellison Lance Reed
 Ellmers Landry Rehberg
 Emerson Langevin Reichert
 Farenthold Lankford Renacci
 Farr Larsen (WA) Reyes
 Fattah Larson (CT) Ribble
 Finler Latham Richardson
 Fincher LaTourette Richmond
 Fitzpatrick Latta Rigell
 Flake Levin Rivera
 Fleischmann Lewis (CA) Roby
 Fleming Lipinski Roe (TN)
 Flores LoBiondo Rogers (AL)
 Forbes Loeb sack Rogers (KY)
 Fortenberry Lofgren, Zoe Rogers (MI)
 Foxx Long Rohrabacher
 Frank (MA) Lowey Rooney
 Franks (AZ) Lucas Ros-Lehtinen
 Frelinghuysen Luetkemeyer Roskam
 Fudge Luján Ross (AR)
 Gallegly Lummis Ross (FL)
 Garamendi Lungren, Daniel Rothman (NJ)
 Gardner E. Roybal-Allard
 Garrett Lynch Royce
 Gerlach Mack Runyan
 Gibbs Maloney Ruppelberger
 Gibson Manzullo Rush
 Gingrey (GA) Marchant Ryan (OH)
 Gohmert Marino Ryan (WI)
 Gonzalez Markey Sanchez, Linda
 Goodlatte Matheson T.
 Gosar Matsui Sanchez, Loretta
 Gowdy McCarthy (CA) Sarbanes
 Granger McCarthy (NY) Scalise
 Graves (GA) McCaul Schakowsky
 Graves (MO) McClintock Schiff
 Green, Al McCollum Schilling
 Green, Gene McCotter Schmidt
 Griffin (AR) McDermott Schock
 Grijalva McGovern Schrader
 Grimm McHenry Schwartz
 Guinta McIntyre Schweikert
 Guthrie McKeon Scott (SC)
 Gutierrez McKinley Scott (VA)
 Hall McMorris Scott, Austin
 Hanabusa Rodgers Scott, David
 Hanna McNehey Sensenbrenner
 Harper Meehan Serrano
 Harris Meeks Sessions
 Hartzler Mica Sewell
 Hastings (FL) Michaud Sherman
 Hastings (WA) Miller (FL) Shuler
 Hayworth Miller (MI) Shuster
 Heck Miller (NC) Simpson
 Heinrich Miller, Gary Sires
 Hensarling Miller, George Smith (NE)
 Herrera Beutler Moore Smith (NJ)
 Himes Moran Smith (TX)
 Hinchey Mulvaney Smith (WA)
 Hinojosa Murphy (CT) Southerland
 Hirono Murphy (PA) Stark
 Hochul Myrick Stearns
 Holden Nadler Stutzman
 Holt Napolitano Sullivan

Sutton Velázquez Wilson (FL)
 Terry Visclosky Wilson (SC)
 Thompson (CA) Walberg Wittman
 Thompson (MS) Walden Wolf
 Thompson (PA) Walsh (IL) Womack
 Thornberry Walz (MN) Woodall
 Tiberi Waters Woolsey
 Tierney Watt Wu
 Tipton Waxman Yarmuth
 Tonko Webster Yoder
 Towns Welch Young (AK)
 Turner West Young (FL)
 Upton Westmoreland Young (IN)
 Van Hollen Whitfield

NOES—1

Griffith (VA)

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann Giffords Slaughter
 Brady (TX) Herger Speier
 Broun (GA) Higgins Stivers
 Butterfield Lee (CA) Tsongas
 Cardoza Lewis (GA) Wasserman
 Dingell Paul Schultz
 Engel Rokita Weiner
 Eshoo Shimkus

□ 1926

So the question was decided in the affirmative, and title II of the bill was retained.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my votes this evening. Had I been present to cast my votes, I would have voted “yes” on the amendment offered by Mr. LATOURETTE and “yes” on the amendment offered by Mr. SHERMAN. I would have voted “no” on the amendment offered by Mr. AMASH, and finally I would have voted “yes” on retaining title II, the Department of Veterans Affairs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business and missed rollcall vote Nos. 413, 414, 415 and 416. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote No. 413, “nay” on rollcall No. 414, “aye” on rollcall vote No. 415 and “aye” on rollcall vote No. 416. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the permanent RECORD immediately following this vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2055 is postponed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2112, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-103) on the resolution (H.

Res. 300) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

POLITICAL IED IN IRAQ

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Iraq with other Members to see our military, we further met with Prime Minister Maliki. We discussed the killing of the 35 freedom-seeking Iranian dissidents at Camp Ashraf by Iraqi authorities. The United States has turned over the protection of these people who oppose Iranian dictator Ahmadinejad to Iraq. The Prime Minister's candid position was that the dissidents were responsible for their own deaths and the Iraqi Government was not to be blamed for their recent demise.

Upon requesting that we wished to visit the camp to hear from the people who actually saw what happened, you would have thought a political IED had gone off. The Prime Minister curtly rejected that request. In an effort to fairly get at the truth, the statements from the ones actually present at the homicides was important. It is disturbing that the Prime Minister refused us access to the Iranian dissidents he promised the United States he would protect.

What does the Iraqi Government have to hide? Maybe the truth. Meanwhile, 35 innocent people are dead and hundreds of others are wounded by this new "free" democracy in Iraq.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING DALLAS MAVERICKS ON WINNING 2011 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Dallas Mavericks on winning the 2011 National Basketball Association Championship. This is the organization's first NBA world championship title, and I congratulate the team owner, Mark Cuban, Coach Rick Car-

lisle, his staff, and the entire Mavericks organization on this great accomplishment. I also congratulate the team's captain, Dirk Nowitzki, on being named the recipient of the NBA Finals Most Valuable Player Award, so much deserved.

The Mavericks also display a strong commitment to the Dallas community through its foundation. The Dallas Mavericks Foundation is dedicated to inspiring and motivating our youth to take their education seriously and to strive for healthy bodies and minds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating each member of the 2011 NBA Championship Dallas Mavericks for their very many victories, but their very first championship, the champions of our community.

□ 1930

CREATING JOBS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to some of my friends here. We are going to spend some time talking tonight about the difficulty this country is having in terms of unemployment and job creation. We have got a big challenge ahead of us, and the Republicans here in the House have a lot of good ideas about how we can get this economy going, how we can take the regulatory burden off of small businesses, how we can reform the Tax Code for individuals and for businesses so we can be competitive.

