



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2011

No. 105

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 14, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### BRING OUR TROOPS HOME FROM AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I plan to come to the floor at least once, maybe twice a week until we get our troops home from Afghanistan. I do that because I have the privilege to represent the Third District of North Carolina, the home of Camp Lejeune Marine Base, Cherry Point Marine Air Station, and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. I have been privileged, since I didn't

serve, to have great relationships with active duty and retired marines in the district.

I want to share with this House, Mr. Speaker, that we continue to support a corrupt leader and a corrupt government. Just recently, the half brother of Mr. Karzai, Wali Karzai, was murdered in Afghanistan. This only reinforces the fact that Afghanistan is in a fragile situation at every level of their government. It is in chaos, quite frankly.

Just this week, I spoke with a Marine colonel who has been to Afghanistan three times. He was in my office on Tuesday, and he shared the same sentiments as the retired Marine general who has been advising me for 20 months. Recently, I emailed the general and I said, Please give me your ideas of what Mr. Obama has proposed in bringing 10,000 of our troops out in July and then another 23,000 next year, 2012. This is what he emailed back to me, Mr. Speaker, and I read:

"I think the timeline is too long. I think he needs to increase the number of troops coming out of country, more and quicker."

Another point he made in his email is: "Get real with 'training' an army and police force. All we are doing is training eventual new members of the Taliban. Trainers are doing a wonderful job, but we don't have the time to 'make' an army."

And, Mr. Speaker, then it was kind of sad the way he closed: Every day somebody from our country dies—a marine, a soldier, an airman, Navy, whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I bring posters to the floor—I have probably 12 now that I want to bring to the floor every time that I speak—to remind the House that there is pain in war.

The wife to my left on the poster is in tears. The little girl, who is about 2 years of age, she doesn't understand why this Army officer is kneeling before her with a folded flag. Yet I would say to the little girl: When you grow

older and you're old enough to know, your daddy was a real hero, Sergeant Jeffrey Sherer, who gave his life for this country.

Mr. Speaker, that leads me to share with the House an editorial that was written about 4 weeks ago by Eugene Robinson, and the title is, "Afghan Strategy: Let's Go." And I want to read from his editorial:

"Slender threads of hope are nice, but they do not constitute a plan. Nor do they justify continuing to pour American lives and resources into the bottomless pit of Afghanistan. The threat from Afghanistan is gone. Bring the troops home."

This, again, is an editorial from Eugene Robinson.

Mr. Speaker, with our Nation in such a financial crisis, the people of the Third District of North Carolina, which I represent, ask me many times when I'm home on the weekends: Why are we still in Afghanistan? Why are we still spending \$10 billion a month to prop up a corrupt leader and there's no future in Afghanistan?

We're not going to change history. History has always said to these great nations like America: You go into Afghanistan, you're never going to change anything.

The Congress needs to join those of us on both sides of the aisle when we debate trying to bring our troops home from Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, again I want to make reference to the wife in tears and the little girl looking up at the Army officer wondering, Why are you giving me this flag? Young lady, your daddy was a hero.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying to God, please bless our men and women in uniform. God, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. God, please, in Your loving arms, hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

□ 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.

H5021

God, please bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right. God, please give wisdom, strength, and courage to President Obama, that he will do what is right.

And three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

#### THE MASSIVE TRANSFER OF WEALTH FROM THE MANY TO THE HANDS OF A FEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. The rancorous debate over the debt belies a fundamental truth of our economy: that it is run for the few at the expense of the many, that our entire government has been turned into a machine which takes the wealth of the mass of Americans and accelerates it into the hands of a few. Let me give you some examples.

Take war. War takes the money from the American people and puts it into the hands of arms manufacturers, of war profiteers, of private armies. The war in Iraq, based on lies, \$3 trillion will be the cost of that war, at least. The war in Afghanistan, based on a misreading of history, half a trillion dollars in expenses already. The war against Libya will be \$1 billion by September. Fifty percent of our discretionary spending goes for the Pentagon. A massive transfer of wealth into the hands of a few while the American people lack sufficient jobs, health care, housing, retirement security.

Our energy policies take the wealth from the American people and put it into the hands of the oil companies. We could be looking at \$150 a barrel for oil in the near future.

□ 1010

Our environmental policy takes the wealth of the people, clean air, clean water, and puts it in the hands of the polluters. It's a transfer of wealth not only from the present but from future generations, as our environment is ruined.

Insurance companies, what do they do? They take the wealth from the American people, in terms of what they charge people for health insurance, and they put it into the hands of the few.

We have to realize what this country's economy has become. Our monetary policy, through the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, privatized the money supply, gathers the wealth and puts it in the hands of the few while the Federal Reserve can keep creating money out of nothing, give it to banks to park at the Fed, and our small businesses are starved for capital.

Mark my words: Wall Street cashes in whether we have a default or not. And the same type of thinking that created billions in bailouts for Wall Street and more than \$1 trillion in giveaways by the Federal Reserve today leaves 26 million Americans either underemployed or unemployed.

And 9 out of 10 Americans over the age of 65 are facing cuts in their Social Security in order to pay for a debt which grew from tax cuts for the rich and from endless wars.

There is a massive transfer of wealth from the American people to the hands of the few, and it's going on right now as America's eyes are misdirected to the political theater of these histrionic debt negotiations: threats to shut down the government, a willingness to make the most vulnerable Americans pay dearly for debts they did not create. These are symptoms of a government which has lost its way, and they are a challenge to the legitimacy of the two-party system.

#### CONGRATULATING DR. JOHN SHANK ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a dear friend and colleague, Dr. John Shank, and congratulate him on his retirement from Temple University. Dr. Shank is a tenured professor at Temple University, where he serves as the director of the Therapeutic Recreation Program within the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences.

In his 25 years of tremendous service to Temple, Professor Shank has put forth a level of commitment to the advancement of professional knowledge within the field of recreational therapy that is second to none. Without a doubt, John's scholarly successes have overwhelmingly contributed to the reputation of Temple University being regarded as the most prolific academic center within the field of recreational therapy. Not only has Dr. Shank made tremendous contributions to his field, he has served as an outstanding teacher and role model to those students who were fortunate enough to have him as a classroom instructor or research adviser.

Dr. Shank, thank you, for a lifetime of academic and recent achievements and for your contributions to the field of recreational therapy at Temple University. I congratulate you on your retirement and wish you well in the future.

#### COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very shortly the United States Congress is likely to consider three ill-conceived and ill-timed trade agreements that will do nothing to create jobs in this country. One of these agreements is with the nation of Colombia.

One of our most important responsibilities as elected officials is to promote and protect American jobs and American values. We do this by ensuring that those who receive trade preferences respect essential democratic rights. These are important rights: the right to speak out and protest, the right to organize unions and bargain collectively, and the right of citizens to support political efforts to improve their economic condition without reprisals.

Unfortunately, we see what happens when union members in Colombia try exercise their rights. Death squads are unleashed against union activists and human rights defenders; labor leaders are gunned down in broad daylight. This isn't yesterday's news. The intimidation and violence continue to this day. There have been 17 confirmed killings of unionists in Colombia this year, according to a human rights group. Last year, 90 unionists were murdered worldwide, 49 of them in Colombia. Colombia unionists face the highest rates of murder anywhere in the world.

To overcome longstanding objections to passage of the Colombia free trade agreement, President Santos of Colombia and President Obama signed a Labor Action Plan on April 7. The plan includes deadlines for new laws that could enable workers to form unions as a means to advance social progress in Colombia. This plan has deadlines to restrict the use of cooperatives that allow employers to evade bargaining directly with their workers. It calls for new labor enforcement agencies and the hiring of additional inspectors.

On the one hand, the labor action plan has important elements that are necessary and valuable, and President Santos is to be commended for advancing this initiative; however, there are major gaps in the action plan. There are no benchmarks to show whether or not the new laws on paper have translated into laws on the ground. Will workers have greater ability to exercise their rights, to organize, to bargain collectively, and to negotiate contracts directly with their employers? Will levels of violence and murders against trade unionists be substantially reduced? Will employers and companies that violate the rights of workers be punished, as prescribed under the new laws?

We don't know if these are merely gains on paper or if they are real. And based upon the accelerated schedule, it appears we won't be given a chance to learn if there will be real change on the ground before we consider the trade agreement with Colombia.

Any trade agreement with Colombia must produce a verifiable reduction in the violence. It must protect human rights. It must end the impunity enjoyed by death squads and paramilitaries. Due to the lack of benchmarks for progress, Colombia could still have a record year of assassinations and the action plan would be declared a success.

Under the plan, the Colombian Government is supposed to be providing expanded physical protections for union activists. I met with regional and national union leaders last month who told me that little has changed on the ground. They told me they haven't received protection.

The action plan calls for hiring additional labor inspectors over the next 4 years to enforce these new laws. There's a program to relocate teachers who have received death threats. There is a program to address the backlog of thousands of union homicide cases that have yet to be prosecuted. And there is no assurance that the actions will be carried out.

Last week, the Ways and Means Republicans opposed efforts to require Colombia to meet its obligations under the action plan as of the date the free trade agreement goes into force. Without this provision, the U.S. has no leverage to assure implementation of the labor action plan. Maybe that is what the multinational corporations pushing this deal want. And since the agreement is being brought to the floor under fast track, Congress will not be able to consider amendments to make the action plan enforceable.

Given this predicament, the least the administration can do is to stand behind its own action plan. The implementing legislation should require Colombia to fully comply with the plan before the agreement takes effect. The administration should confirm that compliance through on-the-ground consultations with labor and human rights organizations. Without real change on the ground, this trade agreement is not fair to Colombian workers. They deserve their basic right not to be subjected to threats and murder because they demand a better life.

This agreement does not fairly represent our Nation's values, and it's fundamentally unfair to America's workers. They can't compete with workers who face death squads for wanting better working conditions. They can't compete with a country that continues to allow thousands of assassins to operate with impunity. It's past time that we, as a Nation, stand up for American values and American workers.

#### REMEMBERING FORMER FIRST LADY BETTY FORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American with a legacy of being a passionate advocate for the issues that she believed in.

Former First Lady Betty Ford passed away earlier this week at the age of 93. She was known as a beacon of warmth and kindness. She was also a tough lady. She's being buried today next to her husband, Jerry Ford, in Grand Rapids at the Presidential museum.

My entire family and I had opportunities to meet her over the years, and

I have to say, it's truly an honor now to represent part of the district that Jerry Ford had so long served in this very House.

□ 1020

We are all deeply saddened by her passing. Mrs. Ford cared deeply about others, as evidenced in her work helping people through their addiction and recovery from chemical dependency through the Betty Ford Clinic, and her work to raise awareness of breast cancer and many other issues, all at a time when those things really were not discussed much in public.

Above all, she led the Ford team as she supported her husband's service to a Nation with admirable love and mutual respect, at times literally being his voice, like she did that evening that he made his concession speech in 1976.

Well, this spring, at the dedication ceremony of the statue of President Ford here in the Rotunda lying just beyond, we were reminded of his calm, steady leadership, and his ability to reach out to others. They were always a team. And it was as much a tribute to her as it was to President Ford.

Again, we continue to pray for the Ford children, Susan, Jack, Mike, and Steve, and the entire Ford family as we pay tribute to their mother and the legacy that she leaves behind.

Rest well, Mrs. Ford, rest well.

#### COLOMBIA: DEMAND RESULTS ON LABOR AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 6 days ago, on Friday, July 1, armed men assassinated a candidate for the city council of Caldas, a town just outside of Medellin, Colombia. He was the ninth local candidate murdered over the last few months.

Last Thursday, June 30, Luis Eduardo Gomez, a Colombian journalist and witness for a high profile investigation into links between Colombian politicians and paramilitary groups, was shot down and killed in northwestern Antioquia, an area I visited first in 2001. Gomez was 70 years old. He was returning home at night with his wife when he was gunned down. He was murdered a few days after another witness in the case was killed. And investigators for the Attorney General have said several other witnesses have disappeared.

Antonio Mendoza Morales was a councilman in the Caribbean town of San Onofre, Sucre. The 34-year-old Mendoza was also a leader of the Association of Displaced Persons of San Onofre and the Montes de Maria. He was also shot and killed last Thursday night. He is at least the 11th land claims, victims' rights, or displaced persons leader to have been killed in Colombia so far this year.

Displaced persons and victims' rights advocates in the Sucre region received a series of death threats during the month of June. We don't know yet whether Mendoza's killing is related to these threats. But I traveled to Sucre in 2003, and can attest to the daily violence suffered by local leaders and displaced persons and campesino organizations.

On June 7, Anna Fabricia Cordoba, 51, a leader of the displaced and a land rights activist, was shot dead by an unidentified gunman while riding on a bus in Medellin. She had fled her home in northern Antioquia in 2001 after several of her family members were killed. She had been campaigning for the restitution of lands to Colombia's displaced, and was a member of Ruta Pacifica, the Peaceful Path, a women's organization calling for a negotiated end to the war. In 2008, Ruta Pacifica testified before the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission about Colombia's internally displaced. Cordoba, an Afro-Colombian, had been receiving death threats for months. She had asked the Colombian Government for protection, but had not received any. Her children have received death threats following their mother's death.

The Inter-American Commission for Human Rights condemned Cordoba's murder and expressed alarm over the increase in serious threats against Colombian human rights defenders. The situation is getting worse. Every day I receive news about threats, murders, and disappearances of Colombian labor and human rights activists and community leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I recite this sad litany of recent murders to impress upon my colleagues that these are real people, real leaders, being murdered every single day in Colombia. Will their murderers be brought to justice or will their deaths be just one more case that remains in impunity? Will the government's promises to their families to seek justice be fulfilled? Will other threatened leaders and their families receive real protection? I hope so, but we simply don't know yet. Promises are easy. Results take time, commitment, and political will to achieve.

This morning, some of my colleagues will describe the dangers facing Colombia's labor activists. Colombia still remains the most dangerous place in the world to be a unionist. But violence against Colombia's workers happens in the context of a very threatening landscape for anyone who has the courage to organize their communities, run for public office, or stand up for the rights of the poor, the displaced, and the victims of human rights abuse. The source of violence are all the illegal armed actors, the FARC, the ELN, the paramilitaries, and criminal networks known as BACRIM. And also, sadly, it includes members and units of the Colombian military and police.

Before any trade agreement is brought to the Congress for a vote, we owe it to the brave people of Colombia

to give the Santos administration time to demonstrate that it can carry out the historic reforms that it has announced as its priorities. We need time to see if the initial steps required by the U.S.-Colombia Labor Action Plan actually result in changes on the ground inside Colombia. Will workers be able to exercise their rights, organize freely, and bargain directly with their employers without the fear of death? And we need time to determine whether violence against rights defenders and community leaders is actually reduced under the leadership of President Santos, and whether greater protections are provided and prove to be effective.

We need to see, and we should demand to see, results on the ground before Congress takes up the free trade agreement. Let's use whatever leverage the U.S. has in Colombia to help end a culture of impunity and violence that by any standard is intolerable. I cannot approve an FTA on the basis of good intentions. It must be based on results.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me just say trade agreements should be about lifting people up, not keeping them down.

11 COLOMBIAN LAND RIGHTS, VICTIMS' RIGHTS AND DISPLACED LEADERS MURDERED IN 2011 (6/30/11)

February 4

Ana M. Hernández. Assassinated with her 10 year old son. Community Board member of El Cupadero en Frontino (Antioquia). She was killed in front of her 3 children.

March 6

Zoraida Acevedo. Leader of Familias en Acción en Tibú (Norte de Santander). She was shot in front of her husband and her four children.

March 19

Hernán Pinto, victims' rights leader in Cundinamarca, he was murdered brutally, clubbed and stoned to death. Sources say the perpetrators were the FARC.

March 22

Bernardo Ríos Londoño, 27, member of the San José de Apartadó Peace Community, in the Urabá region of northwestern Antioquia.

March 23

David Góez and Éver Verbel. Goez was assassinated near a commercial center in Medellín. Verbel was killed in San Onofre (Sucre).

April 7

Andrés Álvarez Orozco. Campesino leader of Antioquia who had denounced irregular actions by the Public Forces (pólice) in this región.

April 15

Hugo Ulcué. Assassinated when leaving an event in Cauca. He was an indigenous leader who had called for reparations for the massacre of the Naya people.

April 27

Martha Gaibao. Leader on land rights and restitution for six communities in Southern Córdoba. She was assassinated as she arrived at her home.

June 7

Ana Fabricia Córdoba Cabral, 51, member of Ruta Pacífica de Mujeres and founder of the Association of Leaders Moving Forward for a Human Fabric of Peace/LATEPAZ. Murdered by gunman on motorcycle while she was riding on a bus in Medellín.

June 30

Antonio Medoza Morales, councilman in San Onofre (Sucre) and leader of the Associa-

tion of Displaced Persons of San Onofre and the Montes de Maria. Shot and killed at a billiard hall near his home.

Sources: El Tiempo (Bogotá, Colombia) 6/8/11; 6/20/11; and 7/1/11.

[From the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Organization of American States, June 20, 2011]

IACHR CONDEMNS MURDER OF HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVIST AND EXPRESSES CONCERN OVER NEW THREATS TO HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS IN COLOMBIA

WASHINGTON, DC.—The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) condemns the murder in Colombia of Ana Fabricia Córdoba Cabrera, an Afro-descendant community leader who worked with displaced persons seeking the restitution of lands in the Urabá region. The Commission also expresses its deep concern over a new death threat targeting human rights defenders and organizations.

According to the information the IACHR has received, Ana Fabricia Córdoba was a member of the organization Ruta Pacífica de las Mujeres (Women's Peaceful Path) and a founder of the Asociación Líderes Hacia delante por un Tejido Humano de Paz (Association of Leaders Moving Forward for a Human Fabric of Peace, LATEPAZ), whose mission is to support victims of forced displacement. Ana Fabricia Córdoba Cabrera had allegedly reported a number of cases in which rights of displaced persons had been violated by paramilitaries in the Medellín neighborhoods of La Cruz and La Honda. The information indicates that on June 7, a man shot the community leader with a firearm while she was traveling on a bus on her way to Santa Cruz. The IACHR is deeply concerned that Colombian government authorities have admitted publicly that the murder of Ana Fabricia Córdoba could have been averted, since the Ministry of the Interior's Protection Program had reportedly known about threats against the community leader since May 9 but had failed to implement protection measures in a timely manner.

According to the information available, days before the murder, dozens of organizations that work to defend the rights of the displaced population—including Ruta Pacífica de las Mujeres, to which the human rights defender belonged—received a death threat dated June 2. It was signed by the armed group "Rastrojos" and targeted those who had played an active role in the framework of Colombia's Victims and Land Restitution Law, passed on Friday, June 10. The organizations targeted by the threat include CREAR, Arco Iris, Fundación Social, Sisma Mujer, Red de Empoderamiento, Colectivo de Abogados José Alvear Restrepo, FUNDEPAZ, Casa Mujer, Ruta Pacífica de las Mujeres, FUNDHEFEM, CODHES, FUNDEMUD, MOVICE, UNIPA, and Fundación Nuevo Amanecer. The threat also mentioned several individuals by name, including Viviana Ortiz, Angélica Bello, Ruby Castaño, María Eugenia Cruz, Piedad Córdoba, Lorena Guerra, and Iván Cepeda. Members of several of the aforementioned organizations as well as several of those named individually in the threat are beneficiaries of precautionary measures granted by the IACHR. The Commission also observes with concern that the document signed by "the Rastrojos" threatens the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

The Commission reiterates that one of the first steps to effectively protect human rights defenders is to publicly recognize the legitimacy of their work and to take steps to protect them from the moment the public

authorities learn that they have received threats due to their work. The Commission brings to mind that in many cases, such as with Ana Fabricia Córdoba, the death of human rights defenders is preceded by threats that were reported to the authorities.

The Commission urges the State to guarantee the right to life, integrity, and security of Ana Fabricia Córdoba's family members, investigate what occurred, and punish those responsible for her murder. The Commission also urges the State of Colombia to immediately and urgently adopt any necessary measures to guarantee the right to life, integrity, and security of human rights defenders, especially the organizations and individuals who have been threatened. The State should carry out a comprehensive and systematic investigation of the threat with respect to all the organizations and individuals named therein.

The Commission reiterates that the work of human rights defenders is critical to building a solid, lasting democratic society and to fully attaining the rule of law. In this regard, acts of violence and other attacks against human rights defenders impinge on the essential role they play in society and contribute to the vulnerability of those whose rights they are working to defend.

A principal, autonomous body of the Organization of American States (OAS), the IACHR derives its mandate from the OAS Charter and the American Convention on Human Rights. The Inter-American Commission has a mandate to promote respect for human rights in the region and acts as a consultative body to the OAS in this matter. The Commission is composed of seven independent members who are elected in a personal capacity by the OAS General Assembly and who do not represent their countries of origin or residence.

[From the Committee to Protect Journalists, July 5, 2011]

PROVINCIAL JOURNALIST SHOT TO DEATH IN COLOMBIA

NEW YORK.—Luis Eduardo Gómez, a Colombian freelance journalist who was a witness for an investigation into links between politicians and paramilitary groups, was shot and killed on Thursday in the town of Arboletes, in the northwestern province of Antioquia, according to news reports. The Committee to Protect Journalists called on Colombian authorities today to thoroughly investigate his murder and bring those responsible to justice.