I would like to yield to my friend from Illinois, ADAM KINZINGER.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing some pretty tough times in our country. I remember the days when we had very low unemployment, and if you wanted a job you had multiple offers when you got out of college, and everybody needed you and the economy was thriving. And now we are creeping back up in the unemployment.

I remember when we passed an \$800 billion spending package out of the House of Representatives—\$800 billion—and we were told that if we pass this spending package, unemployment will not exceed 8 percent, and we approached 10 percent. Thankfully, unemployment began to go down, but now it is stalled out, and it is beginning to go up again.

What we have is this idea of we need to spend, we need to borrow, and we need to tax our way to prosperity. And what does that do? Well, I will tell you what it does. It raises our taxes, and it just piles burdens on our children and grandchildren—and us. Yes, we all care about our children and grandchildren,

but even this generation now is swimming in debt.

Think about this: If you combine the cost of the war in Iraq and the cost of the war in Afghanistan, you combine them this year, do you realize that is less expensive than what we are paying just in interest on our national debt? Just in interest. And that is going to continue to grow. As we add more and more debt, that interest is going to continue to get bigger and bigger. And do you know what? We have another year of deficits, so the interest is bigger, and we have another year, so the interest is bigger.

Meanwhile, the job creators, the people who really get this economy rolling, the people who we are going to rely on to take individuals who are unemployed and take them from recipients of tax dollars—where they don't want to be—to taxpayers, the small business owners and these factory owners that we want to get manufacturing back, they are the ones that have to say, look, I have to invest for 10 and 15 and 20 years in the future, and all I see is a future of debt, doubt, and despair.

I think my colleagues will agree with me when I say that we live in the greatest country in the world, and I think they will agree with me when I say there is absolutely no reason, there is no reason that Americans should begin to accept the fact that we are in decline.

America doesn't have to be a nation in decline. America is a world leader, and we can retain our position as the world leader, but it is not going to be through what is done in government. It is not going to be by passing more regulations. It is not going to be by passing more taxation. It is not going to be by more and more rules and redtape. No. It is going to be done by restoring that entrepreneurial spirit that made our country so great in the first place.

I remember as a kid watching cowboy movies and seeing the old West and how America built the country that we have today, and learning about the Industrial Revolution and learning about those folks that worked long hours to make what we have, and being very proud of what I saw, every moment. But we began to accept that is no longer in our DNA. Ladies and gentleman, that is not true. That is in our DNA. That is who we are.

We can recover from this massive debt we are seeing, and we can do it easily. Well, we have got to cut spending, but we have got to get people back to work.

My home State of Illinois, the President's home State of Illinois, is a shining example of what not to do to create jobs. In Illinois, we just increased the individual tax rate. Well, that was probably not overly brilliant, because now people are leaving Illinois at an even faster rate than they were prior.

But then we did something especially crazy—we increased the corporate tax rate in Illinois. So now you have our neighbors in Indiana that are really

having a field day with businesses coming over to them. You have our friends in Texas and in the South, like my friend from Arkansas, that are begging folks to come over and bring their businesses from Illinois. In fact, *The Wall Street Journal* just came out with an article that said while Illinois has raised \$300 million in receipts from this tax increase, they have given away \$240 million just to keep businesses there that were leaving because of the tax increase. Then we even contemplate in these halls increasing taxes on job creators again.

Debt, doubt, and despair and big bloated bureaucracy is in our future right now. It doesn't need to be. Our future is the future of the America that when you remember your parents and grandparents working hard, that is what we are going to be again.

The situation we are in is not fun. The situation we are in right now is very difficult. It is going to take a lot of hard work. It is going to take tough proposals. We put forward a budget plan to begin to get us out of the deficit and balance the budget. But you know what we got from the other side of the aisle, as my colleagues can attest to, is just demonization. No, not an alternative that we can take our budget and their budget and try to come up and meet in the middle somewhere, which the American people want. They want both sides to talk and come to a conclusion. But we didn't get that. We got television commercials. We got attempts to frighten senior citizens. We got politics as usual.

I don't think it is any doubt if you are watching, I am a young guy. I can tell you that the generation today believes in an America that I believe in. We see people go overseas all the time to Iraq and Afghanistan and defend freedom and stand for what they believe in. And do you know what? Some of these people going overseas today were 8 years old when 9/11 happened, but they know what we represent.

I will not accept second place. My colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle will not accept an America in decline, because we will maintain our position as the greatest country in the world. But, ladies and gentlemen, to do that, we have got to make tough decisions. It can't be about the next election anymore. It has got to be about the next generation. It can't be about 2012. It has got to be somewhat about 2011—right now.

So I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for organizing this opportunity to just talk to the American people and say, look, we want to get people back to work, but you can't spend, you can't tax, and you can't borrow your way to prosperity. Never accept second best. We will continue to maintain our role as the greatest country in the world, and I kind of like being in that position.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

I hear a lot of folks who talk about the problem that we have economi-

cally, the debt problem, all of the many things that we have been trying to address here in the House, and I hear them say, well, if we can just get to where we need to be after the next Presidential election, after the next President, whoever that President is, after that President is sworn in in January of 2013, if we can just get to that point in time, then we can really address the problems.

□ 1940

That scares me because I don't think we can wait anywhere near that long. In fact, I think we are already living on borrowed time in terms of the crisis that this country is facing. We know for a fact President Clinton appointed a Medicare commission over a decade ago, a bipartisan Medicare commission.

Why did he do that? He did it because we had a problem then. We had a problem then in 1998, and we still have that problem now. We have a problem with the insolvency of Medicare. We have a problem with rising health care costs. We have a problem with our debt and the deficits that we run year after year after year. We have a problem with too much regulation—too much government regulation—which stifles job creation. We have a problem with our Tax Code. If you're talking about our business Tax Code and business taxes, we have a problem there. Why? Because it's hard to compete with other countries when you've got the highest corporate tax rate in the world.

It's not about whether you like big business or small business. It's about job creators. And our Tax Code discourages job creation. If you're talking about individual income tax, we've got a problem there, too. We've got one of the most complicated Tax Codes.

So what have we done about it here in the House? Well, on all of these counts we have acted. We have acted. And we've been passing legislation that addresses the jobs issue, our spending issue, Medicare, the Tax Code, over-regulation. This is what we've been doing day in and day out since we got here.

And I would like to yield to some of my friends. Before I do, I would just like to say this: we're the only one with a plan. Where's the Senate's plan? Where's the President's plan?

So as we discuss here tonight, I just ask us all to think about where is the other plan that we can compare ours to. There's not one. In fact, a former Democratic National Committee chair who's running for Senate now in Virginia, Tim Kaine, said today, It's a pretty bad deal when the Senate hasn't even passed a budget. The U.S. Senate doesn't have a plan. The President doesn't have a plan. This House has a plan. And we're working hard every day to execute it and implement it.

I would like to yield now to the gentlelady from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you. I appreciate my friend's work here on the floor.

I just came back from a week in my home district in southwest Washington. It's a tremendous place. It's where I grew up. Some of my fondest memories are in and around southwest Washington, whether it was lakes or rivers or streams or working my first job at the Vancouver Mall. It's not even called the Vancouver Mall anymore. I had a lot of opportunities—a lot of opportunities that I am very worried the next generation of Washingtonians are not going to have. And let me tell you why. Our unemployment has been over double digits going on 3 years now.

Let me read this to you because this is important. These aren't just empty numbers. These represent families and lives: Clark County, 10.2 percent; Cowlitz County, 11.9 percent; Lewis County, 13.2 percent; Pacific County, 12.5 percent; Wahkiakum, 11.8 percent; Skamania, 12.9 percent; and Thurston County is at 8 percent.

Let me compare those numbers quickly. I'm not happy about 8 percent. I'm not happy about 13 percent. But there's a slight difference in the reason that the Thurston County numbers are lower than the other counties, and that's because that's where the State government is housed.

So there are more government jobs, more public sector jobs in that area. But the rest of the district and even in Thurston County is based on small businesses. These are the hearts and souls of our economy. Small business owners, entrepreneurs, mom-and-pop shops.

I got to tour Somarakis Vacuum Pumps. He is an engineer that started a small little company. Built it up. He's passing it on to his son. He's now expanded into two counties. He has a vision to grow and hire people. In fact, he has been able to stay afloat these last few years because a lot of the trade that he's done, he deals with other corporations and other countries across the world, which is one of the reasons he's been able to remain competitive.

You know what he told me this last week when I was home and I was touring his new facility? He said, JAIME—I wish I could give you his Greek accent, but I can't—he said, JAIME, I'm a proud American. I built this company because I believe in the entrepreneurial spirit of America. I believe in this country. But you in Washington, D.C.—and he's speaking to the governing class here—are making it harder for me to function. You're making it harder for me to survive: the unpredictability, the high taxes, the new energy proposals, some of which the President has supported.

He said, JAIME, if that cap-and-trade bill went into effect or if you increase my energy taxes through the EPA, I will be out of business. I will not be able to hire the next generation of engineers and pass this company on.

And other small businesses around our whole region and around our Nation are saying the same thing: can

you give us some predictability, quit raising our taxes, get the EPA off our backs. We all want to protect our way of life, but what's happening right now is small business owners, the job creators, are being squeezed. And why?

I was reflecting on, it's true, neither the Senate nor the President has put forward a really strong governing jobs agenda this year. When we got to meet with the President a couple of weeks ago, he pointed to some of the bills that they passed last year, and some of the plans. If I reflect on the \$700 billion-plus bailout or the \$800 billion stimulus or the health care bill that was over a trillion dollars, one would think if we spent that kind of money, we would have the jobs to show for it.

But where are the jobs? I just read you the unemployment numbers for southwest Washington State. They have actually not gone up in tremendous rise. So, clearly, borrowing and spending more has, at the very least, a negligible effect. We can do better. We have to do better. The way we do that—stop bailing out big corporations, banks, auto dealers. Right? Stop spending more money.

Fast fact: I had some job creators in my office a couple of weeks ago, and they were asking for more investment. And I asked them about the stimulus—the \$800 billion stimulus bill that the President and the Democrats here voted on and passed last year—how much that had actually stimulated job creation. You know what they told me? Less than 3 percent of that number actually went to build roads. Remember the shovel-ready hurrah that was talked about? We're passing this because we're going to build infrastructure. I'm one of those who believes infrastructure is important. Less than 3.5 percent was actually used to build roads.

Where is the rest of that money? My goodness, we borrowed almost half of that. We're going to pass the interest and the debt on to the next generation, and yet we didn't even use it on what we said we were going to use it on. That tells me that we're spending too much, we're borrowing too much. It's time to cut back.

Every family in southwest Washington and across this Nation has cut their own budget back in recent years. Every small business owner, job creators, they will tell you—I have several in my area who haven't even taken a paycheck in several years in order that they not lay anyone else off. And they're looking at us, saying, Why can't you live within your means? Well, guess what? We're going to. Not only are we going to make sensible cuts and reductions, we're also going to stimulate job growth.

Energy was one of the things I mentioned. In the last couple of months we have passed off this House floor several bills that allow us to drill for energy here in America, using American entrepreneurialism, American innovation, and creating American jobs. I call

on our Senate to pass those bills and the President to sign them into law. They're saying thousands and thousands of jobs could be created here in America if we simply take advantage of the resources in our backyards. That will do several things. It will drive down the cost of gas, which is going to hit every family and every small business here in the next several months. That's one immediate step we can take, in addition to cutting back over-spending. That's a jobs production bill.

□ 1950

We could also make sure that we allow for some predictability. With these Federal regulations that are coming out, small business owners call me regularly, and say, Good grief. I just barely get one rule under order, and you're sending me five new ones. I can't keep up.

Here is the difference. Small businesses, small business owners, they can't just hire someone who is not being productive and just dedicate that person's time to going through Federal regulations. Maybe a big corporation could, one which can retain lots of lobbyists or lawyers; but at the True Value Hardware on Main Street in Ridgefield, both the owners actually work the store, so they can't just waste money to jump through government regulations and government hoops. It has got to stop.

Last year, the EPA released 900 new regulations—900. Do you know what the EPA acting director for the water department told us on the Transportation Committee just 2 or 3 months ago? She basically said she didn't have to take into account any of those regulations and their impact on our economy. That wasn't her concern. I'm sorry. Since when does the government put forward regulations and rules and then say, "We don't have any concern for what that's going to do to the economy"? That's why we're in the mess we're in now.