Gómez, 70, was returning home at night with his wife when he was gunned down by unidentified assailants who fled the scene on a motorcycle, according to local press reports. Gomez had reported on local corruption and links among politicians and illegal right-wing paramilitary groups in the Urabá region of Antioquia, the Colombian press freedom group Foundation for Press Freedom (FLIP) said. Most recently, he had written about tourism and the environment for the newspapers El Heraldo de Urabá and Urabá al día, among others, the Colombian press said.

According to the newspaper El Colombiano, the journalist had not received any threats prior to his death.

Gómez was participating as a witness in the attorney general's investigation of links between politicians and right-wing paramilitary groups, a scandal known as "parapolitics." Another witness in the case was killed a few days before the journalist's death, and investigators said other witnesses have disappeared, according to press reports. Gómez was also investigating the unsolved murder of his son, who was also his professional collaborator, and was killed two years ago, the daily El Espectador said.

"We urge Colombian authorities to fully investigate the murder of freelance reporter Luis Eduardo Gómez, establish whether he was killed for his work, and bring those responsible to justice," said Carlos Lauria, CPJ's senior program coordinator for the Americas. "Colombia has made progress recently in its fight against impunity in journalist murders. It must not allow this new killing to set its progress back."

The parapolitics scandal broke in late 2006, after the weekly newsmagazine *Semana* published a series of investigative pieces that forced Colombian authorities to examine the alleged associations. Dozens of former and current members of Congress have been detained or investigated since 2007, the press said.

The Urabá region of Antioquia province has been marked by violence for some time and was controlled for many years (until 2006) by the paramilitary group the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), press reports said. Colombian provincial journalists, working in areas where paramilitaries and other illegal armed groups are prevalent, face challenges in trying to report on the organizations' activities, CPJ research shows.

With 43 journalists killed for their work since 1992, Colombia has historically been one of the most dangerous places in the world for journalists, CPJ research shows. However, CPJ's Impunity Index has showed that over the past four years the country is improving its record, as anti-press violence has slowed and authorities have had some success in prosecuting journalist murders.

#### DEBT CEILING/JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, last week we learned that the economy added a meager 18,000 jobs and the unemployment rate went up to 9.2 percent, far from the 6.7 percent that President Obama claimed it would be today if the stimulus bill had been signed into law. Far too many Americans are looking for jobs. Yet the President insists that tax increases are the way to fix Washington's spending problem. Tax hikes that will destroy jobs and destroy the confidence that our job creators need to hire new employees. To keep American jobs here we don't need to raise taxes. We do need to get our fiscal house in order.

Twenty-two million Americans search daily for full-time work, the worst sustained unemployment streak since the Great Depression. To these Americans, there is no end in sight. For them, unemployment's not a rate, it's a reality. Our job crisis has everything to do with our spending crisis and our debt crisis.

If we hit the August 2 deadline, the United States Government will face what many Americans have felt: Too much month left at the end of our money. We simply won't have enough money to pay our bills. Americans have had to make that decision time and time again. At the end of the month, they have to decide what to pay first—the mortgage, the electric bill, the grocery bill, or the car payment.

Now, I will be very disappointed if, in making those decisions, the administration chooses to play politics. We need to make sure we pay Social Security, interest on the debt, Medicare, and our troops that are standing in harm's way. The American people want real solutions, and the House of Representatives has committed to a long-term plan. We voted for a budget that would make Washington start living within its means. Even the President's own chief of staff has said that in 5 years Medicare is going broke.

However, it's been 800 days since our friends in the Senate have passed a budget. And they have nine House-passed jobs bills sitting in their hands, but they refuse to act on any of them.

A recent poll shows that only 17 percent of mothers believe that their children will have a better life in the future. At every townhall meeting I ask participants whether they think their grandchildren will live a better quality of life than they live. The response is slim.

If Congress is going to be asked to raise the debt ceiling, we must have a long-term plan to fix Washington's spending problem. House Republicans have made our demands clear. We will not raise the debt ceiling without spending cuts larger than an increase in the debt ceiling. We will not raise the debt ceiling without structural reforms that restrain further spending and guarantee that we don't get into this mess again. And I am not interested in a temporary band-aid. We have already voted "no" on raising our debt limit without significant cuts and reforms.

□ 1030

We will not support a plan that raises taxes on hardworking Americans. We didn't get into this problem because taxes are too low. We are in this situation because of runaway spending and the failed economic policies of this administration.

We need to move forward and solve this crisis in a responsible way.

#### HONORING FREDRICK DOUGLAS WILLIAMS III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the accomplishments of Mr. Frederick Douglas Williams III of Selma, Alabama, a great American and a trailblazing Alabamian.

After more than 50 years in the floral business, Mr. Fred D. Williams III retired on June 30, 2011. A fixture in the Selma community for more than five decades, Fred Williams has provided his floral expertise to countless families for weddings, graduations and other special occasions in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama and throughout the Southeast. Fred's Flower and Gift Shop opened on Octo-

ber 15, 1956, and served as a vital part of the Selma community.

Fred Williams comes from a family of public servants and entrepreneurs. His parents were pillars in the City of Selma and served as role models for the entire community. His mother, Ms. Mary Ellen Richardson Williams, was a beloved educator; and his father, Fred D. Williams, Jr., was a wise and generous business owner. His father owned J.H. Williams & Sons Funeral Home, established in 1905 and still in operation today in Selma, Alabama. The Williams family were pioneers in a time when African American businesses were few or nonexistent. The opening of Fred's Flower and Gift Shop was an extension of his family legacy.

Fred Williams spent most of his formative years in Selma. He moved with his family to Richmond, Virginia, in the 1950s where he graduated from Maggie L. Walker High School. He then went on to attend the historic Stillman College in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. After graduation, he returned to his hometown of Selma and opened his flower shop in 1956.

For 45 years, Fred Williams was married to Martha J. Williams, who passed away on July 15, 2003. Their marriage was blessed with two children: Kay Frances Williams, who is married to Earl Johnson of Alexandria, Virginia; and Kimberly Joyce Williams, who is married to John Dylan of Bloomington, Minnesota. He has two beautiful granddaughters: McKenzie, who is 13; and Madison, who is 7.

For over 50 years, as Selma's premier florist, Fred Williams shared his creative genius, creating exquisite floral arrangements, providing supreme service to his loyal customers, and serving as an inspiration to all small businesses. Fred Williams is loved, admired, and highly respected by the entire Selma community, and I am honored to call him "Uncle Fred." His retirement will be a great loss to the business community, but I know that his commitment to bettering Selma will remain unwavering.

On a personal note, I grew up in the Williams household, and his daughter Kim and I were childhood best friends. In fact, there is not a childhood memory that I have that does not include the Williams family or my many visits to Fred's Florist. Because of the closeness of my family that we shared with the Williams family over these many years, I have always affectionately known him as "Uncle Fred."

Through his business and philanthropy, Uncle Fred has made an indelible mark on the community in Selma, Alabama, and I am extremely grateful for the part that he played in raising me. I would like to sincerely thank him for his fortitude and over 50 years of service. The community of Selma and the State of Alabama appreciates your public service and commitment to business excellence.

Therefore, I, TERRI SEWELL, Representative to the United States Congress from the Seventh District of Alabama, do hereby recognize Mr. Fred D. Williams III for his numerous contributions to the City of Selma, Alabama. I ask those present today to join me in honoring Fred D. Williams III for his retirement and commending him for his many achievements on behalf of the State of Alabama.

#### THE DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I came to the House floor today to talk about the big deal. Every time I open up a newspaper, Mr. Speaker, this week it's been talking about the big deal, the big deal that's going on at the White House.

I want to set the record straight here today. The big deal happened right here on the floor of this House, when the only budget that's passed in all of Washington, D.C., all year long, cutting \$6 trillion in spending, was passed by this body, Mr. Speaker. That's the big deal—\$6 trillion agreed upon by this United States House of Representatives. Now, I know down at the White House they are talking about the big deal is 3 trillion in spending cuts, 6 trillion, Mr. Speaker. The big deal started right here now.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am a big fan of the open process that we have had in this House where every single Member of the United States House of Representatives come here and have their voices heard, offer their ideas, offer their opinions, and that happened in our voting process, Mr. Speaker.

I have a vote tally here from that week of voting on the budget. The Congressional Black Caucus budget came to the floor of this House, was debated, considered. It received 103 affirmative votes, 103. The Republican Study Committee budget came, debated in this House, 119 affirmative budgets. The Progressive Caucus budget came, 77 affirmative votes. Congressman VAN HOLLEN brought a Democratic alternative, 166 affirmative votes.

The only budget to get 218 votes, Mr. Speaker, was the House Budget Committee budget with 235 "yes" votes, 235. Now, that's a budget that was laid out line item by line item by line item, so absolutely everyone in America could see what it was that we were doing to achieve these savings to change the direction of our borrowing and our spending.

Now, no one even introduced the President's budget in this body, Mr. Speaker. No one offered it. Now the Senate brought the President's budget to a vote, and it was defeated 0-97. The United States Senate, Mr. Speaker, defeated the President's budget 0-97.

Now, they brought the House-passed budget up over there. They couldn't pass that either. It received 40 affirma-

tive votes, but they still couldn't pass the budget. As my colleague said earlier, it's been over 800 days since the Senate has passed a budget.

Now, I know the President has come back out and he has talked about some alternatives, some things he would do differently from the budget that he offered in February, differently from that budget that got zero votes in the Senate. And in a Budget Committee hearing the other day, we asked the Congressional Budget Office Director what's the score on the President's new plan. And the office told us, Mr. Speaker, that they can't score a speech. I think that's true.

There is a lot of talk in this town, but there is a not a lot of line item by line item by line item putting your name, your money, and your vote by where your priorities are. But this House did it, Mr. Speaker. We are the only body in town to do it. It's the only budget in town to pass and it's the big deal, \$6 trillion over 10 years to help try to get this country back on track.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, it did it by not cutting one penny from the benefits that seniors are receiving today, not one, so that seniors, even those over 55, Mr. Speaker, would continue to receive the same Medicare program that seniors are receiving today; so those over 55 would receive the same Social Security benefits as those folks who are receiving those benefits today. I cannot believe, when I open up the front page of the newspaper, I hear folks talking about Social Security benefits might not go out the door, veterans benefits might not go out the door.

Mr. Speaker, we have a plan that this body passed that gets those checks out the door. It is responsible in that it cut \$6 trillion in spending. It is responsible in that it bends the budget curve going forward over the next 10 years and it gets those checks out the door.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's going to happen over the next 3 weeks. I don't know where this town is going to go. This town is a tough town to predict. But I know that this House has put its mark in the sand. This House has brought every single Budget Committee alternative that was offered to this floor. We voted on each and every one, and the only one to pass this House was the big deal, \$6 trillion, and it gets our seniors and our troops paid on August 3.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to rally around that and let's give the American people what they deserve, and that's some certainty in the budget process.

□ 1040

#### THE UNEMPLOYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, as we have the opportunity to

debate whether or not our brave young men and women are fighting in wars in foreign lands that have not been approved by the Congress, as we talk in terms of trillions of dollars as to the national debt that we have acquired and think of ways that we can reduce it, and as we look at our revenue code and recognize that it is just so totally unfair and should be reformed and revamped, millions of people have awakened this morning unable to really consider these important issues because they are without work. Millions of people have lost their self-esteem, have lost their jobs, and some have lost their health insurance. Many have lost their homes, others have pulled their kids out of college, cars have been lost for inability to pay, and creditors have been just nightmares to them.

Included in this vast amount of people are African Americans, many who have served this country, hardworking people that find themselves not at the 9.2 so-called unemployment rate but at a 16 percent unemployment rate. And this doesn't take into account the millions of people, and especially African Americans, that know that there are no jobs for them. And to be going to the unemployment office just to be counted among the faceless unemployed doesn't make sense.

Included among them are veterans that have fought for this country. Some have come home with physical and mental problems, but they have not received the support or the transitional aid that's necessary for them to assimilate in a work market that has no jobs. So many of these people have worked in local establishments, in our butcher shops, our cleaners and our shoe repair, and they are without work. So many of them are women that have toiled and raised their families without the assistance of anyone else, and they too are without work and without hope.

As we think about these people and think about reduction of our spending, we find that Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security seems to be constantly referred to as entitlements, and people talk about that it has to be protected. So many mayors and Governors are talking about how they too have to cut their budgets. And so many African Americans, for reasons that I do not have to go into, have sought public service as a way of life because of the security that's involved in it. And so when we talk about cutting the budget and cutting the services that are provided, we're talking about a larger number of minorities that will be losing their jobs as a result of budget cutting, whether we're talking about teachers or policemen or clerks that work in the city halls or the communities that have Governors that have slashed back their jobs, but certainly as we talk about Medicaid and Medicare, we're talking about hospitals. And all of you know, no matter where you come from, that you see a large number of African Americans working

in these institutions trying to get an education to move forward because we know of the large number of health care providers that we need.

We are proud in the city of New York to say that we have been able to train and educate a larger percentage of physicians than all of the teaching hospitals that we have throughout our great country, and we're proud to do that. All of a sudden, we hear that some \$300 billion will be cut from the hospitals that provide this care. And it's not just by the beneficiaries that you and I know they need this care and they will be put in harm's way, but also we have to acknowledge that many of the people that work in these hospitals, a large number of them being minorities, they too will be released to join the unemployed.

So while I'm praying for our spiritual leaders to protect the vulnerable, please understand that every time we make a cut in the budget, we're cutting someone's job, and they will join the hopeless and the unemployed.

#### OPPOSING THE COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my ongoing concerns about human rights abuses in Colombia and to oppose any consideration of the pending United States-Colombia Free Trade Agreement until tangible and sustained progress is seen on the ground. Colombia has a longstanding legacy of serious and pervasive human rights violations. Trade unionists, members of indigenous groups, and human rights defenders have been particular targets for violence. Despite some positive rhetoric by the Santos administration about improving protection of human rights, serious abuses continue.

In one recent incident reported by Human Rights Watch, seven people were massacred in southern Colombia on July 2, reportedly by FARC guerrillas. On June 25, another eight people were killed also in the southern part of the country. In both cases, children were among those killed. According to Human Rights Watch, there were 17 such massacres between January and May, 2011, resulting in a total of 76 deaths—a 21 percent increase over the same time period in 2010.

Several members of indigenous groups have been targeted and killed in recent weeks as well, ranging from children to prominent community leaders. Human Rights Watch reports that 14 members of indigenous communities have been killed in 2011 in Antioquia Department alone. Other indigenous leaders have been threatened, and dozens of families have been displaced. The Colombian Government has to act immediately to ensure a thorough investigation into these horrific

crimes and to finally end the cycle of impunity. Further, the government must take immediate steps to protect indigenous communities and other particularly vulnerable groups, as human rights groups have repeatedly demanded.

Labor leaders and trade unionists also continue to be victims of serious abuses. Though the recently agreed to Labor Action Plan commits the government, at least in writing, to take several important steps to prevent and punish these human rights violations, we have yet to see any sort of tangible progress on the ground. With recently published statistics showing that Colombia again led the world in trade unionist deaths in 2010, it is critical that we see a real reduction in violence before we even consider passing and implementing a trade deal.

The Labor Action Plan is not legally binding under the FTA before us. If violence and impunity continue, the United States will have no mechanism for delaying or halting implementation of the free trade agreement. The Labor Action Plan fails to require sustained, meaningful and measurable results. Once we enact the FTA, we lose any ability to force the Colombian Government to produce tangible change.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support the NAFTA-style trade model illustrated in the three pending Bush-negotiated free trade agreements because so-called free trade has proven destructive to the American economy and harmful to workers both in the United States and abroad. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that implementing the Colombia and South Korea free trade agreements would increase the U.S. trade deficit by \$16.8 billion and eliminate or displace 214,000 U.S. jobs. Particularly at a time when we should be focused on job creation, I strongly oppose all three FTAs, which jeopardize more jobs.

□ 1050

Finally, I find it particularly concerning that we are considering implementing an FTA with Colombia in the absence of demonstrated progress on human rights and workers rights.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot turn a blind eye to ongoing abuses, and we should not consider the trade agreement until these issues are fully resolved.

#### COLOMBIAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to address the House and the American people regarding the Colombia free trade agreement and the negative impacts it will have on working families in the United States as well as Colombia.

Quite frankly, I am stumped as to why Congress is even considering this

trade agreement. Colombia is the most dangerous place in the world to be a union worker. This year, 17 trade unionists were assassinated as of mid-June. Last year, 51 trade unionists were killed in Colombia.

As a Member of Congress, I have traveled to Colombia to see labor conditions there firsthand. We simply can't afford to approve an FTA with a nation as unsafe as Colombia which can't even enforce its own laws.

Like many of my colleagues, I was glad to see that the Obama administration negotiated a Labor Action Plan with the Colombian Government. Both morally and economically, it is imperative that Colombia address some of these concerns regarding human and labor rights for workers. The administration says the Labor Action Plan has been met. The problem is that the Labor Action Plan doesn't go far enough.

Many of my colleagues might question whether labor conditions in a foreign country could really impact job prospects of their constituents here in the United States. Well, when you consider that for years American workers have been competing for jobs with nations that have weaker labor and environmental standards, it is no wonder that we are losing jobs here in the United States.

Let me be blunt: if joining a union means putting your life on the line, there is no freedom. There is no fair competition. Without fair competition, we will see even more American jobs shipped overseas. I think we can all agree that the last thing that this country needs right now is to lose more jobs.

Let me be clear. I am committed to trade. Trade can benefit our Nation, our businesses, and our working families. In fact, I am a member of President Obama's Export Council, and the goal there is to double American exports in 5 years, not to export American jobs.

The fact of the matter is that the Colombia free trade agreement doesn't help American working families. It really benefits transnational corporations. These transnational corporations already repress Colombian workers. Nothing under this agreement makes the lives of Colombian workers better. Nothing under this agreement makes the lives of U.S. workers better. They don't get an equal share of the benefits of this free trade agreement.

Why are we rushing to approve an agreement when workers in Colombia don't even want it? Even worse, once the agreement is in effect, the U.S. loses our most important leverage to see that the human rights situation improves in Colombia. So I ask again: why the rush?

Congress should wait to see if Colombia institutes the Labor Action Plan, as they have promised. After that, we can determine if conditions for working families in Colombia actually improve. The Labor Action Plan is a good

first step, but it won't fix Colombia's problems overnight.

You would hope that an international trade agreement would bring jobs with it. To give my colleagues some idea why there are problems with the Colombia FTA, the U.S. International Trade Commission doesn't predict that the Colombia FTA would create jobs. Now, the U.S. International Trade Commission always predicts very high and lofty job creation numbers for trade agreements, but even they are skeptical. That alone should be evidence for my colleagues that now is not the time for the Colombia free trade agreement.

Congress should be focused on creating jobs, and this trade agreement doesn't pass the smell test, although the Colombia FTA does stink when you consider that it is hardworking middle class families who will pay the price with this unfair trade agreement.

The Colombia FTA will kill jobs, drive down American wages, and drive small American companies that face unfair competition out of business. We can do better. I urge my colleagues to stop settling for not so bad and pursue a trade policy that means prosperity for everyone.

#### GREAT LAKES THREATENED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are one of the most overlooked and unappreciated national assets. They are the largest source of freshwater in the world and contain 20 percent of the freshwater on Earth.

The Great Lakes face many challenges. Agricultural runoff, sewer overflows, and other pollution makes its way into the Great Lakes from across the northeast and the Midwest, leading to unsafe water quality and public health concerns. Also, invasive species hitch a ride in the ballast water of oceangoing vessels, like the zebra mussel, or swim up the Mississippi River, like the Asian carp, and threaten to alter the lakes' fragile, closed ecosystem.

In recognition of the importance of the Great Lakes and to combat the threats to their health, in 2010, 11 Federal agencies announced a plan to implement the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, an ambitious action plan to remove toxins, clean up the lakes, and protect them from further pollution and invasive species.

I am concerned that funding for this important program has been uneven. It was funded at \$475 million in fiscal year 2010, fell to \$300 million this year, and is funded at just \$250 million in the fiscal year 2012 Interior Appropriations bill the House will consider next week.

However, the mere existence of this special cleanup funding is evidence that Congress and the administration recognize the Great Lakes are a unique natural resource that deserves protection.

In 1969, the Cuyahoga River famously caught fire, symbolizing the abysmal water quality of the water in the Great Lakes basin. Legislation from the Clean Water Act and the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative has gone a long way toward returning the lakes to good health. However, the Great Lakes face a new threat beyond water quality: the diversion or removal of water from the Great Lakes basin.

In recognition that due to national and global trends, the value of freshwater will increase, as will the incentive to remove it from the Great Lakes, the eight States that border the Great Lakes entered into a compact with each other and two Canadian provinces on the use of Great Lakes water. Congress ratified the agreement, and it was signed into law by President Bush in 2008.

Among the most important provisions of the compact are restriction on the removal or diversion of water from the Great Lakes basin. The underlying goal was to prevent any one State from plundering the freshwater in the Great Lakes.

So it is with great concern that I learned yesterday that the Ohio State legislature had passed legislation to permit businesses to remove 5 million gallons of water a day from Lake Erie. In New York, we are about to adopt a far more reasonable limit by requiring a permit for the withdrawal of 100,000 gallons per day. The Ohio bill, if adopted, would violate the spirit of the historic Great Lakes compact and force a race to the bottom among the eight signatory States, which will result in an accelerated level of diversions and further reduce the water level in the Great Lakes beyond the impact of Ohio businesses. Such an outcome is unacceptable.

The consequence of such a large scale removal of water from the Great Lakes basin would have a devastating environmental and economic impact in my community. Water levels in the Great Lakes are already on the decline, and the additional large-scale removal of water will lead to algae blooms and reduced water quality, negatively impacting aquatic wildlife and the associated fishing industry, and reduce recreational boating and commercial shipping activities.

In my community of western New York, this action would threaten the progress we are making in Buffalo toward reclaiming the waterfront as an engine of recreational and economic opportunities.

I wrote to Ohio Governor John Kasich yesterday encouraging that he conclude, as have his predecessors Bob Taft and George Voinovich, that this legislation poses a danger to the health of our greatest regional asset, and suggesting that he veto this ill-advised legislation. I hope that he will heed that advice so advocates for the Great Lakes can focus attention on the restoration initiative and on cleaning up the lakes instead of having to fight to

protect them from massive withdrawals of freshwater for profit when the issue was supposed to have been settled years ago.

Now more than ever, it is critical that the Great Lakes remain vigilant and united against the threat of water diversion.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Dr. George Dillard, Peachtree City Christian Church, Peachtree City, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, give us the strength to prove ourselves a people mindful of Your favor, gladly doing Your will. Bless our Nation with individuals who give honorable service, who live with integrity and govern with honesty.

Save us from prejudice, confusion, pride, arrogance, and evil. Help us that we might see truth and seek it. Defend liberty and fashion a united people out of many people and languages.

Grant us wisdom for those entrusted with the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace, and through obedience to Your law we may show Your praise among the nations. Remind us, though the rule of law is the foundation of our society, laws without justice are empty words. In prosperity fill us with thankfulness; in trouble remind us to trust in You. Thank You for those brave individuals who stand in the gap protecting our lives and liberty.

Lead us to faith in You, to good character, knowledge, discipline, patience, and love for others. Draw us together as one Nation in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POMPEO 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR.  
GEORGE DILLARD

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank Pastor Dillard for coming today and leading us in prayer. I want everyone to know that he loves his country and he prays for each and every one of us every day, as well as the other leaders of this country.

This is his fourth time to be here, only the first time as long as I have been in Congress; but his heart is to pray for each one of us and our leadership.

If you ask in Peachtree City where Pastor Dillard is located, they will tell you the big church with the red roof. But it's a big church with a big heart. He leads three services a day, and you can't say that he doesn't have some type of service for you, because he has a traditional service, he has a more jazzed up service, and then he has a coffee house service where he sits around and talks to the members of his congregation about things that they face every day in life.

So again I want to thank and recognize Pastor Dillard for coming and sharing with us today and for the heart that he has for his country and for each and every one of us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

JOB, JOB, JOB

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

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, hardly a week goes by without this administration promulgating some new regulation that burdens the American people and our economy.

This week it's an environmental regulation that will drive up energy costs. According to a report by the SBA, regulations cost \$1.7 trillion annually. OMB has reported that regulations cost \$62 billion annually.

Regardless of which agency's number we believe, it doesn't matter. Both numbers are too high and hurt economic growth at a time when unemployment is too high.

Let me make this real simple and settle this argument between these agencies. The cost of regulations is not

simply a job, it's jobs, and every job has a human face.

If more spending and more regulations meant more jobs, then this President's policies would have produced the strongest economic recovery in our Nation's history. Unfortunately, it's made things worse.

TAKE CARE OF PEOPLE IN THIS  
COUNTRY

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

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, it is time that we get back to talking about what people in this country really need: the chance to live a healthy, prosperous life. Cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security should not be on the table at all.

After reckless spending sprees, Republicans want to balance the budget on the backs of our most vulnerable citizens. This is unconscionable, and I will not be silent nor complicit. We need to take care of people in this country, not promote policies that perpetuate a cycle of poverty.

Communities like those in the 11th District of Ohio need jobs. The Democrats have introduced many job-creating measures. The other side has not, and we are still waiting for the jobs Republicans promised.

SCARE TACTICS WILL NOT LEAD  
TO DEBT SOLUTION

(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. Madam Speaker, rather than negotiate in good faith with the Republican leadership, the current administration has resorted to scare tactics. On Tuesday, the President threatened to withhold benefit checks for Social Security recipients and disabled veterans.

Threatening seniors, along with not paying our military, is a sad example of irresponsible political rhetoric. The American people have had enough of political games and threats. Liberals want to increase revenues, which means more taxes, killing jobs. The challenge is not too little revenue; it's too much spending.

The American people voted to see meaningful spending reform that really reduces the deficit. House Republicans have passed numerous bills that cut spending, curb government growth, and encourage job growth. Cut the spending. Do not impose new taxes which kill jobs created by small businesses.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy to the people of India who yesterday suffered another terrorist attack on the people of Mumbai.

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP F.C. BARNES

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Bishop F.C. Barnes, a great friend and distinguished American who has passed away at the age of 82.

Fifty-two years ago, Bishop Barnes founded Red Budd Holy Church in Rocky Mount, North Carolina, and continued as senior pastor until his death. During his pastorate, the church congregation grew from a few members to more than 800.

Bishop Barnes was a world-renowned vocalist known for his extraordinary musical talent. He recorded many productions, including the award winning "Rough Side of the Mountain."

The loss of this great saint of God is irreplaceable. His enormous contribution to Red Budd Holy Church, Edgecombe County and, indeed, the Nation are deeply appreciated and recognized on this day.

Bishop Barnes leaves a strong and loving family, including his church family, who will miss him so much. Their loss is heaven's gain.

□ 1210

EPA STIMULUS FAILURE

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, briefly, here are some examples of why the \$1 trillion in government stimulus spending bill failed to hold down unemployment or reinvigorate our economy:

Over the past few years, the EPA has spent more than \$27 million on grants to foreign countries. This includes funds for Breathe Easy, Jakarta, an Indonesian campaign to improve air quality. Now, President Obama may have some affection for a city he lived in as a child, but is that any reason to send them Federal stimulus dollars?

There have been 65 grants handed out since the stimulus bill was signed; six of these grants went to Russia and ten grants went to China. We already owe China interest on our debt. Why on Earth are we giving them grants to keep their own country clean? The Energy and Commerce Committee has launched an investigation into this spending. We need to know how much has been spent and if the EPA has further plans to send money overseas.

Our growing debt is hurting job growth. This is just another sad case of Federal spending wasted on projects that do nothing for the American economy.

JOB

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, it's been 27 weeks since the Republicans took

control of the House, and they have yet to bring one single jobs bill to this floor.

In San Bernardino County, my constituents face a 13 percent unemployment rate. But instead of taking swift action to create new jobs, Republicans are threatening the loss of countless more jobs by taking the debt ceiling negotiation to another brink. And why are they doing this? To protect billionaires, millionaires, and corporations that ship jobs overseas.

We all know that the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy have failed—have failed—to create any new jobs here at home. And they are threatening Social Security and Medicare to protect these unneeded tax breaks, which is wrong. No taxes, no jobs. No taxes, no jobs.

Let's come together on a plan that creates jobs, protects our seniors and the middle class, and do it responsibly to deal with the deficit.

#### EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL BOB DURBIN AND HIS WIFE, DIANA

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

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Speaker, this past week, a great American family retired from service to our Nation. Lieutenant General Bob Durbin and his wife, Diana, spent 36 years in service to our country in the United States Army working with soldiers and their families. On behalf of the United States, I want to thank them both for that service.

This is also something I can speak to personally. Twenty-five years ago, General Durbin was my instructor in leadership at the United States Military Academy at West Point. He taught me there that it's always right to do the harder thing and not take the easier path. He reminded me that when times get tough, as they are here in America today, that real leaders can make real change. And Diana taught me that families with Christ in their hearts can make real changes in our world.

Bob had many assignments during his 36 years in the Army, including command of Kansas' own Big Red One at Fort Riley, Kansas. He was also the first general assigned the daunting task of training the Afghanistan army and police force so that Afghans may live in peace and security as we do in America.

Bob and Diana, thank you for your service to our Nation. There is no higher praise I can give you than to say, "Job well done."

#### HONORING INDIANA STATE REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM H. CRAWFORD

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of Representative Bill Crawford, America's longest-serving African American State legislator. Crawford, who is retiring in 2012, has served Indianapolis' 98th District with distinction since 1972.

During his tenure, he served as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, where he left a lasting imprint by crafting budgets that afforded every child an equal opportunity to receive a quality education and every minority and woman-owned business an opportunity to compete.

Crawford has also fought to ensure workers on public contracts reflect the communities where the work is performed. A believer in the power of redemption, Crawford authored Indiana's "second chance" law, under which one who pays their debt to society and has been trouble-free for 8 years can have their criminal record sealed to ensure they can find employment.

Crawford has been called both "the dean" and "the conscience" of Indiana's black caucus, as his metric for gauging the wisdom of any action has been simple: Is it right? Not safe, not popular, but right.

#### "JULY IS JOBS" INITIATIVE

(Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, for months now here in Washington we have debated spending, the debt ceiling, and job creation. But for generations, American businessmen and -women have shaped not only our national economy, but the world's economy and made our country a symbol of strength and ingenuity. To honor that spirit, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in listening to those small business owners and job creators who truly drive our economy.

That is why we have launched our "July is Jobs" initiative, where we ask the residents of South Carolina's First Congressional District to share with me, through social media and email, their ideas on job creation and moving our economy forward. They are the ones on the ground every day trying to grow their businesses, hire new employees, and navigate what is best for their families.

At the end of the month, I will share a selection of these ideas on the House floor, and I am 100 percent certain that we will learn a thing or two from those job creators. Because, at the end of the day, this isn't about the left or the right or Washington politics; it's about them.

#### LOUISIANA COASTAL WETLANDS

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank President Obama and the administration for recognizing

how important Louisiana wetlands are not only to Louisiana citizens but also to the country. President Obama put \$35.8 million into his budget for coastal restoration projects in Louisiana.

Madam Speaker, I also rise today to implore the Republican leadership to right the wrong in zeroing out the money that the President put in for our coastal restoration. The Federal Government has made over \$150 billion through offshore oil and gas revenues, primarily from oil and gas exploration off the coast of Louisiana. Louisiana has lost 25 square miles of coastal wetlands every year, or one football field every hour.

More than 80 percent of the Nation's offshore oil and gas is produced off Louisiana's coast, and 25 percent of the Nation's foreign and domestic oil comes ashore on Louisiana roads and waterways. The coastal zone also contains the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port, which handles 13 percent of the Nation's daily oil imports.

Madam Speaker, I would just implore the Republican leadership to do the right thing and restore the money for Louisiana's wetlands.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT NATHAN R. BEYERS

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today, shortly after Independence Day, to pay tribute to a brave young man who lost his life defending our country. Twenty-four-year-old Sergeant Nathan Beyers was killed in Baghdad on July 7 when his convoy was attacked by an IED. He died supporting Operation New Dawn in Iraq. He died protecting our country. He died fighting for a better, freer, and safer America.

While we mourn the loss of this American patriot, I rise today to remind everyone that his memory will never be forgotten. We shall remember his legacy of love, sacrifice, and patriotism today and every day.

Sergeant Beyers leaves his wife, Vanessa, an infant daughter in Spokane, Washington, as well as his parents, family, and friends who loved him deeply.

He also leaves behind something that is intangible: A legacy of honor for the bravery he displayed and the life he gave in the name of America.

May God bless the Beyers family and all of the brave men and women who have answered America's call to freedom.

#### RECOGNIZING THE CREW OF THE AMTRAK DOWNEASTER

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to

recognize the crew of the Amtrak Downeaster who quickly guided 112 passengers to safety after the train was involved in an accident this week in Maine. With the engine engulfed in flames, two conductors and one engineer reacted calmly and professionally to evacuate the train. Although the tragedy sadly took the life of a truck driver whose vehicle was on the tracks, no one in the train was seriously injured.

This accident could have been much, much worse, and in part we have the crew of the Downeaster to thank that all of these passengers escaped without a serious injury.

Over the last 10 years, the Downeaster has made 30,000 trips between Portland and Boston and transported 3½ million passengers without a serious incident. And the next morning, the train left Portland on schedule and arrived in Boston 3 minutes early.

We should all take a minute today to think about the men and women who work in our transportation system, who day in and day out make sure we are safe, whether we are driving in our own cars or riding on a bus, plane, train, or, like my hometown, a ferry.

□ 1220

#### IT'S TIME FOR CONGRESS TO DELIVER

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, our economy has seen better days. Our national unemployment rate is over 9 percent, and America is borrowing \$188 million every hour. We need to get serious about cutting spending and growing this economy.

We can start by enacting free trade agreements. That will create over 250,000 American jobs. Reforming the Tax Code will encourage companies to create jobs and stay in America, cutting frivolous lawsuits and scaling back needless regulation to give small business owners a chance to grow and succeed.

Finally, we must reduce the debt and balance the budget. The American people don't want more rhetoric; they want results. It is time for Congress to deliver.

#### DEBT CEILING MUST BE RAISED

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I have never been more concerned about our Nation's economic security and future. Just this week, Moody's warned that the U.S. may lose our top-notch AAA credit rating if we fail to increase our Nation's debt ceiling. Economists say that if we fail to do so, it will put not only our national capital markets in turmoil, but the capital markets internationally in turmoil. It will hurt

American wages and jobs. The stock market will tank.

A letter signed by hundreds of senior company executives and organizations agrees. It said, and I quote: "Treasury securities influence the cost of financing not just for companies, but more importantly for mortgages, auto loans, credit cards, and student debt."

And yet some Members of this body have said that under no circumstance whatsoever will they ever vote to raise the Nation's debt ceiling. However heartfelt this may be, it is nothing short of a threat to commit economic suicide.

#### WASHINGTON'S IRRESPONSIBLE AND RECKLESS SPENDING

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

Mr. HURT. Madam Speaker, today I rise to address the urgent need to rein in the out-of-control government spending that has led this Nation to a dire debt crisis that is hindering job creation and threatens the very future of our country.

The people of Virginia's Fifth Congressional District understand the importance of this issue. I continually hear from my constituents—Republicans, Democrats, and independents—who say if we are serious about turning this economy around and preserving this country for our children and grandchildren, we must put an immediate end to Washington's irresponsible and reckless spending.

Our Nation is now facing a \$14 trillion debt and \$1.5 trillion deficit. We are borrowing over \$4 billion a day, and over 40 cents on every dollar we spend.

As the President continues to request an increase in the debt limit, while remaining steadfast in his call for hundreds of billions of job-crushing tax hikes, we are reminded of the need to put in place both short- and long-term fixes that will help restore fiscal discipline in our Nation's Capital once and for all. We need to make significant and immediate cuts to reduce our debt and deficit now. We need to put in place spending caps that limit spending as a percentage of GDP, and we need to pass a balanced budget amendment to force the government to live within its means.

#### HARDER YET MAY BE THE FIGHT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, C.A. Tindley was right when he proclaimed, "Harder yet may be the fight."

When they tried to privatize Social Security, we fought and held them back. We fought the good fight. When they tried to minimize the CHIP program, Children's Health Insurance Program, we fought the good fight and we held them back. When they tried to de-

stabilize Medicaid, we fought the good fight and we held them back.

They are now trying to minimize and voucherize Medicare. We will fight the good fight. We will hold them back because C.A. Tindley is right:

"Harder yet may be the fight;  
right may often yield to might;  
wickedness a while may reign;  
Satan's cause may seem to gain.  
But there's a God that rules above,  
with hand of power and heart of love."

When we're right, He'll help us fight. Harder yet may be the fight, but we will hold them back.

#### COMMENDING BECK PRIDE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to bring attention to an amazing program that exists to repay our returning war veterans by helping them to readjust to life as a civilian.

The Beck PRIDE Program is an outreach of Arkansas State University that helps young, combat-wounded veterans achieve their higher education and other post-military goals. Beck PRIDE provides free mental and physical rehabilitation services, as well as academic counseling and financial aid. Both veterans and their families are referred to organizations throughout Jonesboro that give them the help they need during this critical time of adjustment.

The Beck PRIDE Program is nationally recognized for its success in improving the quality of life of returning military personnel and reintegrating them into the community.

In light of the great sacrifices that these veterans make for our country, it is only right to help them readjust to the way of life they served to protect. I am honored such a program exists in my district.

#### JOB CREATION

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, Americans are losing faith in our ability to get things done on their behalf. Today, that means addressing two problems at once: our long-term deficit and our unemployment crisis. The truth is these are two challenges, and these two challenges are two sides of the very same coin. So when Republicans say raising government revenue is off the table, I suppose that is why for months they refused to embrace one of the very best revenue raisers there is: job creation.

Our deficit exploded when 8 million Americans lost their jobs in 2008. With 14 million jobless today, no debt deal of any size will work without a focus on jobs. Investing now in infrastructure,

in energy, in education will not only create jobs; it will pay back dividends in the future. That's because putting Americans back to work, supporting their families, boosting productivity, and, yes, paying taxes is the government revenue raiser Republicans should join Democrats to get behind without delay.

#### REPUBLICANS HAVE A PLAN

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, the question on everyone's mind in this Nation today is: where are the jobs? And, more importantly, what is Washington going to do about it?

Well, Republicans have a plan. We want to open new markets to exports, make the Tax Code fairer and flatter, rein in regulations, and reform government spending.

But when we look across the negotiation table, what do we see? Nothing. We hear a lot of speeches and that a lot of things are on the table; but, of course, there is no plan from the Democrats. No plan to read, to score, or to negotiate.

To this point, the director of the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office recently said: "We don't estimate speeches."

So, Mr. President, where is your plan?

I implore my friends across the aisle and across the Rotunda to get off the stump. Give us a plan. Compile those nice words into legislation so we can get Americans back to work.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, the Financial Services appropriation soon due on the floor will be contentious; but one section should be a piece of cake because it only requires Members to vote on the local budget of a city, the District of Columbia, already voted on and locally funded by the only elected officials accountable to voters and the only officials who have familiarity with that local budget.

I ask my colleagues to give the local budget of my city the same respect you demand for yours. Please do not tell local people how to spend local money. According to the Republican Study Group, its 10th Amendment task force intends, and I quote, "to disburse power from Washington back to re-

gions and States, local governments and individuals."

Your principle, please honor it.

□ 1230

#### SUPPORT THE FREE SUGAR ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, our government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. Yet, when it comes to our Nation's sugar policy, Washington has decided to implement price controls, which cost our country jobs. According to a Commerce Department study, for every job Washington protects by its antiquated sugar policy, three American manufacturing jobs are lost.

At a time of record unemployment, the last thing that we should do is maintain an outdated policy that hurts job creation here at home. In my district, the 10th District of Illinois, we have confectioners, family bakeries, family restaurants, and food makers who are forced to pay higher prices for sugar because of government price controls. If Washington removed these price controls, it would lower the cost of sugar and allow small businesses and confectioners to lower the price of goods and to hire more workers.

Today, I am asking that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in supporting the Free Sugar Act of 2011. This bipartisan bill will end Federal price controls on sugar and help to create jobs here at home.

#### TO REALIZE THE AMERICAN DREAM ONCE AGAIN

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, the best way to deal with this country's debt is to put people back to work. We've heard it from both sides of the aisle.

At the end of Bill Clinton's administration, this country had a surplus. Revenues exceeded expenses. There was job growth: 23 million people. But then, with George Bush, we lost 8 million jobs. We went into a huge deficit.

The best way to deal with that is to put people back to work. The President does have a plan, and we Democrats have a plan: innovate, educate and manufacture. Make it here in America. We will put people back to work.

Folks need to be able to realize the American Dream again, and that's what we are going to fight for every single day. We want to put people back to work. That will help take care of the debt.

#### REVIVING THE ECONOMY

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Madam Speaker, we all know that the Federal Government is spending too much money, that our national debt is too large and that we must make serious reductions to get our budget under control.

As our Nation's leaders continue today to debate the national debt, some in the Washington establishment are calling for greater Federal revenue by asking more Americans to sacrifice by sending more of their hard-earned money to the Federal Government in the name of higher taxes. Yet we all know that greater taxes on small business owners and families will not help the economy grow and will not put Americans back to work.

Tax, borrow, and spend policies do not create jobs. We cannot tax our way out of this debt. At a time when we continue to see record unemployment, taking more money from our job creators to pay for Washington's spending disease cannot be an option.

What we need, Madam Speaker, is a growing economy to bring in new revenue. By pursuing policies that reduce spending, keep taxes low and reduce regulatory burdens, we can help revive the economy and stabilize our Federal budgets.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in our efforts to protect senior citizens and Social Security.

Over the past few weeks, I have received hundreds of phone calls and letters from my constituents, urging me to protect Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

I have a question: What will happen to the millions of senior citizens and people living in poverty who rely on these programs?

It seems like the Republicans are focusing on giving tax breaks to those who need them the least. Currently, approximately 52 million Americans benefit from the Social Security program. According to the most recent statistics published by the AARP, one in six residents in New Jersey receives Social Security. In addition, statistics show that women rely more on Social Security than any other segment of our population.