We can change it. We can take some steps to bring oversight to these regulatory agencies. Man, they're just going crazy. We're going to work to streamline those, and we're going to do it now because House Republicans believe and understand that job creators and job growth occur in the private sector when individuals and entrepreneurs have the freedom to grow and to develop, not when they're hampered, not when their wrists are tied, not when they're told, You have to jump through these hoops just to sell your product or just to hire someone. It has got to stop, which is why we're putting forward and why House Republicans are proud to put forward bills that are either going to pull back some of these regulations or streamline them, reform them or allow for more American job growth here in the United States.

So I appreciate that, and I look forward to hearing what my other colleagues have to say about this pro-growth agenda.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you.

Before I yield to my colleagues, I would like to just go through the plan that the House Republicans have put together that certainly includes addressing the debt, that certainly includes addressing our spending. It's a plan that we believe will help get us on the right fiscal path and help this country—the private sector—create jobs. There is much, much more to what we're trying to do here in the House to encourage private sector job creation, and I'd like to run through some of those.

As I indicated, certainly we need to deal with the debt. That's why we talk about reforming Medicare and saving Medicare for those on it and saving it for the next generation. We talk about that a lot because that directly relates to our debt, and we have to get our debt under control if we're going to have the type of job growth that we are accustomed to in this country: job growth based on technological advancement and innovation. So dealing with the debt is a critical component of encouraging private sector job creation.

Yet there are other parts to our plan, which include increasing energy development, maximizing energy production. We have passed numerous bills here in the House that will encourage drilling in the gulf and that will encourage drilling offshore so that we can create more jobs in energy production and become energy independent. It's not just a jobs issue. It's a national security issue.

There is also the issue of the Tax Code that I referred to earlier. We can't be competitive in this country if we don't reform the way we tax individuals and the way we tax businesses. Ultimately, when businesses decide to land somewhere, they look and they ask, Is that where I want to do business? Unfortunately, we have created an environment in this country that runs business off. We want businesses to look around the world and say, The United States is where I want to create jobs. That's the only place for me. In order to do that, we've got to make sure that we have rules in place that encourage private sector job creation.

I'd now like to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for organizing tonight's conversation with the American people about what our plan for job creation is all about and how we're going to, once again, restore the greatness of this country by getting America back to work, by creating an economy for job creators.

The gentlelady from Washington reminded me of my visits throughout my district this past week in eastern Colorado and northern Colorado, Colorado's Fourth Congressional District. It's around 6 o'clock back home, and there are probably a lot of people who are just now coming home from work or

who are about to get off work. They're worried about how they're going to continue to pay for their daughter's education, how they're going to make ends meet, what they're going to do to afford that car payment.

I and every single person here tonight will assure them that we have a plan for jobs, that we have voted on our plan for jobs and that we will continue to pursue policies to create jobs in this country, not because they're created by government but because we get government out of the way and allow the private sector to flourish.

This last week in Colorado, I met with a number of businesses. I toured a number of businesses in northern and eastern Colorado, and I had the opportunity to talk to the leadership of those companies and to the people who work on the lines in the factories. I was struck by one statement, one statement by an individual who said, It's time that we let loose the innovators and the entrepreneurs in America.

What are we doing to let loose the innovators and the entrepreneurs in this great country?

I know what the Republicans have been doing to make sure that we're reducing regulations, to make sure that we have an energy policy that, instead of strangling the American working family, helps the American working family and that opens up our resources. We can do so in an environmentally responsible manner. We have done it, and we will continue to do it. We will continue to pursue tax policies that are fair and that don't chase businesses overseas but that allow those jobs to be created right here.

Another business owner in my State gave me a call last year, and said, You know what? My number one competitor just moved to Ireland, and I'm left with a choice. I can either stay headquartered here in Colorado and pay 30 percent more in taxes than they do or I can go overseas and find another place to do business and take those jobs with me.

That's not the kind of choice that we ought to be presenting in this country to the men and women who create business in the United States. Instead of deciding where to go, the question they ought to be asking is, How much can we grow right here in the U.S.? Along these lines, of the factories that I toured and of the manufacturing plants that I toured, I spoke with one employee who came up to me and said, I'm just glad this business is located in Colorado. I'm glad they chose Colorado.

It wasn't that long ago that I was a State legislator. I remember one of the debates that we were dealing with was a particular regulation that many small businesses were struggling with. They were trying to figure out whether or not they could survive under that regulation. While the debate in the Colorado State Legislature was taking place on whether or not this regulation

was good for job creation or not, there was an advertisement on one of the State's largest radio stations from our neighbor to the north, the great State of Wyoming. Their Chamber of Commerce and one of their municipalities said, Come to Wyoming, a business friendly place. They said that because Colorado was forcing a regulation on its business owners that was going to put the men and women of our State out of business. They saw an opportunity. They said, Come to us. We'll take your jobs. We'll take your businesses. You can do it right here, and you'll be better for it.

That's not the kind of policy I want for Colorado, and that's not the kind of policy I want for the United States. The policy of this country should be this:

We will make sure our government gets out of your way to let you do what you do best—run your businesses, your families and your lives. We're not going to foster policies that force you to make a decision to go overseas because of an arbitrary decision in our Tax Code or a regulatory scheme that says, Don't do business here because we're going to make it too tough on you to do business.

Our plan for jobs in the 112th Congress is clear. Unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle, my colleagues on the Democratic side seem to have labeled their 112th Congress mission the "kick the can down the road" tour.

□ 2000

It is the kick the can down the road tour because they're not going to present solutions for Medicare. They're not going to present solutions to solve our energy crisis. They're not going to present solutions to solve our debt and deficit, but no, they're going to pass it on to the next generation. They're going to kick the can down the road and say, You know what? If you're 50 or 55, we're going to go ahead and put the burden all on you, all on you.

That is not a solution for this country. That is debt, doubt, and despair, as my colleague from Illinois just a few minutes ago so eloquently stated. Debt, doubt, and despair. I haven't heard a campaign theme of debt, doubt, and despair, but that is certainly what they are running on.

We can do better, and I'm glad to be part of the 112th Congress and the Republican majority that has said we will create jobs in this country, we will get back to economic opportunity, and we will start by taking care of future generations, and that work begins today.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his time.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you to the gentleman from Colorado.

I now yield to the gentlelady from Alabama.

Mrs. ROBY. I appreciate my colleague from Arkansas for giving us time tonight to talk about this most important issue, which is jobs.

It is the number one issue here, and what I see and we've all testified to to-

night is that, as we travel throughout our districts, the number one thing that we hear from business owners all throughout the United States is the heavy hand of government has created so much uncertainty that the private sector, even those who have the ability to create jobs, are not doing so because they're fearful. They don't know what the Federal Government is going to do to them next, and this is so evident by the recent unemployment numbers that have come out.

Since the first day that this administration took office through the end of April of this year, the economy has lost 2.5 million jobs. That is an average of 3,044 jobs every single day. And unfortunately, and just to talk about the gentlelady from Washington's unemployment numbers, those numbers aren't even necessarily correct, because the rate is so much higher because so many job seekers are giving up and they are leaving the labor force.

I traveled, like you all did, throughout my district this week, and I found myself at Rand Manufacturing, and they manufacture water heaters. It's a household name. They have over 1,000 jobs in the city of Montgomery, and they brought me into a room that was used for research and development for their company, but it was an addition, a \$1 million addition to their headquarters which is already over 700,000 square feet, but \$1 million that they had to invest due to regulation alone. This is not a research and development facility to further their products. This is to keep up with the government regulations that they have to comply with.

How in the world can we expect the private sector to invest in job creation when every dime they have is going toward complying with government regulation? Companies in the United States of America are hitting the brakes on hiring and production. And to go back to the U.S. factory sector, the engine of our recovery, it had its biggest 1-month slowdown since 1984, and they showed private sector hiring dropped drastically.

You know, I'm a mom. I have two children, Margaret and George, who you hear me talk about often, and a lot of Members have their children up here this week with them. And as I look around the floor and I see these young people, I think: This is why we're here. And as was so eloquently said, it has to be about the future generation and not the next election. And when I look into my children's eyes, I am reminded about how important it is that we do all we can, which is what we are. We're leading. We're doing all we can to lift this heavy hand of government. And when I go to the grocery store and when I'm at the gas pump, we see it. We feel it. We know exactly what is going on.

In January of 2011, President Obama said entrepreneurs embody the promise of America, the idea that if you have a good idea and you are willing to work

hard and see it through, you can succeed in this country, and in pursuing this promise, entrepreneurs also play a critical role in expanding our economy and creating jobs. That was President Obama in January of 2011. The Obama administration has done nothing to encourage businesses to create jobs. They have been obstructionists, causing uncertainty, this growing uncertainty with this overreaching regulation. Economic growth has been stifled.

House Republicans have taken steps to reduce spending in a meaningful way by approving all the legislation that the gentleman from Arkansas talked about to decrease spending for the rest of the year, and we adopted a budget that will cut nearly \$6 trillion over the course of the next 10 years.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have done nothing to demonstrate their commitment to private job growth in this country. Increased spending, misguided attacks on the budget that we passed, raising the debt without deficit reduction, and burdensome regulations—this is the plan being offered by the other side of the aisle, and this is not what the American people sent us here to Washington to do for that future generation.

I ask the President and my Democrat colleagues to let us make sure that entrepreneurs continue to embody the promise of America. Enough is enough. More taxation, regulation, and litigation will not create more jobs in this country.

America is certainly at a crossroads. We have an opportunity here, and House Republicans are committed to taking every possible step to spur job creation and get our economy back on track so that Americans can do what they do best, that is, create and innovate and lead.

I again thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you to the gentlelady from Alabama.

You know, when I think about where we are in this country in terms of unemployment and I think about what we can do to encourage job creation, it's clear to me that we can fix this problem. This is something that is possible.

Sometimes I feel like this administration's solution to the unemployment problem is to go around and beg the private sector to invest, to beg the private sector to create jobs. That doesn't work.

There's a reason that folks in the private sector who have money to invest are not investing. They're sitting on the sidelines. Why? Well, it's a lot like investing in your own family situation. You want to be careful with your money. You've got a certain amount of money to invest. You want to invest it in something that's safe. You want to invest it in something where there's certainty. You certainly don't want to take this money that you have, this limited amount of money, and just gamble it on something risky. You want to make sure that what you're

putting your money into is going to pay dividends.

And so what you have is you have a lot of businesses in this country who have money to invest but they're uncertain. We've heard that word "uncertainty" tonight. Well, it is not just a buzzword. It's a fact. When businesses don't know what's going to happen, job creators, when they don't know what's going to happen, they hold on to that money and they say, Well, I better wait; I better wait until I know how things, with more certainty, how things are going to shake out.

There's certainly always going to be some sort of uncertainty. Are the crops going to get rain? Well, that's not something we have control over. But some types of certainty and uncertainty we do have a control over, and it directly relates to policy.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN from Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

□ 2010

Mr. GARDNER. A group of us had the opportunity today to discuss with one of the Nation's leading economists job creation and what's happening to our businesses around the country. And he made the observation, he said, You know, there are a lot of businesses—exactly what you had said—there are a lot of businesses out there that have money on their rolls, but they're not investing into our economy because of what he called and used the term "government activism," policies that relate to government activism. I said, What do you mean by government activism? I am assuming you are not talking about somebody going out from government with a picket sign. And he said, No, no, no. Government activism in terms of the policies that they are pursuing that result in uncertainty, whether it's a regulatory approach that is an activist approach that takes away the certainty business has for the tax structure, for business environment regulations. And the conversation you had was, If we could bring back certainty, if we could get this country back to a point where businesses know what's ahead tomorrow, they know what's ahead next year, then they can plan, and they won't be afraid to invest that money. They'll start creating jobs now. That's one of the Nation's leading economists who said exactly what my colleague from Arkansas is saying tonight.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And I think the debt is directly related to the issue of certainty or uncertainty. If you are an investor and you want to build a new plant, create a new business, do something that would result in job creation, whether you are from outside this country or here in the United States, you are thinking about investing, you look at the nervousness in the market, you look at the debt that we have, you think about the housing collapse in September 2008, and you sort

of think to yourself, You know, this debt makes me nervous. I'm not sure where this is going. And they look and say, Is the government of the United States, led by the President, are they going to get their fiscal house in order so that if I invest, it's a safe bet? So if I invest, I can be certain that I'm investing in a country where the government has got their act together? Or am I looking to invest in a country that's going to just continue to raise that debt ceiling, see no limit?