Therefore, I urge my Republican colleagues to put aside their contempt for entitlement programs and to submit to doing what is best for the interests of the American people.

#### CLEAN ENERGY

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to remain competitive in the global economy, we must invest in clean energy innovation.

San Diego has 767 clean energy companies, and has become an innovation hub, especially in solar power, energy storage and advanced biofuels. According to the San Diego Association of Governments, the algae energy section alone—one energy section—provides the region with 410 direct jobs and \$108 million in economic activity each year.

Unfortunately, the appropriations bill we're voting on this week cuts solar energy research by more than one-third; decreases biomass research by \$33 million; and cuts \$80 million from funding for breakthrough domestic clean energy innovators.

We can't hold back the companies that have come up with the answers to our serious energy problems. I hope my colleagues will join me in fighting for cleantech and biotech innovation by opposing this damaging bill.

#### PUTTING PARTISANSHIP ASIDE TO CREATE JOBS FOR THIS NATION

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, we are now on day 191 of the new Congress. Sadly, I must report to the people of my congressional district and to this Nation that we have done absolutely nothing with regard to creating jobs. Rather than spending time trying to blame George Bush and Barack Obama, I think we ought to utilize every moment we have to create opportunities to work.

We are in a crisis: 9.2 unemployment overall, 16.2 African American unemployment. If you add what the Labor Department does, which is something called U-6, African American unemployment is at 30 percent.

This Congress owes it to this Nation to move the partisanship aside and to create jobs for this Nation.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2354 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337 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. 2354.

□ 1239

#### 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. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 13, 2011, the bill had been read through page 62, line 2.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairman, title V of the Energy and Water bill that is before us today robs Peter to pay Paul.

Title V takes funds which were appropriated 2½ years ago for transportation purposes and moves part of those funds to the Corps of Engineers in today's Energy and Water appropriations bill. Title V specifically rescinds all awarded but unobligated high-speed rail dollars from the Recovery and Reinvestment Act and moves those dollars to respond to the unprecedented flooding this spring in many States for work to be done as it is designed and executed by the Corps of Engineers.

Effectively this is a backhanded increase in allocation to the Energy and Water Subcommittee for this bill at the expense of transportation purposes.

I don't contend or even suggest that the Energy and Water bill is well-funded. In fact, the allocations for the Energy and Water Subcommittee and for the Transportation and HUD Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, are both totally inadequate. But I do object to killing projects in transportation that will create construction jobs in the severely depressed construction industry and provide a valuable transportation alternative in heavily congested corridors among our largest metropolitan areas all over the country. And I do absolutely support making the repairs to flood control systems as quickly as they can be designed and built. That's an obligation.

In my 20 years, 10½ years under Democratic Presidents, 9½ years under Republican Presidents and under the control in the Congress of either party—because it switched back and forth in those 20 years—we have dealt with natural disasters on a bipartisan basis, on an emergency basis, every single year. Most famously, that includes, in September '05, the Katrina disaster which resulted in \$15 billion for recovery of New Orleans and the gulf coast on an emergency and on a

totally bipartisan basis. But this section takes from projects planned, applied for and awarded but not yet obligated and kills those projects.

Roughly \$6 billion of the \$8 billion appropriated for intercity passenger rail and high-speed rail projects in the Recovery Act are already obligated, and half of those are already in construction. The Recovery Act itself allowed until the 30th of September of 2012, the end of the '12 fiscal year, to obligate those dollars. Of the roughly \$2 billion unobligated, 80 percent of those dollars arises from the single decision just 3 months ago of the Governor of Florida to refuse the \$1.6 billion previously applied for and awarded for a project to build true high-speed rail on a dedicated corridor between Orlando and Tampa.

Now, Orlando lies roughly equidistant from Jacksonville, Tampa and Miami. Those four, Jacksonville, Tampa, Miami and Orlando, are four of America's 40 largest metropolitan areas. All have over 1½ million people, all are growing by between 15 and 30 percent, and they are among our fastest growing metropolitan areas. They represent a prime example of the opportunity that high-speed rail offers in carefully selected high-population corridors around the country to reduce congestion and expedite travel.

When that money was refused by Florida, the Federal Rail Administration re-awarded the \$1.6 billion to projects in other States, including, as examples, in the Northeast Corridor, which carries half of all intercity rail passengers in America every day, nearly \$800 million for work in that Northeast Corridor, and that work would bring the speed up to 160 miles per hour in parts of New Jersey, and the work would be done in New York and New Jersey. So that is \$800 million.

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

Mr. OLVER. I ask unanimous consent to be given 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Secondly, in the high-speed corridors that are based on Chicago as their hub, to go to Detroit, to go to St. Louis, to go to Indianapolis, to go to Milwaukee, for equipment that will allow those high-speed corridors to function better.

Thirdly, in projects on the west coast as well. All of those projects are jeopardized by this provision in this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chair, I am opposed to the misguided cuts to high-speed rail funding in this bill that

will eliminate thousands of jobs, halt a large number of rail projects across the country—and we are way behind every other nation almost, industrialized nations, anyway—and hurt local and State economies. This is the latest in the majority's agenda that can best be described as penny-wise and pound-foolish.

In their Pledge to America, the majority made a promise to the American people. "We will fight efforts to use a national crisis for political gain," they declared. Sadly, that's what they're doing today. Using the tragedy of natural disasters in America's heartland as a political tool to try to eliminate a job creation program, one of the very few we have, is just wrong. Thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in economic investment are at stake, and yet this fight brought to us today is little more than an unnecessary ideological battle.

The high-speed and intercity passenger rail program is critical to our country's competitiveness. It puts Americans back to work, revitalizes our construction and manufacturing sectors, boosts the domestic economy, and helps end U.S. dependence on foreign oil. It is both unwise and ineffective to cut important funding from one project in order to pay for disaster relief. We are a Nation that should be able to both build for the future—in fact we must—and provide for our fellow citizens in need today.

High-speed rail creates jobs. Every \$1 billion of high-speed rail and intercity passenger rail construction funding supports 24,000 jobs. High-speed rail creates short-term jobs in construction, long-term jobs in ongoing maintenance and operation, and indirect jobs by providing regions with access to a larger labor pool and driving economic development.

In my home State of New York, the United States Conference of Mayors estimates at least 21,000 new jobs and \$1.1 billion in new wages with the construction of high-speed rail along the Empire Corridor from Buffalo to Albany.

High-speed rail also creates the economic corridors of the future. A high-speed rail line in western New York as currently planned would reduce travel time significantly and expand the western New York labor market to 955,562 workers. This would make us the 26th largest metro area in the Nation, and that means new businesses will be drawn to the area as we connect our cities to Montreal, Toronto, New York City and the rest of the eastern seaboard; and for the first time in many areas, we may even be able to go west.

In New York, high-speed rail will be our next Erie Canal. Nationally, it is rightfully being compared to our national highway system. Both spurred local development and brought millions of jobs to our State and the Nation. At this point in time, we must not let this opportunity slip away.

What's more, rescinding funds for high-speed rail now, after \$5.68 billion

have already been obligated by the Federal Railroad Administration, will negate the unprecedented work already being done by the FRA and its partners.

FRA, the States, Amtrak, and infrastructure-owning railroads have made significant progress in reaching service outcome agreements to ensure that intended project benefits are realized, while protecting the public's investment and the railroads' operating interests.

The attempt to rescind this money is nothing but an opportunistic attempt to gain politically from a human tragedy. The flooding that has occurred in our Nation's heartland is being used as an excuse to eliminate an investment in our transportation network of the future.

□ 1250

This is morally reprehensible and economically irresponsible.

If we are to be a competitive global economy in the years to come, we must dedicate ourselves to building the infrastructure that we will need to compete. To rescind these funds now after so much progress has been made and at a time when investments in our own infrastructure and our country are so sorely needed is quite simply an act of foolishness.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the rescinding of unobligated high-speed rail funds in the bill that we are considering today.

During the full committee markup of the 2012 Energy and Water appropriations bill, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN offered an amendment providing \$1.028 billion in emergency funding to the Army Corps of Engineers to repair damage caused by recent storms and floods and to prepare for future disaster events. It makes sense to spend money on that; we have always given money for emergencies. But the funding is offset in the chairman's amendment by a rescission of all the remaining unobligated high-speed rail funding that was originally approved in the American Recovery Act.

The language of the amendment would rescind all unobligated high-speed rail funding as opposed to just \$1.028 billion to be spent for the emergency. This provision jeopardizes several important projects that are already underway, already in the planning stages, that support good jobs and will make long-overdue improvements to our rail system.

Last May, the Department of Transportation awarded some of these high-speed rail funds for major improvements on the Northeast Corridor, such as \$449 million for catenary improvements, which would allow trains to reach 160 miles per hour on certain seg-

ments, and \$294 million for the Harold Interlocking in Queens, which would reduce delays for Amtrak and on the Long Island Railroad.

I've heard a lot of people complain about the trip times and reliability on the Northeast Corridor and complain that even the Acela is not true high-speed rail, and they're right. But these are the kinds of projects that have to be done to prepare to make significant improvements in the corridor and to prepare the way for true high-speed rail later.

Make no mistake: These are projects that are happening now. This is not money just sitting there waiting for a visionary high-speed rail system to come about. This is money going to real infrastructure investments now that support real jobs now and support real economic development when we need it most.

I share the chairman's desire to provide funding to the Army Corps to repair storm damage, but this is not the way to go about it. This is a perfect example of why we have—or used to have—different rules for emergency spending. If something unexpected happens, massive storms and floods, we should be able to respond without jeopardizing other funding. We always said that emergency funding didn't have to be paid for by offsetting other reductions in worthy programs.

I am very concerned about the underinvestment in transportation and infrastructure that seems to have taken hold on the other side of the aisle. We have always had bipartisan agreement that investing in roads, rails, bridges, highways, tunnels and transit is an essential government function. And historically, it's what made the economy grow. From Henry Clay's American system and the internal improvements and Abraham Lincoln's transcontinental railroad, from the Erie Canal of DeWitt Clinton, in more recent times the interstate highway system of Dwight Eisenhower, the economy of the United States was built on these infrastructure developments.

As the Nation is embroiled in negotiations over the debt limit now and how to address the long-term deficit, this is yet another example of the misguided thinking that cutting government spending is somehow the answer to these long-term economic challenges. It is unfathomable that we would pass anything that would eliminate good jobs, and not just the direct transportation and construction jobs but all of the jobs dependent on the connectivity and efficiency of our transportation system.

We need to make the investments necessary to put America on a path toward long-term economic growth. We should be providing a lot more money for high-speed rail, which is one of the connection systems of the future. This bill that we will be considering today takes an extra step backward by revoking funds already allocated—not necessarily obligated, but allocated and

announced—for ongoing projects that are moving ahead. I urge my colleagues to fix this provision.

Emergency funding is obviously warranted for the floods, but it should not be done by eliminating already allocated funds for high-speed rail in an area where we very much need those improvements on the current transportation system.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, we must fund the Army Corps of Engineers to repair damage caused by recent storms and floods and to prepare for future disaster events, there is no question about it. But doing so by cutting long-term investments in high-speed rail makes absolutely no sense, and I rise in strong opposition to this offset. This reckless rescission will eliminate thousands of jobs, halt a large number of rail projects across the country, and hurt local and State economies.

The program is critical to our country's competitiveness by putting Americans back to work, revitalizing our construction and manufacturing sectors, boosting the domestic economy, and ending the United States' dependence on foreign oil. And it flies in the face of President Obama's stated goal of connecting 80 percent of America by high-speed rail in the next 25 years.

Should this rescission pass in this House, the Capital Region of New York State alone stands to lose three critical projects, thousands of jobs, and millions in investments. Specifically, the bill, as written, would eliminate over \$150 million intended for the Empire Corridor Capacity Improvements project, the Empire Corridor South: Albany to Schenectady Second Track project, and the Empire Corridor South: Grade Crossing Improvements project. This would lead to the loss of some 4,223 jobs.

Plain and simple, Madam Chair, we cannot afford these cuts at this time.

Just a few weeks ago, the local chambers of commerce from the capital region of upstate New York flew down to Washington, DC, to meet with Members of Congress to discuss their areas of interest and attention. It turns out that one of their top priorities was high-speed rail. Why is that? It's plain as day. High-speed rail investments create jobs. Jobs are the building block of our recovering economy, and a strong economy leads to a reduced Federal deficit.

Madam Chair, why is it that Europe, Japan, China and other countries can invest in 200-plus-mile-per-hour trains, but when the United States wants to simply lay additional track, upgrade some crossings, and guarantee timely, affordable, relatively average speed trains, we are left out in the cold?

Let's not let shortsighted politics trump our long-term economic viabil-

ity. These are commonsense investments that have already been committed to, have already increased reliability in our rail system, and have already created jobs. Let's not pull the rug out from the feet of our job creators, not now. We simply cannot afford it. We cannot afford to deny the hope for jobs. We cannot afford to deny the American pioneer spirit.

I would like to thank my colleague, Representative SLAUGHTER from New York, for her tireless advocacy on this issue and for having the vision and determination to make high-speed rail in upstate New York and across this State and country a reality.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the rescission of funds from the high-speed rail program that was unwisely included in the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water bill reported from the Appropriations Committee.

My home State of North Carolina has been working for many years to advance the Southeast High-Speed Rail Corridor from Charlotte to Raleigh and Richmond, and ultimately linking the southeastern States with Washington, D.C. and providing a connection to rail service in the Northeast.

Over the last 15 years, North Carolina has invested approximately \$300 million in State intercity rail service capacity, including the construction of new train stations and track improvements. These strategic investments have already helped reduce travel time between Raleigh and Charlotte by 1 hour. But over the last two decades, the Federal investment in the Southeast or other high-speed rail corridors has been very, very modest. The burden fell almost completely on the States. In light of the enormous capital investments needed, while our progress has been steady, it has also been very slow.

Madam Chair, this has been an area where President Obama has demonstrated strong leadership, making major Federal investment in high-speed rail one of his top priorities.

Competition for the billions of dollars allocated under the Recovery Act was intense, and ultimately funds were distributed to 31 States, with half a billion dollars awarded to North Carolina. These funds will help our State achieve a goal set long ago—2-hour train service from Raleigh to Charlotte—and I'm happy to report that work is already well underway. And we know what comes next: Raleigh to Richmond.

□ 1300

These planned rail investments will relieve congestion, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, make our neighborhoods more livable and environmentally sustainable, make our communities more attractive places to live and do business in the long term, and

create well-paying construction and manufacturing jobs in the near term—20,000 jobs in North Carolina alone, as a matter of fact.

Rescission of these funds is penny-wise and pound-foolish. It undermines an infrastructure project that would create jobs and pay dividends for years and years in the future. If we want to stay competitive in the international economy, we cannot continue to lay behind countries like China in developing a 21st century infrastructure. Rather than cutting funds for high-speed rail, we should be investing further in a high-speed rail network that will enhance our Nation's overall transportation system, moving us forward the way the highway system drove us forward in the mid 20th century.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to an offset included in this bill that would rescind all unobligated high-speed rail funding. I support the gentleman from New Jersey's efforts to address the flood, but it should not be taken from such an important investment in the economic strength of our country. It is also an investment in moving us to energy independence.

I would like to address my comments particularly to the Northeast Corridor, that is the corridor between New York and Washington and New York and Boston. This corridor is the most heavily traveled not only in the United States but probably in the world. And the MTA says that the corridor between New York and Boston, on day one, if we had high-speed rail, hundreds of thousands of people would travel it, and it would absolutely be a positive revenue source. It would literally make money because of the ridership that is in that area and also in the area between New York and Washington.

In the money that was allocated, the MTA is focusing on high-speed rail between New York and Boston. And they are supporting the \$294 million for the Harold Interlocking Amtrak Bypass Routes, which would create, according to analysis, well over 9,000 jobs immediately, as it is shovel-ready and ready to go. This is an investment towards high-speed rail, but it's needed right now to move three lines: the Long Island Railroad, Amtrak, and the New Jersey Transit. In this one area, the Interlocking has over 783 trains moving through this each day from the three different transit systems. So this obviously needs to be upgraded to take care of delays and to be able to move people and commerce faster. Because of the way the Harold Interlocking is currently constructed, conflicts among

the three rail lines are frequent and result in delays, disruptions at Penn Station, and over the entire northeast corridor.

So this critical funding will be used to construct a bypass that would allow these trains to move conflict-free and quickly. It is fully designed, has undergone extensive environmental review, including a final environmental impact statement. This project is shovel-ready and will be completed—if not interrupted by this action on the floor—by 2017, and will, very importantly, move us towards high-speed rail between two of the major commerce centers in our country, between Boston and New York. It would literally make money. To rescind this money would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and would move us backwards. We should be investing in the economic corridors of our country, which is our rail, our high-speed rail.

I strongly, strongly support the high-speed rail and urge my colleagues for the economic strength of our future to vote against this amendment, this section that would rescind the money for the very needed high-speed rail that would move us into the 21st century to be able to compete and win in the 21st century, move our people, move our commerce, create jobs not only in the railroad but in the commerce that is between the two centers. We cannot afford to fall behind in our transportation system. It's one of the things that made this country great. It is an important investment. It is an investment that would literally make money in the Northeast Corridor, and it would be absolutely tremendously foolish to rescind this investment towards the economic future of our country.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. EMERSON. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chairwoman, first let me say that I deeply respect the words that all of my colleagues have talked about with regard to high-speed rail. And I understand very much the concerns that the funding for emergency flood restoration and rebuilding would come at a cost to future years of high-speed rail development, keeping in mind that this money has not been specifically obligated.

But first, let me talk about the flooding that's started in North Dakota, going all the way down to Louisiana, down the entire Missouri River system and the entire Mississippi River system. We're talking about more than one-third of the entire watershed of the United States of America. We're talking about farmers. We're talking about the people who work for the farmers. We're talking about the hardware stores and the implement dealers and all of the communities that have been devastated by flooding. And these folks have no recourse.

We're talking about billions of dollars in lost economic activity, and

we're talking about the safety and the protection of people, their families, their children, and the folks who worship with them at church. If we don't have the emergency ability to make it possible for these people to regain their lives and their livelihoods, then we're talking about billions of dollars of lost economic activity for this country. And for people who say, Well, you know, it's farmland, and it's not important. We're talking about farmland. Well, guess what, people, we have the most abundant, safest food supply in the world. We pay less money than any person in any country of the world for our food policy. We pay 9 cents on the dollar. And if we don't restore the livelihoods of these people, if we don't restore our levees and our bridges and our roads and the economic activity of these communities, then we're going to be paying a whole lot more for food, and people are going to be screaming about that. But at the end of the day, isn't the government's role to protect the lives of people?

I just want to say that it wasn't an easy decision for the subcommittee to make, to be able to protect people's lives. But when we're talking about money that is unobligated, that has been returned to the Treasury, and it's that pot of money that can help people be safe, safe from water, safe from flooding so that they could be rebuilding their homes and producing a lot of economic activity—and, yes, a lot of jobs, because there is not a lot of difference between farming and hiring of people and producing and the ripple effect on the economies, and a factory. It's the same thing. It's just a little different.

So I have great respect, as I said earlier, for the arguments that my colleagues are making. But at the end of the day, I think that it's critical that people's lives and people's livelihoods be protected. We must rebuild and we must restore these levees before the next big flood comes again so we can protect our wonderful food source in the United States.

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

□ 1310

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. I rise in strong opposition to the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which includes an amendment that would rescind the remaining unobligated high-speed rail funding that was originally approved in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

In listening to my colleague who just spoke, I don't think anyone here on this floor disagrees that we support the farmers, we support the people who have been impacted by flooding. But the question is whether these particular funds are the appropriate funds

that should be dedicated to address that particular issue.

I would venture to say that while I believe it's important that the Army Corps of Engineers has access to funding necessary to prepare for future disasters, I would say that because I am the ranking member of Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications. But when you consider our long overdue efforts to be able to develop a high-speed rail network that would create jobs and bring rail infrastructure into the 21st century for the United States, that also is a priority as well.

I am proud to be vice chair of the bicameral High-Speed Rail and Intercity Passenger Rail Caucus, and I am glad that we are working to increase the visibility on this issue. I have long fought for bringing transportation systems into the 21st century. After all, that's important to Americans' lives as well. Because if we're not able to traverse from one side of the country to the other, if we're not able to do it in an efficient manner, eventually we will also find ourselves without more jobs and without being able to have appropriate living conditions.

Consider that high-speed rail pays for itself, significantly reducing \$700 billion a year of oil purchased that could be dealt with regarding our trade deficit. High-speed rail pays for and saves lives. We are talking about lives. What about the 43,000 Americans who die each year in car accidents? What happens when we talk about that high-speed rail pays for its efficiency and mobility by being able to move people and goods without delay and waste? And also when you consider that high-speed rail pays by improving air quality, which also helps and saves lives.

Thirteen countries around the world are investing hundreds of billions of dollars into their systems. And for years the United States has failed to keep up. Finally, we have an administration that is actually focused on this issue and has made a commitment to this funding. However, when you consider that in the United States we only have one high-speed rail corridor, that's the Acela Express, operated between Boston and Washington, D.C., and even in our one corridor the trains only reach 150 miles per hour, far below what we would really call a true world class high-speed rail.

So when we consider being in the High-Speed Rail Caucus and what our efforts are today, thankfully we are looking at a situation where we do have funding that's been allocated. So when we say it's unallocated funds, let's talk about that. Actually, what's happened is the administration has done an excellent job in considering areas that have said they are not ready to do high-speed rail at this time. So rather than our wasting money as we did in the past, years in the past, of building bridges to nowhere, what we've said is, if a particular area is not ready, let's put the money back where it can now be reallocated.

So it's not that the funds are totally unobligated. We are now in the process of putting them in the areas that are ready to build high-speed rail now. We must be forward thinking and proactive to position our country to compete in the global economy. That's about American lives as well. Nowhere is it more important than in the area of high-speed rail to take that broad step.

It will cost about \$40 billion to bring high-speed rail to areas like mine in California. But with it comes really a revolution in travel in a way that we have not touched before.

Madam Chairwoman, I cannot support this bill in its current form in light of the amendment that's been brought forward, and I urge my colleagues to vote against these draconian cuts. We had an opportunity to do more funding for Army Corps, and on this very floor many of my colleagues chose not to do so.

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

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Chairman, the question is, just how important is the Mississippi River? The Mississippi River system connects approximately 30 States in our Nation's heartland with the international markets. Sixty percent of all U.S. grain exports are shipped from the Mississippi River. Twenty-five percent of all large commercial bulk ships that arrive in the U.S. come to the mouth of the Mississippi River. U.S. Customs and Border Protection estimates that the river system facilitates between \$85 billion and \$104 billion annually in foreign trade through the Mississippi River system. And one-third of the Nation's oil comes up the river to refineries in Louisiana.

This year's historic flooding carried an estimated 60 million cubic yards of sediment down the Mississippi River. This sediment doesn't just float on out into the gulf; it settles. It settles all along the river, from Missouri to Lake Providence, Louisiana, on down to New Orleans, where currently 5 extra feet of sediment has built up over the normal levels. Five feet. And for every foot that's taken away from the draft of a ship, it costs that ship \$1 million. Madam Chairman, one doesn't have to be a mathematician to tell that that's pretty expensive to our economy.

The flood has not only highlighted a need for dredging, it has also damaged levees and floodways all along the Mississippi. The Corps of Engineers estimates that on the river alone it will have to spend an additional \$1 billion to \$2 billion to repair levees and floodways damaged by the recent floodwaters. This is work that must be done to allow these levees to again protect Americans from future floods.

Madam Chairman, I know that there aren't many out there speaking against

the Mississippi River and the need for maintenance. They are just arguing that the money does not need to be offset since we could call it emergency funding. And yes, we could go that route. But as we are in the middle of negotiations and debate about raising the debt ceiling, the last thing we should be thinking of is adding more to the pile of debt. We cannot continue to do this, Madam Chairman, especially when we have seen the national debt increase at an average of \$3.9 billion per day, especially when the Treasury Department now projects that the U.S. debt will exceed the GDP by the end of this year.

The Congressional Research Service study reports that if supplemental operations had been fully offset over the last three decades, the Federal debt could have been reduced by at least \$1.3 trillion. That translates to a reduction of public interest payments of \$57 billion per year. Ignoring the need to offset spending is a mistake, Madam Chairman, a mistake that our children cannot afford for us to make.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Ms. DeLAURO. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Chairman, included amongst a multitude of misguided policies in this bill the Republican majority has on the floor today is the rescinding of high-speed rail funds that would otherwise create good middle class jobs, strengthen our economy, allow us to build a 21st century infrastructure that we need to compete with the other economic power centers around the world.

Over 6 months in the majority and my Republican colleagues have proved very capable of ending Medicare, rolling back health care reforms, namely for women, and choosing to reduce the deficit on the backs of working middle class families and the most vulnerable.

One thing they have chosen to do is to zero out job creation. And, in fact, by cutting funding for high-speed rail projects in this bill, the majority is threatening as many as 60,000 jobs. This is the majority's answer to last week's extremely disappointing jobs report that showed that we are mired in unacceptably high 9.2 percent unemployment after adding only 18,000 jobs in June, with a construction sector that has 16.3 percent of its workers unemployed.

□ 1320

This is the majority's answer to the 14 million unemployed in this country, real people, real families looking to wait their way through this crisis.

In Connecticut, the majority's decision to rescind a \$30 million investment—and I might tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—this \$30 million has been obligated. It is an investment in the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line and would seriously

limit the ability to expand one of the best intercity passenger rail networks in the country. The line represents a critical component of a larger regional plan for passenger rail to integrate the New England rail system, connect it to New York, the middle-Atlantic States and to Canada.

The improvements that would be made with the investments my colleagues on the other side are seeking to eliminate are essential to meeting the needs of the entire region and achieving the benefits of the Federal and State investments that have already been made there.

High-speed rail is desperately needed in Connecticut. This is the most heavily trafficked commuter region in the country. New England's traffic has increased two to three times faster than its population since 1990, and 80 percent of the Connecticut commuters drive to work alone.

When it's completed, the line is expected to reduce the number of vehicles on the road by approximately 4,000 cars a day, saving a billion gallons of fossil fuel a year and reducing carbon emissions over that time by 10,000 tons.

Just as important, the line has been a high priority for Connecticut, for its Representatives on both sides of the aisle for many years. It means opportunities for economic development and expansion throughout our State.

But expanding the economy, creating jobs is simply not a priority for the majority. They appear perfectly content to allow us to fall behind our global competitors like China, with its plan to invest a trillion dollars in high-speed rail, highways and other infrastructure in 5 years.

And the short-sightedness is further exemplified by what has been put forward this week in a \$230 billion 6-year surface transportation bill that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce calls unacceptable as the cuts will destroy, rather than support, existing jobs, which would be devastating to construction and related industries, leading to a less competitive economy and a drag on the GDP due to underperforming infrastructure.

Now, I want to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I have a great appreciation for disaster assistance, a great appreciation for the commercial value of the Mississippi River. I am there. I have been there for disaster assistance.

Now, if you don't want to do an emergency declaration, then let me tell you where you can get some of the money from in order to do this: \$40 billion to the oil industry every year in a tax subsidy. Nobody here believes that they are suffering as the farmers in our country are suffering. They don't need money for the levees. They don't need any money at all; but, no, the other side doesn't want to take any money from that \$41 billion to do something about those who are suffering in these States due to natural disaster.

Or what about the \$8 billion we provide to multinational corporations to

take their jobs overseas? Let's take that money and use it for the people of this great Nation who are in difficult straits, difficult times and their jobs, yes, and their levees need to be dredged. Let's get that money to the Army Corps of Engineers.

Finally, we support Brazilian cotton farmers. We give them \$147 million every single year. I suggest we take that money from the Brazilian cotton farmers and spend it on the folks in our country who are in desperate need.

Don't take it from high-speed rail. Don't commit us to planned obsolescence.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I would like to congratulate the Appropriations Committee and the chairman for their fine work on making some difficult choices.

Obviously, our budget times are tight. We have to prioritize our spending, and we have some emergencies here in this country which are abnormal, extremely abnormal from the standpoint that our weather patterns have changed dramatically this past year and as a result we have a lot of our citizens that are really suffering right now.

In my district, I have the Mississippi River along the one side, I have the Missouri River running through the area as well, so both of those have been dramatically impacted by the massive rain storms that have run through the area as well as some of the tornados that have gone through the area as well.

So I want to put a face on some of this for just a moment. You know, we have today a number of farmers who no longer can drive to their homes. They have to take a boat to their homes. They have 5 feet of water. Some of them are looking at the roofs instead of their homes, and their crops are gone. And when they are gone, whenever a flood occurs, it doesn't just occur and wipe out that year's crops. Quite often times it takes 2 or 3 or 4 years. And sometimes the ground is damaged to the point where it can never be reclaimed.

The gentlewoman from the southeast portion of our State, some of her area that was devastated by some of the levees that were blown up, those crop lands may never return to fertile ground because of what happened. Again, well, people say, well, it's just farm land. No, it's not. This is the business of farming. This is their business location.

And if you look at their farms, it's not just land that's laying out there. They have irrigation systems, they have thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars in irrigation systems and the berms and the ground that's been cultivated and excavated in a way that it can utilize all the waters that they irrigate with or whatever.

So they have a huge investment in this property. It's not just land. It's a huge investment in their business. We are interested in continuing to help those folks rebuild those levees, rebuild their lives, rebuild their businesses because this is what they are about.

One of the things that has happened in my area right now is with, basically, a tsunami coming down the Missouri River basin. In Montana they had an unusual amount of snow that fell this year, a late snow melt. And then on top of that they had a whole year's worth of rain in a 2-week period, and we have literally a tsunami coming down the Missouri River basin.

Fortunately, we had a flood control set of dams in there that have minimized it; but even at that, this is a 100- to 500-year flood that is devastating everything in its path. And so those folks, in fact, right now from Kansas City on north, there isn't a single private levee that isn't either breached or topped.

Let me repeat that: There isn't a single private levee north of Kansas City that is not breached or topped. That's how severe and how devastating this situation is this year.

When we start talking about the uses of the river, it's important to note that barge traffic on rivers—the gentleman from Louisiana a moment ago talked about the usage of how much corn and grain goes up and down the Mississippi. The normal barge can carry 900 trailer loads of grain, 900 trailer loads of grain.

Think of all the vehicles we are taking off the roads. Think of the environmental impact of none of those vehicles being on the road. It's very significant.

Yet, in our area, the Missouri River is being underutilized because of some of the new mandates that are being put on it by different bureaucrats here in D.C. with regards to trying to worry about a fish or a bird that lives along the shore and/or for recreational purposes.

So we have some interesting debates going on right now. Those we will decide at a later date, but the problem we are facing today is the devastation that it has had to life and property and the safety of those. We believe that these funds are necessary for people to recover from this devastation that has occurred.

And just as a side light here, we also would like to thank the Appropriations Committee for not only finding a way to do this, prioritizing Federal funds without adding to our debt, but there is an interesting fact here as well. I want to note, it was from a report back in January of 2009 with regard to the Congressional Research Service that said had supplemental appropriations been fully offset—which this is since 1981—Federal debt held by the public could have been reduced by at least 23 percent, or \$1.3 trillion. This could have reduced interest payments to the public by \$57 billion a year.

I think while it's difficult, I know that our friends across the aisle and some of the folks here discussing the prioritization this morning are not happy with this. I think these are difficult times. We all have to realize that reprioritizing things sometimes is not easy.

But in this situation I believe that it's justified, and we certainly support what fine work the Appropriations Committee has done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, it is just a matter of time before we will rue the day that we did not build out the infrastructure across the length and breadth of our country. Our President has proposed that we have an infrastructure bank such that we can take care of the needs on this side as well as the needs on this side. We will rue the day that we did not build out our transportation infrastructure.

One example, in 2005, in Houston, Texas, Rita hit the gulf coast. We had thousands of people being evacuated from a major urban area, and as they were moving away, the highways became clogged. They were stopped on the highways. People spent nights on the highways. Trains are a part of the emergency evacuation system in this country, and we need more rail so that we can evacuate people in times of emergencies.

9/11/01, who can forget? The skies were clear. There was a full ground stop. More than 4,000 planes were grounded. No one could fly. Trains became a part of the emergency evacuation system so that people who could not fly could still make their destinations.

It is time for us to wise up and realize that the President is right. It is time for us to, in the parlance and vernacular of those in the streets of life, to 'fess up and tell the truth. We should not put Peter ahead of Paul. We should not rob one to pay the other. It is time for us to take a holistic approach and show some vision.

Let's move to create jobs across the length and breadth of the country with this infrastructure program. Let's give architects who have offices and business and laborers and engineers jobs. Let's give them jobs to do.

And the good news is you cannot export these jobs overseas. You don't have to worry about them being outsourced, because they will all be done right here in the United States of America.

Let's rebuild this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, I first want to congratulate and thank the chairman of the Energy and Water subcommittee for setting as a priority making sure that our waterways, especially the Mississippi River, are restored after the devastating floods that we experienced throughout our country. It wasn't just in a few States; it was throughout many parts of the Midwest, South, and other parts of our country that experienced tornado damage and experienced unprecedented flooding going back to 1927.

But now if you look at where we are and you look at what is being done here, this is not money that is adding to the deficit. We are at a point right now as we face this debt ceiling—and there is a divide in Congress; there is a divide in Washington. And the question is: Are we going to start living within our means and truly setting priorities in this country or just continue going down this spending binge acting as if nobody is going to pay the tab?

And, of course, I think what the chairman, the full chairman of Appropriations and so many other members of this new majority have said is that game is over. The game of spending money we don't have is over, and we've got to make the tough choices of setting priorities in this country.

So if you look at some of the money that was moved over from high-speed rail—and there were billions of dollars set aside in the stimulus bill that was such a failed disaster, over \$787 billion of money that we don't have with the promise that unemployment wouldn't go over 8 percent. It's very clear that that failed. But what we're saying is let's take some of that money and move it over into something that's much more important right now, and that is getting our economy back on track, getting people back on track and getting their families back together.

Look at what happened on the Mississippi River. Just a few weeks ago, I flew over the Morganza Spillway and looked at the Atchafalaya Basin where some of that flooding happened where you literally had people who were in harm's way and their areas were flooded to keep other people from flooding. And it was one of those terrible choices no one wants to have to make, but those families were put in that situation and their communities were flooded so other communities wouldn't.

The extra silt that came down the Mississippi River now threatens to impede the ability for us to move commerce through 30-plus States of this country so that we can get those exports, so that we can create more jobs and be able to be competitive with foreign countries. If you're a farmer in Iowa, if you're trying to move commerce in Missouri down the Mississippi River, if you don't have the ability now because we're not able to dredge the

river, all of a sudden now Brazil is going to get that contract for that product because you can't be competitive anymore.

Not only are we talking about tens of thousands of jobs, but we're talking about priorities. If you look at the high-speed rail projects, many States have turned the money down. Why? Because they realize it's a money loser. They lose money on the deal because it just doesn't pay for itself. Of course, States have balanced budgets. Most of those States have to balance their budget every year, so they can't just take what looks like free money to go and engage in a process that's ultimately going to cost them money every year that they don't have. But because they have to balance their budget, many of them have turned that money away.

And so you look here in Washington, there is no balanced budget requirement, and it shows you, frankly, one of the reasons why we need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution so that we are forced to live within our means, too, so we can't just keep spending money as if there is no consequence, because there is consequence. Our children and our grandchildren are counting on us to make those responsible decisions and to set the priorities. We cannot just tell everybody that comes in the door, You've got an idea, here's some money; you've got an idea, here's some money. Nobody has the money. We'll just go print it, raise the debt ceiling and just keep giving it as if it's not going to have an effect. At some point, it has a real effect; it has a real impact. And so we've got to make the tough choices and set the priorities.

So there was devastating flooding throughout our country. You had so many States that saw tornado damage and flooding damage, and they're trying to get back on their feet. And then there is this high-speed rail money. And so much of the money in the stimulus bill went to waste and was squandered. We have nothing to show for it. The promise of no more than 8 percent unemployment didn't work. It was a failure, and everybody recognizes it. And so we're saying we're going to make those tough choices.

None of these choices are easy, but we didn't come up here to make easy choices. We came up here because we've got to set the priorities of this country, and that means balancing our budget and not just saying everything can get all the funding it wants. If something is a priority, then that means we've got to find the money somewhere else. And so that's what's being done here. And that's why I commend the chairman for making that tough decision. And, yes, we're going to have to have a fight over this. We're going to have to have a discussion over this, as we should. This is the people's House.

That's what this discussion is about. It's about setting our priorities and

shifting from the old way of doing business of just spending more money we don't have on every idea that sounded good. We can't keep doing that. So that's why I support what the chairman is doing.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. First of all, I want to be clear that I support the funding to protect the citizens of the Midwest from flooding. And, in fact, Louisiana has gotten more money than probably anybody else.

I come from Florida. We have disasters, natural disasters, all of the time. But the reason there is no funding for flood protection is because the Republican leadership cut the funding and the Republican Members supported it.

Let me be clear. I support the funding for the disaster. As the ranking member of the Transportation Subcommittee on Rail, I find that these funding cuts which would block all of the remaining unobligated high-speed rail funding approved by the economic stimulus entirely unacceptable.

And I am sick and tired of Members coming to the floor saying that the stimulus money was a disaster. It is not a disaster that we put people to work in Florida and throughout this country. And, in fact, if it wasn't for the stimulus dollars, teachers would have lost their jobs. In one area, we kept firefighters and police officers employed. And that is a job while this economy is turned around.

And let's not forget how we got in this mess. Institutional memory is in order. When you have your head in the lion's mouth, you pull it out, you ease it out. What happened? How did we get here? When Bill Clinton left, we were operating with a surplus. But we had 8 years of Bush and two wars. And do you think this mess started 18 months ago? No, it did not.

□ 1340

We have been practicing what I call reverse Robin Hood for 8 years. Nobody remembers that, when you kept giving tax breaks to the rich and billionaires. What happened here in December? Almost \$800 billion that you gave to the not just millionaires, billionaires. And yet you come up saying in June and April, we can't send the pension checks.

Yes, we're spending money up here, but it's the priorities you have. You don't have the priorities of taking care of the elderly people. You want to cut Medicaid and Medicare and Social Security while you give billionaires—billionaires—tax breaks, and millionaires. And now you want to cut money for high-speed rail. But we know for every billion dollars that we spend for high-

speed rail, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs. But yes, we have some Governors that are shortsighted, like my Governor Rick Scott of Florida that sent back almost \$3 billion. We have 11 percent unemployment. What was he thinking about? I guess he was thinking he didn't want to see those people going to work and making Barack Obama look good, even though we have the most congestion in that area, and that our competition is there. If you look at Spain, if you look at France, you look at Germany, 200 miles, 1 hour and 15 minutes. That is the future of our country. But we have some shortsighted people here, people who only want to see, you know, well, we need to balance the budget. Well, where were you when they were giving tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires? And you do it over and over again. That's the sad thing.

If you put it on the board, put it on the board today, you would have the same vote. You would have the exact same vote. And every opportunity you have to vote, you vote to give millionaires and billionaires tax breaks. So, you know, we started the rail system, and we are now the caboose, and we don't even use cabooses any more.

I am hoping that the American people will wake up. It is shameful that over and over again in the people's House, in the people's House, we attack the people who do not have lobbyists on Capitol Hill. And so I yield back the balance of my time, but I do know that elections have consequences. The American people are watching you. I have voted five times to raise the debt ceiling. Why did I do it under Bush? Because I knew it was in the best interest of this country and not the politics of the time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

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

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chairwoman, I think we are going to have to extend the space shuttle for an extra day to retrieve the thought process, it got so far out there in orbit. Let me just be very clear, to kind of bring this back to the subject matter at hand.

We're talking about taking funds that have been designated for a project in the future, near term or long term, but in the future, to satisfy an emerging issue that is in the present. Future versus present.

In my district of Arkansas, the cresting of the Illinois River has ripped apart roads, washed out bridges. Floods have taken the lives of constituents of mine, young people who will grow up without a mother or father. We have people living in tents. We have an urgent issue that is facing us today. The flooding has done damage across our entire State, leaving hundreds of Ar-

kansans without homes, and crop losses estimated at over \$500 million. It has even been asserted by the other side that it is "just farmland." Just farmland.

Well, let me say to the people who make that argument, don't make that argument with your mouth full.

It has also caused about \$100 million in damage to dams, parks, roads, and waterways under the control of the Army Corps of Engineers, and if left unrepaired, will only result in additional devastation in the next season.

But it isn't just about what happened in Arkansas; the entire Mississippi River and its tributary system has been imperiled by these tragedies. They are the lifeblood of our Nation's commerce, and bordering farmlands are rich with fertile soil able to provide food for so many of the American people. Allowing these lands to be so vulnerable to future flooding will only imperil our Nation's food supply.

Offset or not to offset; it is an emerging issue. And on offsets, as you have already heard from my colleague from Louisiana, my colleague from Missouri, that supplemental appropriations, if fully offset over the last three decades, would have reduced by at least \$1.3 trillion the debt and reduced the public interest payments on this debt of \$57 billion a year. Now, my friends, \$57 billion in interest payments would build a lot of high-speed rail.

I congratulate the chairman for his work on this Energy and Water bill. I support it. It is prudent. It is wise. It is necessary. And I commend it to the leadership and to this entire House to pass it and restore the fiscal integrity of our country and give relief to the people who need it so desperately.

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

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

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chair, I have a written prepared statement I will include for the RECORD. It talks about California and the need for investments, and I don't think anybody is going to argue with the need for this country to invest in its country or its infrastructure. We have had that argument.

I'm trying to figure out a way how to make my comments without making anybody wrong. The chairman is faced with a difficult task of trying to balance a budget. He faces that challenge with limited funds. It is a terrible job. But I think we ought to look at the process and be thoughtful and explain to the people out there who are watching us, the young people here who are watching us, that we can be smart. We can be compassionate, and we can do that without allowing ourselves to be fighting among ourselves and trying to make decisions between jobs, the economy, infrastructure, and taking care of those who need to get back on their feet. I have no arguments with that.

My mother used to say when unexpected guests came to our house during dinnertime, you don't turn them away, you just add more water to the soup, and then you enjoy each other's company.

Congress is a living organism responsible for its past, its present, and its future.