I actually was in the Judiciary Committee a couple of weeks ago, and one of my colleagues on the other side made the argument that we just haven't spent enough money. If we only would spend another trillion or so, we might have some economic activity. I couldn't believe what I was hearing. And I said to myself, How high does unemployment have to go? How high does the debt have to go before we realize that we've got to get the spending under control?

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I yield to the gentlelady from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I was thinking through your comments here. And the gentleman from Colorado was talking about the uncertainty in investment. Why would you invest when you saw someone just burning through cash? You know, there's another reason that people wouldn't invest, and I think of a company in my district, Longview Fibre.

In southwest Washington, we have tremendous resources in our timber, sawmills, Holden paper companies, just tremendous renewable resources. And one of those energy sources that people have seemed to research is the ability to, through biomass, create energy. This is a green source of energy.

Let's talk about what uncertainty can do to a business. So in the last couple of years, the EPA has signaled—and then pulled back and then signaled—that they're not going to count biomass as green. So a company takes considerable time, energy, effort, and resources to put in play a biomass facility. And then the EPA steps in and says, Oh, time out, it doesn't matter how much money you have invested, it doesn't matter how much time and resources you have invested, we don't think that is going to count—and puts everything on hold.

Well, the EPA decided to stay its ruling for a little bit, meaning they're not really sure whether biomass is green or not. In an environment like that, what company would take the time and the energy and the resources to create a biomass facility? And for a moment there—let me explain. Biomass isn't chipping whole, new, old-growth trees—I guess that would be old trees. It's chips. It's the waste. It's the bark. It's actually fully using the resource of timber, right? It's properly managing that resource. But the EPA—actually, what I think it is is some bureaucrat in

the central planning office somewhere here in Washington, D.C., has said, Ah, we don't understand that. We think you are going to cut all your trees down. We're just going to go ahead and tie your hands. It ties up resources, capital, and jobs.

Longview Fibre is in Cowlitz County. Cowlitz County is upwards in double-digit unemployment. These are good-paying, family wage jobs. This uncertainty is killing us. You know, another thing you mentioned—actually, I think it was the gentleman from Colorado who talked a little bit about business is not hiring and why.

I'm a member of the Small Business Committee. And through testimony, I think it was about 2 weeks ago, we had a whole panel on—it had to do with health information technology. But interestingly, the Gallup organization was represented there, and they do nightly surveys. On some of the questions that they had asked, it showed small businesses, that small business owners were not hiring to capacity. In fact, there was about 40 percent more they could hire. So existing businesses could hire up to 40 percent more people if they weren't doing it. So, naturally, we asked "Why?" in the answer. Shoot, they didn't have the certainty to know whether or not they were going to have any kind of cash flow, or if they could make payroll if they did it. You know what was on the top of that list up there? Health care. Health care costs.

Our small business owners continue to be targeted by government-run health care schemes. And that's what they are. Because if we want to talk health care, we can talk health care. We can talk compromise in health care because that's a passion of mine. But the schemes that were passed target, unfairly, these small businesses. Now some are getting waivers. Some are not getting waivers. Shoot, why in the world would you hire more employees if you didn't know whether you are going to be targeted or not targeted? That's uncertainty, and it's got to stop.

It's time that we put people before politics. We think of the families who are at the pump, the moms who are trying to make ends meet, balance the checkbook, go get groceries, pick up the kids from school, make health care appointments. It's time we put them first, not agendas, not ideas. It's time we put people before politics, and that's exactly what we have been doing and that's what we are going to continue to fight for here on this House floor.

Mrs. ROBY. To add to that, again, the district work weeks, this new schedule that we have, which affords all of us more time with our constituents, which is so important for transparency and accountability to the people who elected us to be here, who we are making decisions for on their behalf, representing their interests. I can't tell you how many times in these meetings—just what you are saying—in

preparation for full implementation of this health care law, we are seeing businesses sit around conference tables, throwing their hands up, having to spend lots and lots of dollars that could go toward creation of jobs. But they're spending all this money just trying to figure out how this law is going to affect them and their bottom line. And it is a huge travesty. And I'm sure that each of you have had similar situations. But we know that there are free-market solutions to driving down the cost of health care in this country, and that law does nothing to do that, to increase competition and to drive down cost. But yet what we do see every time we sit down at the table with these business owners is, we see how the costs associated with implementing the law is killing them.

So I just wanted to add that to the table. And on behalf of the folks in Alabama that I'm so grateful to have the opportunity to be here to represent, I can't say it strong enough and loud enough about the plan that we have here in the majority of the House to do all that we can to untie the hands of our business owners so that we can get this country back on track.

□ 2020

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you. You make some good points about health care. And one of the things that we have pursued here in the House is medical liability reform. And when we were meeting with the President at the White House, a little over a week ago, someone raised the issue of medical liability reform. He said, well, I'm for that. I'm for that.

It's one thing to say you're for it. It's another thing to advocate for this sort of legislation. We're going to send it over to the Senate from here in the House, and we need the President to get engaged on this issue.

Medical liability reform is one of many solutions, market-based solutions, that can help reduce the health care costs. And it's not enough for the President to say, well, I'm for that.

The President said in the State of the Union on the issue of business taxes, he understands that we're at a competitive disadvantage. He says he does. He says he would like to see us be more competitive with regard to business taxes. But no action, nothing, no leadership on the issue of business taxes.

If he wants to talk about competitiveness, let's talk about competitiveness. Let's talk about having a tax structure that welcomes job creators, not repels them.

If you want to talk about competitiveness, let's talk about trade agreements. On January 27 of 2010, President Obama said, "If America sits on the sidelines while other nations sign trade deals, we will lose the opportunity to create jobs on our shores."

Mr. President, opportunity lost. We've been waiting. We've got three free trade agreements just sitting on the shelf, one with Colombia, one with

Panama and one with South Korea. And the estimates are that these trade agreements, if they were implemented, would increase U.S. exports by more than \$10 billion. I've got to think that \$10 billion in increased exports would equal some jobs. But no action from the President.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. And I too have heard the President talk about his desire to increase trade and the exports of this country. In fact, I believe I've heard the statistic quoted, something to the effect that if we could increase trade in this Nation by exports by 1 percent, we'd create tens of thousands of jobs.