In the past, according to the GAO, we spent about \$150 billion just on Katrina. In Afghanistan, we spend \$325 million a day. And in Iraq, we spend about \$100 million a day. That's almost a \$1 billion a day. We are talking almost a billion dollars in light rail. We can be both right and smart and compassionate if we do the right thing.

In our budgeting process, we should have a fund for unforeseen circumstances. We should learn from Katrina. We are looking at about \$4 billion in terms of the Army Corps of Engineers. I think our leaderships need to get together and just say "we can do this" without fighting among each other, without making each other wrong, because that's wrong. In the eyes of the public, they want us to do the job that needs to get done and have our leadership do that.

So my plea is that we can be fiscally responsible and we can be compassionate, and we do that with good planning and good budgeting processes, including having contingency funds that should have been there. And so we have an opportunity right now to show the public that we can do all of these things and still come out winners for those who need the help, and those who need jobs, and still take care of the Nation's infrastructure needs. That's what America is all about. It's a can-do spirit without having to fight within our own families.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition of the underlying bill that rescinds over one billion dollars in high-speed rail investment to pay for emergency disaster relief due to storms and flooding in the Midwest—emergency disaster relief that should be funded through emergency appropriations.

The Majority appears proud to say they are offsetting the funds needed to help our citizens in the Midwest recover from the storms and floods that have devastated their communities.

But what the Majority is doing is really not something to be proud of.

The Majority is offsetting jobs and offsetting investments into our Nation's infrastructure.

Put bluntly, Madam Chair, with this bill the Majority is offsetting our Nation's future.

This bill would specifically rescind \$68 million intended for the Next Generation Passenger Rail Equipment Purchase in my State of California. During these difficult economic times, rescinding these funds would result in the loss of as many as 1,892 jobs.

Earlier this year, the President released his annual budget request for Fiscal Year 2012, which calls for a \$53 billion, 6-year investment in high-speed rail. I applaud the President's vision for a sustainable future.

Every other industrialized country in the world, except the U.S., has shifted its intermediate range travel, or 50 to 600 miles, to

high speed trains. Are they all wrong and only the U.S. right?

Madam Chair, polls show over 70 percent of Californians support the 800-mile, double-track, grade-separated, fast, clean, quiet, and safe high speed trains that will link San Jose with Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego. California must lead the Nation into the future.

Let's not forget, Californians voted for \$9.95 billion for this project in 2008, a major reason over \$3.7 billion in Federal funding has been granted for our State's starter project. Those funds, with the President's proposal and private investments in discussion, could kick-start the Silicon Valley extension, the first major job destination for California's system.

The investment proposed by the President directly impacts my constituents in Silicon Valley. Those funds could bring the California High-Speed Rail Authority's starter construction project, already-funded between Bakersfield and Fresno, through the Pacheco Pass to Silicon Valley.

Benefits to Silicon Valley are profound; mobility, employment, cleaner air, and international competitiveness.

Mobility: California's high speed rail project connects to many feeder modes at the Diridon Station, across from the HP Pavilion and the proposed A's baseball park in the heart of the Silicon Valley. When finished by 2020, the Diridon Station will be one of the Nation's largest multimodal hubs, with over 600 trains per day including high speed rail, BART, CalTrain, the Capital Trains, Altamont Express, Amtrak, light rail, bus lines, an automated shuttle to the Mineta International Airport, and more.

Employment: Return-on-investment is the first rule for Silicon Valley. Research proves investments in high speed rail return more than twice the cost, in tax revenue, over the life of the projects. And, with 30% construction unemployment, investment in high-speed rail means jobs, right now, in our State. Engineers estimate the project will create over 160,000 construction jobs, for as much as 30 years. An additional 450,000 jobs will be stimulated by the economic vitality created around the 26 down-town stations. Those jobs are in California, for Californians, and cannot be offshored.

Clean Air: Research indicates over 90% of the future riders currently use single passenger cars or short-hop airlines, both major polluters. The electric trains are committed to use non-polluting renewable energy. The U.S. comprises 4% of the world's population but creates almost 25% of the world's greenhouse gasses. High speed rail is a powerful tool the rest of the world is already using to fight climate change.

Competitiveness: The emerging economic engines in Europe and Asia are rapidly overtaking the U.S. and California. They move people to work and products to the market more efficiently. China invested over \$80 billion in high speed rail last year alone, over \$1 trillion in the last decade, completing over 7,500 kilometers of their planned 13,000 kilometer system in just 9 years. The EU's dozen lines are similarly successful, and Japan is also expanding its system dramatically. Many of those systems are now operated profitably by private companies.

How is it possible for every other industrialized country, and many emerging economies, to afford state-of-the-art high speed rail

systems and claim that the world's richest country cannot?

Madam Chair, Americans support investments in our county's transportation infrastructure. A recent Rockefeller Foundation survey found 91% of the national sample agreeing that, "our generation has a responsibility to the future to invest in America's infrastructure—just as our parents and grandparents did."

The foresight of our forefathers, who ensured that our highways, waterways, and railways promoted our economy, must not be lost now. We too must be good ancestors. High-speed rail is the future. The time to invest in that future is now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1350

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. I want to thank the subcommittee chairman and the committee chairman for bringing this bill forward in the way that they've done it.

I particularly want to thank them for the fact that this bill provides \$1 billion in emergency funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to repair the damage caused by recent storms and floods and to prepare for future disaster events. This funding is offset by a rescission of the remaining emergency high-speed rail funding that was originally allocated in the stimulus bill.

Our friends on the other side have told us they're not opposed to the emergency funding because of the storms and floods—they just don't like the offset. In fact, I've heard it said, We've always done it this way. When an emergency comes up, when a disaster occurs, we've always just funded it without a spending offset.

Madam Chairman, on April 26, 2011, the people of Smithville, Mississippi, had hopes; they had dreams and they had plans. Some of those plans were budgetary and financial, but on April 27, at approximately 3 p.m., those plans changed. They changed drastically. When an historically devastating storm swept through the Southeast, Smithville, Mississippi, was struck by an EF5 tornado, and was literally wiped off the face of the Earth.

Let me make it quite clear. The people of Smithville are very grateful for the outpouring of food, of supplies, of materials that have come from around the Nation. They're grateful for the outpouring of help that has come from the various agencies of the Federal and State governments, but those same people have also redirected plans and priorities in their own lives. They didn't proceed forward with the plans that they had the day before.

Madam Chairman, if the men and women in Smithville, Mississippi—many of whom are living in trailers, many of whom have seen their lives disrupted and houses destroyed—are making the difficult choices in their

own lives, they have every reason to expect their government to do the exact same thing.

That's the basis for budgeting: deciding how to allocate available resources for both planned and unplanned events. They continue to say, But we've never done it that way.

Madam Chairman, over the past three decades, if we'd had leadership in this body like that of the leader of this subcommittee and the chairman of the committee and if we had done it in the way that they're doing it today, our national debt would be at least \$1.3 trillion lower, and we would not even be in this debate about considering to raise it.

I want to thank the chairmen for their leadership, and I urge the passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COSTA. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COSTA. I rise in opposition to the underlying bill and to a provision of this bill that, I think, is highway robbery, plain and simple.

Once again, my friends on the other side of the aisle are ignoring an opportunity to invest in their infrastructure, to create more jobs and to build a modern, 21st century system of transportation that utilizes our highways, our air transportation system and, yes, our rail in the state of high-speed rail systems that are part of America's future.

I support providing, like I think the majority of my colleagues do, the funding for the Mississippi Delta—we should and we must—as we have with every area that has experienced a disaster over the history of our Nation, but there are other ways to provide that funding.

In May of this year, Secretary Ray LaHood—a colleague of ours, a Republican—announced that \$368 million of our tax dollars would go to California to invest in the San Joaquin Valley in order to construct the Nation's first true state-of-the-art high-speed rail system. It's a system in California that the people support. In 2008, Californians went to the polls, and voted overwhelmingly for a \$9 billion bond measure to construct high-speed rail that will create hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout the State and that will create economic opportunities not only in the San Joaquin Valley but throughout California.

But this provision steals that money and the promise of new jobs right from the hands of the people it is intended to benefit.

The Great Recession hit my region of the country probably harder than almost any other place in America, with double-digit unemployment levels that exceed 20 percent. Too many people can't find jobs to keep roofs over their heads or can afford decent, healthy diets; but at a time when everyone in Washington says we should be focused

on job creation, this provision is the only one I can see that's about job destruction.

High-speed rail will create over 600,000 construction jobs over the life of the project over the next 10 to 20 years in California, but this provision says "no."

High-speed rail will create 450,000 permanent jobs over the next 25 years, but this provision just says "no."

High-speed rail will spur economic development by connecting our San Joaquin Valley with the Bay Area and southern California to create a system that will provide high-speed rail for 80 percent of California's population, but this provision just says "no."

High-speed rail will improve our air quality and will reduce traffic that clogs our freeways. Of course, this provision just says "no."

High-speed rail has proven to be a smart investment over the five decades that it has been developed in Europe and Asia, but this provision says "no" to America and "no" to California.

High-speed rail will ensure that California is competitive well into the 21st century, but this would attempt to block that area to move into the next phase of a 21st century system of transportation.

The people of California want high-speed rail—they voted for it and the jobs that it will create—but this provision, of course, just says "no."

Now, we've talked about our current financial situation. These are difficult times for America. There is no doubt about that. We must focus on our deficit, and we must come together in a bipartisan fashion. Yet I submit to any of you to tell me that we have a more difficult time today than we had in the 1860s, when our Nation was being torn apart by the Civil War—when inflation was running rampant, when deficit spending made our situation today look tame by comparison, when we had the first issue of paper money, and when a lot of people doubted the credibility of that paper currency.

Yet we had a great Republican President, the Emancipator, during that time in our Nation's history when our country was being torn apart—who had boldness and a vision and who had decided we were going to build a railroad across the country and invest in our Nation even though we were in that Civil War. That's what he did.

So this provision attempts to take on an effort, notwithstanding the difficult financial challenges that we have, to in essence say what President Lincoln said in the 1860s: We can do better. We can build a transcontinental railroad.

President Obama believes we can get ourselves out of this financial situation by working together and, at the same time, by investing in our Nation's infrastructure, just as President Eisenhower did in the 1950s when he decided to embark upon the effort to build interstate freeway transportation that we all benefit from today.

This provision was slipped into law. So, ladies and gentlemen, I ask that we

defeat this provision and that we keep our faith to the voters of California.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to congratulate and recognize the tremendous work of the Appropriations Committee in responding to the flooding disasters during a time of tight budget restrictions. There were tough choices that had to be made, but I believe the committee effectively prioritized the needs of the American people.

Madam Chair, my district in Arkansas was severely impacted by the recent floods that wrought devastation in the Mid-South and the Lower Mississippi Valley. Preliminary estimates of crop damage surpassed a half a billion dollars, and communities were evacuated because the levees struggled to retain the floodwaters.

□ 1400

The St. Francis levee district suffered the most damage because the water levels were so high the water enclosed entire areas and almost completely flooded Cross and Woodroof Counties in my district. In St. Francis County alone, hundreds of homes were underwater and tens of thousands of acres of farmland were flooded as well.

In another part of my district, heavy flooding devastated all areas of Des Arc in Prairie County. The community of Spring Lake, which is home to 32 families, was completely flooded with several feet of water. So far, only three of those families have moved back into their homes. The community of Smith Road, which is home to 18 families, was completely flooded as well. So far, not one of those families has been able to move back to their homes. On top of the damage to these communities, more than 50,000 acres of farmland were flooded. The entire corn crop was wiped out and most of the rice crop as well.

Mr. Chair, the flood disasters across the Mid-South have taken a huge toll on our way of life and have touched nearly everyone in my district. We must ensure we retain the vital funding to the Corps of Engineers so that we can repair and reinforce our levees so that citizens in the lower Mississippi Valley and the Mid-South can live in safety and our economy can recover.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DOLD). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you.

This has been an interesting debate. I've been able to sit down here and listen to a lot of folks on both sides talk about really investments that we need to make in the United States. I'm glad that there are some investments that our friends on the other side actually think are important to the country, be-

cause it seems in many ways the national narrative is that there isn't anything the government can make investments in that is important for our country.

To hear some Members talk about natural disasters and to hear some Members talk about the barges going up and down and farmland, there's a huge subsidy program where billions of Federal dollars are spent to support farmers. There are obviously dams that need to be built, and that is Federal money. When it applies to certain Members' districts where they are actually affected and families affected, it's their responsibility to come to Washington, D.C., and advocate for those investments.

I think what you're seeing here on our side is that we have Members on this side of the aisle who believe that investments need to be made in our communities, too, and that over 30 years, if you take cities like Youngstown or Cleveland or Detroit, you will see cities that need investment. We may not have had a natural disaster, but over the last 30 years we have had an economic disaster where we have had a lack of private investment. I am rising here to say that high-speed rail can be a force multiplier in our economic improvement in our community and across the country.

The gentleman from California just cited the number of jobs, the billions of dollars that could be invested. In Youngstown, Ohio, we would be linked up to a Pittsburgh to Cleveland corridor that would then go over to Toledo and Detroit and that would make its way over to Chicago. This is essentially connecting the United States of America.

You would be taking an economic region like ours with two major powerhouses in education and in health care that would be connected by high-speed rail. In Ohio, we gave away the high-speed rail money, too. Our Governor gave it away. And there were hundreds of millions of dollars in private investment that was going to follow the public investment that needs to be made. But if we're going to connect, if we're going to try to resuscitate some of these older areas in our country, high-speed rail is a way to do it.

These are investments that can be made. We can connect the Cleveland Clinic with the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. We can connect Case Western Reserve with Carnegie Mellon, and they can partner in research, get on the train, and help lead some economic development and commercialization of products. You could take a region of our country and connect it through high-speed rail.

The problem is—and I will end with this—all of these investments need to be made. This is the dirty little secret in Washington, D.C. We're only spending 2 percent of our GDP on our infrastructure, while China and India are spending 10 percent of their GDP reinvesting back into their country. We

will lose the future if we do not make these investments. These are critical to the competitiveness of the United States. The dams that need to be built and the high-speed rail and the roads and the combined sewer and the airports and the ports and the highways and the bridges, we need to invest in all of these things.

Our country is crumbling. We can't have Members say, We only need to make this one investment for this one dam because it's in my district and because I know families who have been hurt. We've got to elevate ourselves and look at what needs to be done in the entirety of the whole country and how we are going to compete against China, how we are going to compete against India, how we are going to be globally competitive.

All of these investments need to be made, including the economic development and the private investment that can be drawn in through high-speed rail.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman, and I really do want to thank our appropriators. This is a tough, tough business. I certainly want to thank the ranking member whom I've had the privilege of working with and thank the chairman as well, because this is a tough dilemma that we are facing.

I think I come with a unique perspective. I live in hurricane and flood country. Houston is the site and was the recipient of hundreds of thousands of Katrina survivors coming in from New Orleans. We have faced our own ups and downs, most recently with Hurricane Ike, and I walked the beach with both former President Clinton and former President Bush when we went down to Galveston and looked at the amazing devastation.

So many of us were concerned about the tragedy in Joplin, Missouri, and other places, and then the constant flooding. I have talked to Members of Congress where there is flooding going on in their district as we speak. But here is the dilemma that we have and the reason that I rise to raise the question of the recapturing of already designated funds and to realize that these are not funds that were just sitting in a pile unused. These funds are not only already designated—I would like to say appropriated—high-speed rail dollars but, as well, these funds will generate thousands of jobs.

As I read the amounts of moneys that were designated, \$450 million were going to be utilized for necessary repairs in New Jersey. That means that my friends on the floor of the House have made a sacrifice, and I appreciate that, but high-speed rail is a valuable and necessary investment in America's future.

I truly believe that there could have been a compromise, where resources

could have been used for the flooding problems in the area that my colleagues have spoken about, the needy areas, and still leave an amount that would have been shared for high-speed rail. Let's create jobs together. That is the restoration of those flood areas, and I would almost ask the question without knowing as a member of the authorizing committee for Homeland Security, what other opportunities might have been in place to be able to utilize those dollars for the disaster that has occurred.

But I will tell you, it is no doubt as you go across Europe and see the value of high-speed rail, new technology, that America is far behind with its high-speed rail investment, the new technology, the new science, the new kinds of cars that are being produced that will create jobs, in essence putting the cars together, manufacturing the cars but then the assembling of the cars now being placed in cities around America. Those are real jobs, long-term jobs.

The decision that the administration made was a thoughtful decision. Let me thank Secretary LaHood for understanding the value of high-speed rail, and I would suggest that the proposal that we have for Texas does impact rural Texas. It is a proposal for high-speed rail from Houston to Dallas, going through our rural communities, creating the opportunities for jobs but creating the opportunities for investment in the purchase of land and the growth of business. All of that has an impact in creating jobs.

□ 1410

That's what we are all here for. We are here to be the rainy day umbrella for Americans who are in trouble, and as well we're here to create jobs, which Americans are so desperately in need of.

So I am disappointed that we didn't find the happy balance, and I believe that we could; that we couldn't measure the amount of resources that might have been able to be utilized for our friends that have just experienced a disaster and not completely gut monies that are already designated, appropriated. It's almost as if we came in and said there's a pile of cash, and I'm not going to bother to identify what it's supposed to be used for.

I would hope that there would be a method of reconsideration. These are fair gentlemen on the floor of the House. I've worked with all of my colleagues here. And I would just raise the question of why would we, in essence, zero out high-speed rail, not only for our urban centers but for our mid-western areas that are desperately in need of jobs, and for the southern areas that now are looking to the future for high-speed rail to create jobs and to create the quality, excellent, superior mobility system that Americans deserve—not the country of America, but the people of America deserve.

I would argue vigorously for a reconsideration of the funding and the re-

structuring of the funding to ensure that we have high-speed rail, create jobs, and deal with our friends who are in need.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of funding for high speed rail, and the importance of ensuring that money designated for high speed rail by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is utilized to build high speed rail-ways.

I must express my concerns about the offset in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. There is no doubt that recent flooding in the Midwest has devastated communities and greatly impacted the region's economy.

The Army Corps of Engineers must have the resources to address the damage wrought by the flooding of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, but I urge my colleagues to consider the source of this funding.

The funding allocated for high speed rail in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will do more than update our Nation's transportation system; high speed rail creates jobs, increases tourism and is environmentally sustainable.

The Department of Transportation recently awarded \$15 million for a high speed rail project in Texas. The funding was awarded for engineering and environmental work to develop a high-speed rail corridor linking Dallas and Houston, where I represent the 18th Congressional District.

The demand for high speed rail in the state of Texas is significant. The second most populous state in the Nation, Texas' population is forecasted to grow by an additional 9.4 million people by 2035, a 38.9 percent increase over projected 2010 levels.

Additionally, the population growth is not going to be spread evenly across the state. According to the Texas State Data Center, 92 percent of the 2010–2035 population growth will occur in the existing metropolitan counties. High speed rail is an investment in the future of the state.

Receiving this funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was a tremendous opportunity for Houston, and the entire state of Texas. The award will allow our state to make critical investments in infrastructure that will increase mobility and allow for better commercial and private growth of our cities.

A long time supporter of high speed rail, I supported the Safe Highways and Infrastructure Preservation Act, and secured \$150 million dollars for the metro solutions light rail project because high-speed rail projects and other transportation investments represent the potential to create hundreds of jobs, enhanced mobility, and future economic development for Texas, and the entire Nation.

I commend the Chairman for recognizing the need for emergency funding in flood stricken areas. However, there are plenty of places from which my colleagues can offset funding. I cannot support an amendment that offsets funding from critical infrastructure projects that create jobs. I urge my colleagues in the Majority to explain why they would rather take funding from projects that create middle class jobs than raise taxes for billionaires.

We must repair the damage done by flooding, but we must also invest in the future of America. Other nations around the world have shown us that the future is high speed rail. It

is our responsibility to make critical investments in infrastructure projects, like high speed rail.

I urge my colleagues to think about the consequences of continuing to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans at the expense of middle class jobs and improvements to our Nation's infrastructure. Offsetting funding for high speed rail for emergency disaster relief is not a responsible course of action.

My Republican colleagues constantly talk about creating jobs, yet time and time again, they turn away from opportunities to do so. The time for rhetoric has passed; what the country needs, what our constituents need is action. Offsetting funding for high speed rail, slashing funds that will create jobs is the wrong action, and I urge my colleagues to reconsider.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am urging this House to spend the high-speed rail money on what it's designated for, high-speed rail projects.

Much of this money, or a good portion of it, was turned down by Governors of other States. So I'm here as a representative of Michigan's 13th District, and I want to go on the record right now of claiming that money because Michigan and metro Detroit, the district that I represent, we need jobs, jobs that will be created by the high-speed rail project, jobs that will be created when that high-speed rail that links Detroit to Chicago is tied into a regional transit system around metro Detroit. That's going to attract businesses all around that system. Companies and employers are more likely to stay in Detroit, move to Detroit when they realize they can have close access to Chicago and other midwestern areas. But jobs not only as an indirect result of this transit system and high-speed rail system, but by manufacturing the rails and the passenger cars that are going to be used. By creating jobs, that is the most effective way to create a long-term, resilient, enduring economy. And that's the best way to pay down our debt.

I understand the point that we should allocate a funding source to provide funding for the flood victims. Well, I would like to propose one.

Over the last 10 years, this Congress has authorized the spending of over \$50 billion—that's with a "b"—in economic aid to Afghanistan. Each fiscal year, including this current one, we're spending at least \$4 billion on economic aid in Afghanistan. I'm proposing let's just take a share of the money we're sending overseas to help serve and protect people in another country, let's redirect American tax dollars back to serve Americans.

And my fundamental point is this: We need to be more conservative with our tax dollars. Yes, there are needs all around the world, but our people need help right here. This budget choice that we're faced with right now under-

scores that. This is a choice that we should not have to make. We shouldn't have to choose between serving flood victims and providing for long-term jobs that we need in Michigan and metro Detroit through high-speed rail.

You know, there is another fairness issue. Folks where I live, the auto capital of the world, they can't afford an automobile because of the high cost of automobile insurance. They need high-speed rail and the synergy it will create with mass transit.

So again, I urge you, let's use this money for its intended purpose—to ultimately create jobs. That's the best way that we can pay down the Federal debt, and also it's the principle of it. In these tough economic times, let's redirect American tax dollars to serve Americans. High-speed rail in America will create jobs and make a difference for our people, a positive difference.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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:

An amendment by Mr. MATHESON of Utah.

An amendment by Mr. REED of New York.

Amendment No. 65 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 68 by Mr. ROYCE of California.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

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

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) 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 168, noes 257, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

AYES—168

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Amash  
Baca  
Baldwin

Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)

Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Gibson  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hanna  
Hastings (FL)

Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslie  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Paul

Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Ross (AR)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

#### NOES—257

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Andrews  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishek  
Berg  
Berkley  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cansco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Cicilline  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)

Cole  
Conaway  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Holden  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette

Latta	Pastor (AZ)	Sensenbrenner	Bralley (IA)	Hochul	Pingree (ME)	Dreier	Kingston	Rivera
Lewis (CA)	Paulsen	Sessions	Brown (FL)	Holt	Pitts	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
LoBiondo	Pearce	Shimkus	Bucshon	Honda	Platts	Edwards	Klaine	Rogers (AL)
Loeb	Pence	Shuster	Buerkle	Hoyer	Polis	Ellmers	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Lofgren, Zoe	Petri	Simpson	Hultgren	Pompeo	Pompeo	Emerson	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Long	Pitts	Smith (NE)	Hurt	Posey	Posey	Eshoo	Latham	Rohrabacher
Lucas	Platts	Smith (NJ)	Insee	Price (NC)	Price (NC)	Fattah	Latta	Rokita
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)	Israel	Quigley	Quigley	Flake	Lewis (CA)	Rothman (NJ)
Lummis	Pompeo	Smith (WA)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall	Rahall	Fleischmann	Loeb	Runyan
Lungren, Daniel E.	Posey	Southerland	Jackson Lee (TX)	Rangel	Rangel	Flores	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (OH)
Lynch	Price (GA)	Stearns	Johnson (GA)	Reed	Reed	Forbes	Long	Sanchez, Loretta
Mack	Quayle	Stivers	Johnson (IL)	Reichert	Reichert	Fox	Lucas	Speier
Manzullo	Rehberg	Stutzman	Johnson (OH)	Reyes	Reyes	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Schilling
Marchant	Reichert	Sullivan	Johnson (OH)	Ribble	Ribble	Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Schweikert
Marino	Renacci	Terry	Richardson	Richardson	Richardson	Gallegly	Mack	Scott, Austin
McCarthy (CA)	Reyes	Thompson (MS)	Richardson	Richardson	Richardson	Garamendi	Marino	Sessions
McCaul	Ribble	Thompson (PA)	Richmond	Richmond	Richmond	Garrett	McCaul	Shimkus
McClintock	Rigell	Thornberry	Roe (FL)	Roe (FL)	Roe (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	McCotter	Smith (NE)
McCotter	Rivera	Tiberi	Rooney	Rooney	Rooney	Granger	McKeon	Smith (TX)
McHenry	Roby	Tipton	Ros-Lehtinen	Ros-Lehtinen	Ros-Lehtinen	Graves (GA)	McNerney	Smith (WA)
McKeon	Roe (TN)	Tsongas	Roskam	Roskam	Roskam	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)	Southerland
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Turner	Ross (AR)	Ross (AR)	Ross (AR)	Hall	Miller (MI)	Speier
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Upton	Ross (FL)	Ross (FL)	Ross (FL)	Hanabusa	Miller (NC)	Thornberry
Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky	Roybal-Allard	Royce	Royce	Harper	Miller, Gary	Tsongas
McNerney	Rohrabacher	Walberg	Royce	Royce	Royce	Harris	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Meehan	Rokita	Walsh	Ruppersberger	Ruppersberger	Ruppersberger	Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Visclosky
Mica	Rooney	Walsh	Rush	Rush	Rush	Heck	Neugebauer	Walberg
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh (IL)	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)	Hensarling	Noem	Walsh (IL)
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Webster	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sánchez, Linda T.	Herger	Nunnelee	Walz (MN)
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	West	Sarbanes	Sarbanes	Sarbanes	Herrera Beutler	Olson	Waters
Moore	Rothman (NJ)	Westmoreland	Schakowsky	Schakowsky	Schakowsky	Himes	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Mulvaney	Royce	Whitfield	Schiff	Schiff	Schiff	Holden	Pastor (AZ)	Whitfield
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Wilson (SC)	Schmidt	Schmidt	Schmidt	Huelskamp	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Myrick	Runyan	Wittman	Schmitt	Schmitt	Schmitt	Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Wittman
Neugebauer	Murphy (PA)	Wolf	Schrader	Schrader	Schrader	Hunter	Price (GA)	Wolf
Noem	Myrick	Womack	Schwartz	Schwartz	Schwartz	Issa	Quayle	Womack
Nugent	Neugebauer	Woodall	Scott (SC)	Scott (SC)	Scott (SC)	Jenkins	Rehberg	Yoder
Nunes	Noem	Yoder	Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)	Kelly	Renacci	Young (FL)
Nunnelee	Nugent	Young (AK)	Scott, David	Scott, David	Scott, David	King (NY)	Rigell	Young (IN)
Olson	Nunes	Young (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner			
Palazzo	Nunnelee	Young (IN)	Serrano	Serrano	Serrano			
	Olson		Sewell	Sewell	Sewell			
	Palazzo		Sherman	Sherman	Sherman			
			Shuler	Shuler	Shuler			
			Shuster	Shuster	Shuster			
			Simpson	Simpson	Simpson			
			Sires	Sires	Sires			
			Slaughter	Slaughter	Slaughter			
			Smith (NJ)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (NJ)			
			Stark	Stark	Stark			
			Stearns	Stearns	Stearns			
			Stivers	Stivers	Stivers			
			Stutzman	Stutzman	Stutzman			
			Sullivan	Sullivan	Sullivan			
			Sutton	Sutton	Sutton			
			Terry	Terry	Terry			
			Thompson (CA)	Thompson (CA)	Thompson (CA)			
			Thompson (MS)	Thompson (MS)	Thompson (MS)			
			Thompson (PA)	Thompson (PA)	Thompson (PA)			
			Tiberi	Tiberi	Tiberi			
			Tierney	Tierney	Tierney			
			Tipton	Tipton	Tipton			
			Tonko	Tonko	Tonko			
			Towns	Towns	Towns			
			Upton	Upton	Upton			
			Van Hollen	Van Hollen	Van Hollen			
			Velázquez	Velázquez	Velázquez			
			Walden	Walden	Walden			
			Wasserman	Wasserman	Wasserman			
			Schultz	Schultz	Schultz			
			Watt	Watt	Watt			
			Waxman	Waxman	Waxman			
			Webster	Webster	Webster			
			Welch	Welch	Welch			
			West	West	West			
			Wilson (FL)	Wilson (FL)	Wilson (FL)			
			Woodall	Woodall	Woodall			
			Woolsey	Woolsey	Woolsey			
			Wu	Wu	Wu			
			Yarmuth	Yarmuth	Yarmuth			
			Young (AK)	Young (AK)	Young (AK)			

NOT VOTING—6

Costa	Giffords	Pelosi
Ellison	Hinchee	Rush

□ 1442

Ms. MOORE, Messrs. AKIN, ROTHMAN, and STUTZMAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CRITZ, GUTIERREZ, AMASH, BISHOP of Georgia, and DOYLE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 162, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

AYES—261

Ackerman	Bass (NH)	Bishop (UT)
Adams	Becerra	Black
Baca	Benishek	Blumenauer
Baldwin	Berkley	Bono Mack
Barrow	Berman	Boswell
Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Bass (CA)	Bishop (NY)	Brady (TX)

NOES—162

Aderholt	Blackburn
Akin	Bonner
Alexander	Boren
Altmire	Boustany
Amash	Brooks
Andrews	Broun (GA)
Austria	Buchanan
Bachmann	Burgess
Bachus	Burton (IN)
Barletta	Calvert
Bartlett	Campbell
Berg	Cantor
Biggert	Carter
Bilbray	Cassidy
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)

Chu
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Ellison	Hinchee	Moran
Fleming	King (IA)	Pelosi
Giffords	Maloney	

□ 1447

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

Messrs. HONDA, WEBSTER, and CONYERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 575 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) 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 164, noes 261, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

AYES—164

Ackerman	Becerra	Blumenauer
Andrews	Berman	Boswell
Baca	Biggert	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bishop (GA)	Bralley (IA)
Bass (CA)	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)

Butterfield	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)	Langevin	Palazzo	Scott (SC)	Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Pearce
Capps	Hultgren	Polis	Lankford	Pastor (AZ)	Scott, Austin	Costa	Jones	Pence
Capuano	Inslee	Price (NC)	Larsen (WA)	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Cravaack	Jordan	Pitts
Cardoza	Israel	Quigley	Latham	Pearce	Sessions	Denham	King (IA)	Poe (TX)
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rahall	LaTourette	Pence	Shimkus	Flores	King (NY)	Pompeo
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel	Latta	Peterson	Shuster	Farenthold	Kingston	Posey
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Reyes	Lewis (CA)	Petri	Simpson	Fincher	Kline	Price (GA)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson	LoBiondo	Pitts	Slaughter	Flake	Labrador	Quayle
Chu	Jones	Richmond	Loeb sack	Platts	Smith (NE)	Fleming	Landry	Ribble
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)	Lofgren, Zoe	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)	Flores	Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Roybal-Allard	Long	Pompeo	Smith (TX)	Foxx	Long	Rohrabacher
Clay	Kildee	Ruppersberger	Lucas	Posey	Smith (WA)	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rokita
Cleaver	Kind	Rush	Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Southerland	Gallegly	Lummis	Rooney
Clyburn	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)	Lummis	Quayle	Stearns	Gardner	Lungren, Daniel	Ross (FL)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Lungren, Daniel	Reed	Stivers	Garrett	E.	Royce
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	T.	E.	Rehberg	Sullivan	Gibson	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Conyers	Levin	Sarbanes	Mack	Reichert	Stutzman	Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo	Scalise
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky	Manzullo	Renacci	Sullivan	Gohmert	Marchant	Schmidt
Costello	Lipinski	Schiff	Manzullo	Ribble	Terry	Goodlatte	Marino	Schwartz
Courtney	Lowey	Schrader	Marino	Rigell	Thompson (PA)	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)	Scott, Austin
Crowley	Lujan	Schwartz	McCarthy (CA)	Rivera	Thornberry	Gowdy	McCaul	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Lynch	Scott (VA)	McCaul	Roby	Tiberi	Graves (GA)	McClintock	Sessions
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Scott, David	McClintock	Roe (TN)	Tipton	Graves (MO)	McHenry	Shimkus
Davis (IL)	Markey	Serrano	McCotter	Rogers (AL)	Turner	Griffin (AR)	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Matheson	Sewell	McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Upton	Griffith (VA)	Mica	Stearns
DeGette	Matsui	Sherman	McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Walberg	Grimm	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Shuler	McKinley	Rohrabacher	Walden	Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Deutch	McCollum	Sires	McMorris	Rokita	Walsh (IL)	Harris	Miller, Gary	Tipton
Dicks	McDermott	Speier	Rodgers	Rooney	Walsh (MN)	Hartzer	Mulvaney	Walberg
Dingell	McGovern	Stark	Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Walsh (IL)
Doggett	McIntyre	Sutton	Miller (FL)	Roskam	West	Herger	Myrick	Webster
Doyle	McNerney	Thompson (CA)	Miller (MI)	Ross (AR)	Westmoreland	Huelskamp	Neugebauer	West
Duncan (TN)	Meehan	Thompson (MS)	Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	Whitfield	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Westmoreland
Edwards	Michaud	Tierney	Mulvaney	Royce	Wilson (SC)	Hunter	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Engel	Miller (NC)	Tonko	Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Wittman	Hurt	Nunnelee	Woodall
Farr	Miller, George	Towns	Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Wolf	Issa	Owens	Yoder
Fattah	Moore	Tsongas	Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Womack	Jenkins	Paul	Young (IN)
Filner	Moran	Van Hollen	Noem	Scalise	Woodall	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Velázquez	Nugent	Schilling	Yoder			
Fudge	Nadler	Visclosky	Nunes	Schmidt	Young (AK)			
Green, Al	Napolitano	Wasserman	Nunnelee	Schock	Young (FL)			
Green, Gene	Neal	Schultz	Olson	Schweikert	Young (IN)			
Grijalva	Oliver	Watt	Ellison			Ackerman		
Gutierrez	Owens	Waxman	Giffords	Hinchoy	King (IA)	Aderholt	Crawford	Heinrich
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Welch		Hirono	Meeks	Alexander	Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler
Higgins	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)				Andrews	Critz	Higgins
Himes	Paul	Woolsey				Austria	Crowley	Himes
Hinojosa	Payne	Wu				Bachus	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Hochul	Pelosi	Yarmuth				Baldwin	Culberson	Hirono
Holt	Perlmutter					Barletta	Cummings	Hochul
Honda	Peters					Barrow	Davis (CA)	Holden

NOES—291

NOT VOTING—6

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

□ 1451

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 576, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 291, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—136

NOES—261

Adams	Coble	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Coffman (CO)	Gosar
Akin	Cole	Gowdy
Alexander	Conaway	Granger
Altmire	Costa	Graves (GA)
Amash	Cravaack	Graves (MO)
Austria	Crawford	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Critz	Grimm
Barletta	Cuellar	Guinta
Barrow	Culberson	Guthrie
Bartlett	Davis (KY)	Hall
Barton (TX)	Denham	Hanabusa
Bass (NH)	Dent	Hanna
Benishek	DesJarlais	Harper
Berg	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Berkley	Dold	Hartzler
Bilbray	Donnelly (IN)	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Dreier	Hayworth
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Heck
Black	Duncan (SC)	Heinrich
Blackburn	Ellmers	Hensarling
Bonner	Emerson	Herger
Bono Mack	Eshoo	Herrera Beutler
Boren	Farenthold	Holden
Boustany	Fincher	Huelskamp
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks	Flake	Hunter
Broun (GA)	Fleischmann	Hurt
Buchanan	Fleming	Issa
Bucshon	Flores	Jenkins
Buerkle	Forbes	Johnson (GA)
Burgess	Fortenberry	Johnson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Foxx	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Campbell	Gallegly	Kelly
Canseco	Garamendi	King (NY)
Cantor	Gardner	Kingston
Capito	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Carter	Gerlach	Kissell
Cassidy	Gibbs	Kline
Chabot	Gibson	Labrador
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Chandler	Gohmert	Lance
Cicilline	Gonzalez	Landry

Adams	Black	Calvert
Akin	Blackburn	Campbell
Amash	Bono Mack	Canseco
Bachmann	Boustany	Cantor
Barton (TX)	Broun (GA)	Chabot
Benishek	Buchanan	Chaffetz
Bilirakis	Burgess	Coble
Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)	Coffman (CO)

Crawford	Heinrich
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler
Critz	Higgins
Crowley	Himes
Cuellar	Hinojosa
Culberson	Hirono
Cummings	Hochul
Davis (CA)	Holden
Davis (IL)	Holt
Davis (KY)	Honda
DeFazio	Hoyer
DeGette	Hultgren
DeLauro	Inslee
Dent	Israel
DesJarlais	Jackson (IL)
Berg	Deutch
Berkley	Diaz-Balart
Berman	Dicks
Biggart	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Doggett
Bishop (NY)	Dold
Blumenauer	Donnelly (IN)
Bonner	Doyle
Boren	Dreier
Boswell	Duffy
Brady (PA)	Duncan (SC)
Brady (TX)	Edwards
Braley (IA)	Ellmers
Brooks	Emerson
Brown (FL)	Engel
Bucshon	Eshoo
Buerkle	Farr
Butterfield	Fattah
Camp	Filner
Capito	Fitzpatrick
Capps	Fleischmann
Capuano	Forbes
Cardoza	Fortenberry
Carnahan	Frank (MA)
Carney	Frelinghuysen
Carson (IN)	Fudge
Carter	Garamendi
Cassidy	Gerlach
Castor (FL)	Gibbs
Chandler	Gonzalez
Chu	Granger
Cicilline	Green, Al
Clarke (MI)	Green, Gene
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva
Cleaver	Guinta
Clyburn	Gutierrez
Cohen	Hall
Cole	Hanabusa
Connolly (VA)	Hanna
Conyers	Harper
Cooper	Hastings (FL)
Costello	Hastings (WA)
Courtney	Hayworth
	Heck

McMorris Richmond Southerland  
 Rodgers Rigell Speier  
 McNerney Rivera Stark  
 Meehan Roby Stivers  
 Meeks Rogers (AL) Sullivan  
 Michaud Rogers (KY) Sutton  
 Miller (NC) Rogers (MI) Terry  
 Miller, George Ros-Lehtinen  
 Moore Roskam Thompson (CA)  
 Moran Ross (AR) Thompson (MS)  
 Murphy (CT) Rothman (NJ) Thompson (PA)  
 Nadler Roybal-Allard Tiberi  
 Napolitano Runyan Tierney  
 Neal Ruppertsberger Tonko  
 Noem Rush Towns  
 Olson Ryan (OH) Tsongas  
 Olver Sánchez, Linda Turner  
 Pallazo T. Upton  
 Pascrell Sanchez, Loretta Van Hollen  
 Pastor (AZ) Sarbanes Velázquez  
 Payne Schakowsky Visclosky  
 Pelosi Schiff Walden  
 Perlmutter Schilling Walz (MN)  
 Peters Schock Wasserman  
 Peterson Schrader Wasserman  
 Petri Schwartz Schultz  
 Pingree (ME) Scott (SC) Waters  
 Platts Scott (VA) Watt  
 Polis Scott, David Waxman  
 Price (NC) Serrano Welch  
 Quigley Sewell Whitfield  
 Rahall Sherman Wilson (FL)  
 Rangel Shuler Wittman  
 Reed Shuster Wolf  
 Rehberg Simpson Womack  
 Reichert Sires Woolsey  
 Renacci Slaughter Wu  
 Reyes Smith (NE) Yarmuth  
 Richardson Smith (TX) Young (AK)  
 Smith (WA) Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Bilbray Giffords  
 Ellison Hinchey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1454

Ms. PINGREE of Maine changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 99, noes 328, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

AYES—99

Akin Broun (GA) Conaway  
 Amash Burgess Cravaack  
 Bachmann Burton (IN) Duncan (TN)  
 Benishek Campbell Flake  
 Bishop (UT) Canseco Fleming  
 Black Chabot Foxx  
 Blackburn Chaffetz Franks (AZ)  
 Bono Mack Coble Garrett  
 Brady (TX) Coffman (CO) Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert Lamborn Rokita  
 Goodlatte Landry Rooney  
 Gowdy Long Ross (FL)  
 Graves (GA) Mack Royce  
 Green, Gene Manullo Ryan (WI)  
 Griffith (VA) Marchant Scalise  
 Guthrie Marino Schmidt  
 Harris McClintock Schweikert  
 Hartzler McHenry Scott (SC)  
 Hurt Hensarling Scott, Austin  
 Herger Miller (FL) Sensenbrenner  
 Huelskamp Miller (MI) Sessions  
 Huizenga (MI) Miller, Gary Southerland  
 Hunter Mulvaney Stearns  
 Murphy (PA) Stutzman  
 Neugebauer Tipton  
 Nugent Walsh (IL)  
 Paul Webster  
 Pitts West  
 Pompeo Westmoreland  
 Price (GA) Wilson (SC)  
 Quayle Woodall  
 Ribble Yoder  
 Rohrabacher Young (IN)