We talk about what we're going to do to get this country moving forward again, how we're going to get this economy back, and there is a perfect example of what we can do, not only from my home State of Colorado, but for this country. The goods that we produce, to share them with the world, to make not just U.S. consumers, but world consumers of the excellence in manufacturing that this country used to be, can be, still ought to be and should be into the future.

And so again, I think you talk about the opportunities that we have missed. The other night we came to the floor, and there was a group talking about make it in America. Well, you know what we need to make it in America? We need a business environment that fosters job growth. We need a tax policy that doesn't penalize people for choosing to work in the United States.

To make it in America we need an energy policy that doesn't force people to pay \$60, \$70 every time they fill up a tank of gas just to get to work. To make it in America we need regulations that are pro-business, not anti-business.

To make it in America we need a government that actually represents the American working families, not just bureaucracy. That's what we need to make it in America. And when it comes to trade agreements, I believe that we can and we ought to make it in America, and we can sell it abroad.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. You make a good point. It's not just happenstance when a country has a good manufacturing base. You don't just happen to have job creation. It's a function of policies. It's a function of the policies that we adopt in the Congress, or that we don't adopt.

For example, we haven't reformed our business taxes in years. While other countries are making themselves more competitive, we're sitting on our hands. It's not happenstance.

I want to be so attractive in this country to job creators that manufacturers in other countries want to come here. I want manufacturers around the world to want to be in this country. And the manufacturers that we might have lost, I want them to say, hey,

they've changed their tune. I'm going back home. I want businesses, job creators around the world to say, that's the country where I want to create jobs because it's the best place to do business.

And we, the policies that we adopt here, the regulations that the administration puts forth, it all has an impact. It's not happenstance. It's by design. So we need to make sure that we're doing the things here that encourage the private sector job growth.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. And I couldn't agree more. I was just sitting here reflecting on the number of people who come up and talk to me in my district in southwest Washington about how hard it is to find work, how hard it is to find a good paying family-wage job.

I mentioned timber resources. In our neck of the woods we traditionally have had just a booming timber economy, resource-based economy; and a lot of those operations have either shut down or moved elsewhere to be more competitive.

We've got to allow job growth. I mean, it sounds simple. It really does. You know, the last time our country had the amount of spending that we see happening right now was actually in the lead up to World War II. And I've talked a lot about cutting and reducing government overspending and government growth. It needs to be done. In the last 3 years, the what we call discretionary spending, the money that has to be appropriated annually has increased by over 80 percent. Federal employment has increased by 10 percent in about that same time. So government spending has grown. And people are saying that the way to—not "people"—my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the President are saying that the reason we have stagnant job opportunities is because we haven't spent enough.

Well, I listed earlier the stimulus, the bailouts, the auto bailouts, the health care bill, all this spending that's taken place; and we're still where we are now. And people say, well, it happened during World War II; we spent a ton of money and then coming out of that we grew jobs. The difference, the big difference was coming out of World War II, the last time our debt to GDP ratio was near where it is now, the difference was, and the thing that saved us, was the immediate cuts. Right?

We cut government spending back, but we grew jobs. We literally made things here in America. You know why? We had an environment that fostered job creation. We had an environment that cultivated entrepreneurs. We grew jobs here in America because we made things here. We produced things.

Again, in southwest Washington we had a roaring timber industry that has all but shut down, and the sad thing is if you don't manage the health of a forest, it deteriorates. Some of these folks who are here in these bureaucratic of-

fices in Washington, D.C. I swear have never stepped foot in a real forest. They think you just tie a big ribbon around it and don't let anybody in or out, and that's how we protect our environment. They're wrong. You see, they think that our environment and our economy are mutually exclusive.

Man, that is such a low opinion of American researchers. That really must say that we don't think we can, our citizens, our people are intelligent enough to come up with new and innovative ways to both manage our timber and our timber economy and protect our environment.

So what we have now is shut off stands of trees ripe for beetle infestation, disease or worse, fire as we enter the summer seasons with a lot of dry foliage and underbrush. You know, it sure would be great if the EPA would have allowed some of those companies I mentioned in my district to create their biomass facilities, because then we could create jobs because we'd have a biomass facility up and running. We would be taking the remnants of trees. We wouldn't be taking full trees, but chips and bark, and using those in the biomass facility so we are creating green energy. We're fully utilizing a renewable resource, and we're creating jobs.

My goodness. That's a novel concept. We need to get there.

□ 2030

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentlelady.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just came back from our work week. I traveled better than 1,500 miles throughout Colorado. It was remarkable to me. At every one of our meetings, we found cities, counties, small businesspeople, talking about the opportunity to be able to get America back to work. But the problem, the obstacle that we are truly facing, it is not the American spirit but it is over-regulation coming out of Washington, D.C. Rather than being the stepping-stone, it has become a stumbling block, and we are going to be able to get this economy working and moving forward once again if we simply free up that American spirit.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROKITA (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. WEINER (at the request of Mr. CAPUANO) for a period of two weeks on account of personal matters.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on May 26, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1893. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 793. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12781 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Inverness, California, as the "Specialist Jake Robert Velloza Post Office".

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House also reports that on June 1, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 754. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 14, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1882. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard [Docket

No.: NHTSA-2009-0069] (RIN: 2127-AK81) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1883. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting copy of the report entitled "Auditor's Review of the Operations and Administration of the Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1884. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone: Passenger Vessels, Sector Southeastern New England Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0864] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1885. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones: Fireworks Displays in the Captain of the Port Columbia River Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0997] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1886. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Charleston Race Week, Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1152] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1887. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30119; Amdt. No. 3422] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1888. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30780; Amdt. No. 3423] May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1889. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30775; Amdt. No. 3419] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1890. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30774; Amdt. No. 3418] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1891. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Federal Airways; Alaska [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0010; Airspace Docket No. 11-AAL-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1892. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30778; Amdt. No. 493] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1893. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commercial Driver's License Testing and Commercial Learner's Permit Standards [Docket No.: FMCSA-2007-27659] (RIN: 2126-AB02) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1894. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning the extension of waiver authority for Turkmenistan, pursuant to Public Law 93-618, section 402(d)(1) and 409; (H. Doc. No. 112-34); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1895. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2011-41] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1896. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Administrative Exemptions to the Specified Tax Return Preparer Electronic Filing Requirement Under Internal Revenue Code Sec. 6011(e)(3) and Regulations Under Sec. 6011(e)(3) [Notice 2011-26] May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1897. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — The Mailing of Individual Income Tax Returns By Specified Tax Return Preparers in Calendar Year 2011 [Notice 2011-27] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1898. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Director's Directive #2—Employment Tax and the Employees on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf [LB&I Control Number: LB&I-4-0211-005] received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1899. A letter from the Acting Chair, Social Security Advisory Board, transmitting a report entitled "A Vision of the Future for the Social Security Administration"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1900. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, transmitting a letter regarding Section 1340 of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011; jointly to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Foreign Affairs.

1901. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill entitled, "Veterans Benefit Programs Improvements Act of 2011"; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and the Judiciary.

1902. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting proposed legislation to improve cybersecurity for the American people; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Oversight and Government Reform, Homeland Security, and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 300. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-103). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. ISSA:

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 2147. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Utah except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges to veterans with a compensable service-connected disability and to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 2149. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 2150. A bill to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, including at least one lease sale in the Reserve each year in the period 2011 through 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2151. A bill to facilitate nationwide availability of volunteer income tax assistance for low-income and underserved populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of

Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OLVER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2152. A bill to reauthorize the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, to provide assistance to Best Buddies to support the expansion and development of mentoring programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, 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. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. JENKINS):

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employer rights; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2154. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Gasparilla Island Unit FL-70P; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2155. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P16; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2156. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P17; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 2157. A bill to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Inyo National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. BACA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2158. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14901 Adelfa Drive in La Mirada, California, as the "Wayne Grisham Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H. Res. 301. A resolution expressing support for designation of June 20, 2011, as "American Eagle Day", and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Res. 302. A resolution expressing support for the designation of August 22, 2011, as Rose Brucia Stranger Safety Awareness Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 2147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 2149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 6, "The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post Roads:"

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 2152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact the Eunice Kennedy Shriver Act pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation introduces a clarification that limits the scope of an existing statute. As such, this bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 2157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. BILBRAY and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 104: Mr. HIMES and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 198: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 333: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 389: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 452: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 456: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 458: Mr. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 459: Mr. AKIN and Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 512: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 539: Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 589: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 607: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 614: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 633: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 674: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DOLD, and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 676: Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 687: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 703: Mr. CRAVAACK.
 H.R. 707: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 711: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 733: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 765: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 800: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 816: Mr. OLSON and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 860: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 880: Mr. AKIN.
 H.R. 883: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 886: Mr. DICKS.
 H.R. 905: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 942: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H.R. 997: Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 1004: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1044: Mr. BONNER.
 H.R. 1085: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1093: Mr. HOLDEN and Ms. BUERKLE.
 H.R. 1112: Mr. PETERS and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1161: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 1172: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1174: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1182: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 1236: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. STARK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DENT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 1259: Mr. PENCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HURT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 1265: Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 1293: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 1296: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 1327: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 1331: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 1332: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1350: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 1351: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. COSTELLO, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1358: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 1370: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 1380: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 1391: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 1404: Ms. NORTON and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1418: Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 1426: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1465: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1466: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 1498: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 1505: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 1506: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1515: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 1527: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 1558: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 1563: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 1580: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 1596: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 1606: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1617: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1639: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 1646: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 1663: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 1683: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
 H.R. 1692: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 1705: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 1739: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 1744: Mr. NUNES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr.

HUELSKAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 1747: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 1792: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1814: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 1815: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 1826: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1829: Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 1836: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1852: Mr. BARROW, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 1873: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 1880: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1881: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 1931: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1932: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 1938: Mr. LONG, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LANDRY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. MACK.
 H.R. 1958: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 1959: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 1964: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 1970: Mr. TONKO and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1974: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 1975: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BACA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MCKEON, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 1985: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FARR, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1987: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2008: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 2040: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 2061: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 2064: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 2082: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2104: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MORAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
 H.R. 2107: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 2110: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIMES, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 2115: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 2129: Mr. FILNER.
 H.J. Res. 62: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H. Con. Res. 58: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
 H. Res. 19: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H. Res. 20: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Res. 21: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H. Res. 134: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. FILNER.
 H. Res. 177: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. OLVER.
 H. Res. 247: Mr. POMPEO.
 H. Res. 253: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. STEARNS.

H. Res. 256: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
 H. Res. 262: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 266: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H. Res. 268: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BARROW, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. VISCIOSKY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MACK, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RIVERA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. WEST, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LONG, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. CHU, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H. Res. 270: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H. Res. 286: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 296: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1380: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GARDNER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2055

OFFERED BY: MR. FLORES

AMENDMENT No. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 4. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

H.R. 2055

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT No. 7: Page 6, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$25,000,000)”.

Page 9, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(decreased by \$25,000,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MS. FOXX

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food initiative of the Department of Agriculture.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MS. FOXX

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 45, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 45, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,500,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$82,500,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT No. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide benefits described in section 1001D(b)(1)(C) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(b)(1)(C)) to a person or legal entity in excess of \$125,000.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$7,000,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 5: Page 49, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$180,019,800)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$104,019,800)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 6: Page 50, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$180,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$180,000,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 7: Page 56, line 18, insert “231” in place of “461”.

Page 56, line 19, insert “231” in place of “456”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 8: Page 5, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,900,000)”.

Page 5, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,900,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,900,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 9: Page 17, line 25, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,750,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$7,750,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 10: Page 27, line 23, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$15,000,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 11: Page 33, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,480,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,480,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 12: Page 48, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$175,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$175,000,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. CHAFFETZ

AMENDMENT No. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who provide non-recourse marketing assistance loans for mohair under section 1201 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. (7 U.S.C. 8731).

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. CHAFFETZ

AMENDMENT No. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel in the Department of Agriculture to make) payments for the storage of cotton under section 1204(g) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8734(g)) or for the storage of peanuts under section 1307(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8757(a)).

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT No. 15: Page 8, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,312,000)”.

Page 13, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,312,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT No. 16: Page 8, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$400,000)”.

Page 12, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$400,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT No. 17: Page 48, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$17,500,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$17,500,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT No. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or dispose of (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to close or dispose of) any Agricultural Research Service facility that conducts beef cattle research.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT No. 19: Page 9, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 48, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MS. WOOLSEY

AMENDMENT No. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the directive in the committee report instructing the Food and Nutrition Service to issue a new proposed rule on implementing new national nutrition standards for the school breakfast and school lunch programs in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany H.R. 2112 of the 112th Congress (House Report 112-101).