NOES—328

Cummings Hoyer  
 Davis (CA) Hultgren  
 Davis (IL) Inslee  
 Davis (KY) Israel  
 DeFazio Jackson (IL)  
 DeGette Jackson Lee  
 DeLauro (TX)  
 Denham Johnson (GA)  
 Dent Johnson (IL)  
 DesJarlais Johnson, E. B.  
 Deutch Kaptur  
 Diaz-Balart Keating  
 Dicks Kelly  
 Dingell Kildee  
 Doggett Kind  
 Dold King (NY)  
 Donnelly (IN) Kingston  
 Berg Doyle Kinzinger (IL)  
 Berkley Dreier Kissell  
 Berman Duffy Kucinich  
 Biggert Duncan (SC) Lance  
 Bilbray Edwards Langevin  
 Bilirakis Ellmers Lankford  
 Bishop (GA) Emerson Larsen (WA)  
 Bishop (NY) Engel Larson (CT)  
 Blumenauer Eshoo Latham  
 Bonner Farenthold Latta  
 Boren Farr Lee (CA)  
 Boswell Fattah Levin  
 Boustany Filner Lewis (CA)  
 Brady (PA) Fincher Lewis (GA)  
 Braley (IA) Fitzpatrick Lipinski  
 Brooks Fleischmann LoBiondo  
 Brown (FL) Flores Loeb sack  
 Buchanan Forbes Lofgren, Zoe  
 Bucshon Fortenberry Lowey  
 Buerkle Frank (MA) Lucas  
 Butterfield Frelinghuysen Luetkemeyer  
 Calvert Fudge Luján  
 Camp Gallegly Lummis  
 Cantor Garamendi Lungren, Daniel  
 Capito Gardner E.  
 Capps Gerlach Lynch  
 Capuano Gibbs Maloney  
 Cardoza Gibson Markey  
 Carnahan Gonzalez Matheson  
 Carney Gosar Matsui  
 Carson (IN) Granger McCarthy (CA)  
 Carter Graves (MO) McCarthy (NY)  
 Cassidy Green, Al McCaul  
 Castor (FL) Griffin (AR) McCollum  
 Chandler Grijalva McCotter  
 Chu Grimm McDermott  
 Cicilline Guinta McGovern  
 Clarke (MI) Gutierrez McIntyre  
 Clarke (NY) Hall McKeon  
 Clay Hanabusa McKinley  
 Cleaver Hanna McMorris  
 Clyburn Harper Rogers  
 Cohen Hastings (FL) McNerney  
 Cole Hastings (WA) Meehan  
 Connolly (VA) Hayworth Meeks  
 Conyers Heck Michaud  
 Cooper Heinrich Miller (NC)  
 Costa Herrera Beutler Miller, George  
 Courtney Higgins Moore  
 Crawford Himes Moran  
 Crenshaw Hirono Murphy (CT)  
 Critz Hochul Myrick  
 Crowley Holden Nadler  
 Cuellar Holt Napolitano  
 Culberson Honda Neal  
 Noem

Nunes Rogers (KY) Stark  
 Nunnelee Rogers (KY) Stivers  
 Olson Rogers (MI) Sullivan  
 Olver Ros-Lehtinen Sutton  
 Owens Roskam Terry  
 Palazzo Ross (AR) Thompson (CA)  
 Pallone Rothman (NJ) Thompson (MS)  
 Pascrell Roybal-Allard Thompson (PA)  
 Pastor (AZ) Runyan Thornberry  
 Paulsen Ruppertsberger Tiberi  
 Payne Rush Tierney  
 Pearce Ryan (OH) Tonko  
 Pelosi Sánchez, Linda Towns  
 Pence T. Tsongas  
 Perlmutter Sanchez, Loretta Turner  
 Peters Sarbanes Upton  
 Peterson Schakowsky Van Hollen  
 Petri Schiff Velázquez  
 Pingree (ME) Schilling Visclosky  
 Platts Schock Walberg  
 Poe (TX) Schrader Walden  
 Polis Schwartz Walz (MN)  
 Posey Scott (VA) Wasserman  
 Price (NC) Scott, David Schultz  
 Quigley Serrano Waters  
 Rahall Sewell Watt  
 Rangel Sherman Waxman  
 Reed Shimkus Welch  
 Rehberg Shuler Whitfield  
 Reichert Shuster Wilson (FL)  
 Renacci Simpson Wittman  
 Reyes Sires Wolf  
 Richardson Slaughter Womack  
 Richmond Smith (NE) Woolsey  
 Rigell Smith (NJ) Wu  
 Rivera Smith (TX) Yarmuth  
 Roby Smith (WA) Young (AK)  
 Roe (TN) Speier Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Ellison Hinchey  
 Giffords LaTourette

□ 1458

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) 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 214, noes 213, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—214

Ackerman Braley (IA) Connolly (VA)  
 Altmire Brown (FL) Conyers  
 Andrews Butterfield Cooper  
 Baca Capps Costa  
 Baldwin Capuano Costello  
 Barrow Cardoza Courtney  
 Bartlett Carnahan Critz  
 Bass (CA) Carney Crowley  
 Bass (NH) Carson (IN) Cuellar  
 Becerra Castor (FL) Cummings  
 Benishek Chandler Davis (CA)  
 Berkley Chu Davis (IL)  
 Berman Cicilline DeFazio  
 Bilbray Clarke (MI) DeGette  
 Bishop (GA) Clarke (NY) DeLauro  
 Bishop (NY) Clay DesJarlais  
 Blumener Cleaver Deutch  
 Boren Clyburn Dingell  
 Boswell Coble Doggett  
 Brady (PA) Cohen Dold

Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)	Rahall	Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman	Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Schweikert
Doyle	LaTourette	Rangel	Neugebauer	Rogers (MI)	Sullivan	Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Scott (SC)
Duncan (TN)	Lee (CA)	Reichert	Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Terry	Jones	Paul	Scott, Austin
Edwards	Levin	Reyes	Nugent	Rokita	Thompson (PA)	Jordan	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Nunes	Rooney	Thornberry	Kingston	Pearce	Sessions
Eshoo	Lipinski	Richmond	Nunnelee	Ros-Lehtinen	Tjiberi	Kline	Petri	Smith (NE)
Farr	LoBiondo	Ross (AR)	Olson	Roskam	Tipton	Labrador	Pitts	Southerland
Fattah	Loeb	Ross (FL)	Palazzo	Royce	Towns	Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stearns
Filner	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)	Palazzo	Royce	Turner	Latta	Pompeo	Stutzman
Fincher	Lowe	Roybal-Allard	Pastor (AZ)	Ryunan	Turner	Long	Price (GA)	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	Lujan	Ruppersberger	Paul	Ryan (WI)	Velázquez	Mack	Quayle	Tipton
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Rush	Paulsen	Scalise	Visclosky	Marino	Rigell	Walberg
Fudge	E.	Ryan (OH)	Pearce	Schilling	Walden	Matheson	Roe (TN)	Walsh (IL)
Garamendi	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Pitts	Schmidt	Walberg	McClintock	Rohrabacher	Webster
Gerlach	Maloney	T.	Poe (TX)	Schrock	Walsh (IL)	McHenry	Rokita	West
Gibson	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta	Pompeo	Schweikert	Waxman	Mica	Rooney	Westmoreland
Gonzalez	Marino	Sarbanes	Posey	Scott (SC)	Webster	Miller (FL)	Ross (FL)	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Markey	Schakowsky	Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland	Miller, Gary	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Green, Al	Matheson	Schiff	Quayle	Serrano	Whitfield	Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
Griffith (VA)	Matsui	Schrader	Reed	Sessions	Wilson (SC)	Murphy (PA)	Schmidt	Young (IN)
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz	Rehberg	Shimkus	Wittman			
Gutierrez	McCaul	Scott (VA)	Renacci	Shuster	Wolf			
Hanabusa	McCollum	Scott, Austin	Ribble	Simpson	Womack	Aderholt	Dicks	Lance
Harris	McDermott	Scott, David	Rigell	Smith (NE)	Yoder	Alexander	Dingell	Landry
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Sewell	Rivera	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)	Altmire	Doggett	Langevin
Heck	McIntyre	Sherman	Roby	Southerland	Young (FL)	Austria	Dold	Lankford
Heinrich	McNerney	Shuler	Roe (TN)	Stearns	Young (IN)	Baca	Donnelly (IN)	Larsen (WA)
Higgins	Meeks	Sires	Rogers (AL)	Stivers		Bachus	Doyle	Larson (CT)
Himes	Mica	Slaughter				Baldwin	Dreier	Latham
Hinojosa	Michaud	Smith (TX)	Ellison	Green, Gene	NOT VOTING—4	Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Lee (CA)
Hirono	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)	Giffords	Hinchee		Barrow	Edwards	Levin
Hochul	Miller, George	Speier				Bartlett	Ellmers	Lewis (CA)
Holden	Moore	Stark				Bass (CA)	Emerson	Lewis (GA)
Holt	Moran	Sutton				Bass (NH)	Engel	Lipinski
Honda	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)				Becerra	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Hoyer	Nadler	Thompson (MS)				Berg	Farenthold	Loeb
Inslee	Napolitano	Tierney				Berkley	Farr	Lofgren, Zoe
Israel	Neal	Tonko				Berman	Fattah	Lowe
Jackson (IL)	Oliver	Tsongas				Biggart	Filner	Lucas
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Van Hollen				Bilbray	Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer
Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Walz (MN)				Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Lujan
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Wasserman				Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	Lummis
Jones	Payne	Schultz				Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel
Kaptur	Pelosi	Waters				Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	E.
Keating	Perlmutter	Watt				Bonner	Fudge	Lynch
Kildee	Peters	Welch				Boren	Gallely	Maloney
Kind	Peterson	West				Boswell	Garamendi	Manzullo
Kinzinger (IL)	Petri	Wilson (FL)				Boustany	Gardner	Markey
Kissell	Pingree (ME)	Woodall				Brady (PA)	Gerlach	Matsui
Kucinich	Platts	Woolsey				Braley (IA)	Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)
Lance	Polis	Wu				Brown (FL)	Gibson	McCarthy (NY)
Langevin	Price (NC)	Yarmuth				Buchanan	Gonzalez	McCaul
Larsen (WA)	Quigley					Buchson	Gosar	McCollum
						Burgess	Gowdy	McCotter
						Burton (IN)	Granger	McDermott
						Butterfield	Graves (MO)	McGovern
						Calvert	Green, Al	McIntyre
						Camp	Green, Gene	McKeon
						Capito	Griffin (AR)	McKinley
						Capps	Grijalva	McMorris
						Capuano	Grimm	Rodgers
						Cardoza	Guinta	McNerney
						Carnahan	Guthrie	Meehan
						Carney	Gutierrez	Meeks
						Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Michaud
						Carter	Hanna	Miller (MI)
						Cassidy	Harper	Miller (NC)
						Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
						Chandler	Hastings (WA)	Moore
						Chu	Heck	Moran
						Cicilline	Heinrich	Murphy (CT)
						Clarke (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Myrick
						Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Nadler
						Clay	Himes	Napolitano
						Cleaver	Hinojosa	Neal
						Clyburn	Hirono	Noem
						Coble	Hochul	Nunes
						Cohen	Holden	Nunnelee
						Cole	Holt	Olson
						Connolly (VA)	Honda	Oliver
						Conyers	Hoyer	Owens
						Cooper	Inslee	Palazzo
						Costa	Israel	Pallone
						Costello	Issa	Pascrell
						Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
						Crawford	Jackson Lee	Payne
						Crenshaw	(TX)	Pelosi
						Critz	Johnson (GA)	Pence
						Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
						Cuellar	Kaptur	Peters
						Cummings	Keating	Peterson
						Davis (CA)	Kelly	Pingree (ME)
						DeFazio	Kildee	Platts
						DeGette	Kind	Polis
						DeLauro	King (IA)	Posey
						Denham	King (NY)	Price (NC)
						Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley
						Deutch	Kissell	Rahall
						Diaz-Balart	Kucinich	Rangel

## NOES—309

## NOT VOTING—4

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1501

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 579, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 309, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

AYES—114

Adams	Davis (KY)	Huelskamp	Adams	Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)
Aderholt	Denham	Huizenga (MI)	Akin	Coffman (CO)	Gohmert
Akin	Dent	Hultgren	Amash	Conaway	Goodlatte
Alexander	Diaz-Balart	Hunter	Bachmann	Cravaack	Graves (GA)
Amash	Dicks	Hurt	Barton (TX)	Culberson	Griffith (VA)
Austria	Dreier	Issa	Benishek	Davis (IL)	Hall
Bachmann	Duffy	Jackson Lee	Bishop (UT)	Davis (KY)	Harris
Bachus	Duncan (SC)	(TX)	Black	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Barletta	Ellmers	Jenkins	Blackburn	Duffy	Hayworth
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Johnson (OH)	Bono Mack	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Berg	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam	Brooks	Fincher	Herger
Biggart	Flake	Jordan	Broun (GA)	Flake	Huelskamp
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Kelly	Buerkle	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	King (IA)	Campbell	Flores	Hultgren
Black	Flores	King (NY)	Cantore	Forbes	Hunter
Blackburn	Forbes	Kingston	Chabot	Fox	Hurt
Bonner	Fortenberry	Kline	Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Bono Mack	Fox	Labrador	Chabot	Garrett	Johnson (IL)
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn			
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Landry			
Brooks	Gallely	Lankford			
Broun (GA)	Gardner	Latham			
Buchanan	Garrett	Latta			
Buchson	Gibbs	Lewis (CA)			
Buerkle	Gingrey (GA)	Long			
Burgess	Gohmert	Lucas			
Burton (IN)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer			
Calvert	Gowdy	Lummis			
Camp	Granger	Mack			
Campbell	Graves (GA)	Marchant			
Canseco	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)			
Cantor	Griffin (AR)	McClintock			
Capito	Grimm	McCotter			
Carter	Guinta	McHenry			
Cassidy	Guthrie	McKeon			
Chabot	Hall	McKinley			
Chaffetz	Hanna	McMorris			
Coffman (CO)	Harper	Rodgers			
Cole	Hartzler	Meehan			
Conaway	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)			
Cravaack	Hayworth	Miller (MI)			
Crawford	Hensarling	Miller, Gary			
Crenshaw	Herger	Mulvaney			
Culberson	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)			

Reed Schiff Tierney  
 Rehberg Schilling Tonko  
 Reichert Schock Towns  
 Renacci Schrader Tsongas  
 Reyes Schwartz Turner  
 Ribble Scott (VA) Upton  
 Richardson Scott, David Van Hollen  
 Richmond Serrano Velázquez  
 Rivera Sewell Visclosky  
 Roby Sherman Walden  
 Rogers (AL) Shimkus Walz (MN)  
 Rogers (KY) Shuler Wasserman  
 Rogers (MI) Shuster  
 Ros-Lehtinen Simpson Schultz  
 Roskam Sires Waters  
 Ross (AR) Slaughter Watt  
 Rothman (NJ) Smith (NJ) Waxman  
 Roybal-Allard Smith (TX) Welch  
 Runyan Smith (WA) Wilson (FL)  
 Ruppertsberger Stark Wittman  
 Rush Stivers Wolf  
 Ryan (OH) Sullivan Womack  
 Sánchez, Linda Sutton Woolsey  
 T. Terry Wu  
 Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (CA) Yarmuth  
 Sarbanes Thompson (MS) Yoder  
 Scalise Thompson (PA) Young (AK)  
 Schakowsky Tiberi Young (FL)

Dicks King (NY) Richardson  
 Dingell Kingston Rigell  
 Dold Kinzinger (IL) Rivera  
 Donnelly (IN) Kline Roby  
 Doyle Labrador Roe (TN)  
 Dreier Lamborn Rogers (AL)  
 Duffy Lance Rogers (KY)  
 Duncan (SC) Landry Rogers (MI)  
 Duncan (TN) Lankford Rohrabacher  
 Ellmers Larsen (WA) Rokita  
 Emerson Latham Rooney  
 Farenthold LaTourette  
 Fattah Latta Ros-Lehtinen  
 Fincher Lewis (CA) Roskam  
 Fitzpatrick Lipinski Ross (AR)  
 Flake LoBiondo Ross (FL)  
 Fleischmann Loeback Royce  
 Fleming Lucas Runyan  
 Flores Luetkemeyer Ruppertsberger  
 Forbes Lummis Ryan (OH)  
 Fortenberry Lungren, Daniel Ryan (WI)  
 Foxx E. Sarbanes  
 Franks (AZ) Mack Scalise  
 Frelinghuysen Manullo Schilling  
 Gallegly Marchant Schmidt  
 Gardner Marino Schock  
 Garrett McCarthy (CA) Schrader  
 Gerlach McCarthy (NY) Schwartz  
 Gibbs McCaul Schweikert  
 Gibson McClintock Scott (SC)  
 Gingrey (GA) McCollum Scott (VA)  
 Gohmert McCotter Scott, Austin  
 Goodlatte McHenry Scott, David  
 Gosar McIntyre Sensenbrenner  
 Gowdy McKinley Sessions  
 Granger McMorris Shimkus  
 Graves (GA) Rodgers Shuler  
 Graves (MO) McNeerney Shuster  
 Green, Al Meehan Simpson  
 Green, Gene Mica Slaughter  
 Griffin (AR) Michaud Smith (NE)  
 Griffith (VA) Miller (FL) Smith (NJ)  
 Grimm Miller (MI) Smith (TX)  
 Guinta Miller (NC) Sutherland  
 Guthrie Miller, Gary Stearns  
 Hall Mulvaney Stivers  
 Hanna Murphy (CT) Stutzman  
 Harper Harper, PA) Sullivan  
 Harris Myrick Sutton  
 Hartzler Neugebauer Terry  
 Hastings (WA) Noem Thompson (PA)  
 Hayworth Nugent Thornberry  
 Heinrich Nunes Tiberi  
 Hensarling Nunnelee Tipton  
 Herger Olson Tonko  
 Herrera Beutler Owens Turner  
 Higgins Palazzo Upton  
 Himes Paulsen Van Hollen  
 Hochul Pence Visclosky  
 Holden Perlmutter Walden  
 Huelskamp Peterson Walsh (IL)  
 Huizenga (MI) Petri Webster  
 Hultgren Pingree (ME) Welch  
 Hunter Pitts West  
 Hurt Platts Westmoreland  
 Inslee Poe (TX) Whitfield  
 Issa Pompeo Whitman (SC)  
 Jenkins Posey Wittman  
 Johnson (IL) Price (GA) Wolf  
 Johnson (OH) Price (NC) Womack  
 Johnson, Sam Quayle Woodall  
 Jordan Quigley Reed  
 Keating Kelly Yarmuth  
 Kelly Rehberg Yoder  
 Kildee Reichert Young (AK)  
 Kind Renacci Young (FL)  
 King (IA) Ribble Young (IN)

Johnson, E. B. Moran  
 Nadler  
 Kaptur Napolitano  
 Kissell Neal  
 Kucinich Olver  
 Langevin Pallone  
 Larson (CT) Pascrell  
 Lee (CA) Pastor (AZ)  
 Levin Paul  
 Lewis (GA) Payne  
 Lofgren, Zoe Pearce  
 Long Pelosi  
 Lowey Peters  
 Luján Polís  
 Lynch Rahall  
 Maloney Rangel  
 Markey Reyes  
 Matheson Richmond  
 Matsui Rothman (NJ)  
 McDermott Roybal-Allard  
 McGovern Rush  
 McKeon Sánchez, Linda  
 Meeks T.  
 Miller, George Sanchez, Loretta  
 Moore Schakowsky

Schiff  
 Serrano  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Stark  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Velázquez  
 Rahall  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Woolsey  
 Wu

NOT VOTING—8

Ackerman Giffords Marchant  
 Andrews Hinchey Speier  
 Ellison LaTourette

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

□ 1504

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) 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 297, noes 130, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

AYES—297

Adams Bono Mack Chabot  
 Aderholt Boren Chandler  
 Akin Boswell Clay  
 Alexander Boustany Coble  
 Altmire Brady (TX) Coffman (CO)  
 Amash Braley (IA) Cohen  
 Andrews Cole  
 Austria Broun (GA) Conaway  
 Bachmann Buchanan Cooper  
 Bachus Bucshon Costa  
 Barletta Buerkle Costello  
 Barrow Burgess Courtney  
 Bartlett Burton (IN) Cravaack  
 Barton (TX) Calvert Crawford  
 Bass (NH) Camp Crenshaw  
 Benishek Campbell Critz  
 Berg Canseco Cuellar  
 Biggert Cantor Culberson  
 Bilbray Capito Davis (KY)  
 Bilirakis Cardoza Denham  
 Black Carney Dent  
 Blackburn Carter DesJarlais  
 Bonner Cassidy Diaz-Balart

NOES—130

Ackerman Chu  
 Baca Cicilline Filner  
 Baldwin Clarke (MI) Frank (MA)  
 Bass (CA) Clarke (NY) Fudge  
 Becerra Cleaver Garamendi  
 Berkeley Clyburn Gonzalez  
 Berman Connolly (VA) Guterrez  
 Bishop (GA) Conyers Hanabusa  
 Bishop (NY) Cummings Hastings (FL)  
 Bishop (UT) Davis (CA) Heck  
 Blumenauer Davis (IL) Hinojosa  
 Brady (PA) DeFazio Hirono  
 Brown (FL) DeGette Holt  
 Butterfield DeLauro Honda  
 Capps Deutch Hoyer  
 Capuano Doggett Israel  
 Carnahan Edwards Jackson (IL)  
 Carson (IN) Engel Jackson Lee  
 Castor (FL) Eshoo (TX)  
 Chaffetz Farr Johnson (GA)

NOT VOTING—4

Crowley Giffords  
 Ellison Hinchey

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

□ 1508

So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the 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 187, noes 239, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

AYES—187

Adams Campbell Franks (AZ)  
 Akin Canseco Gallegly  
 Amash Cantor Gardner  
 Bachmann Carter Garrett  
 Bartlett Cassidy Gibbs  
 Barton (TX) Chabot Gingrey (GA)  
 Bass (NH) Chaffetz Gohmert  
 Benishek Coffman (CO) Goodlatte  
 Berg Cole Gosar  
 Biggert Conaway Granger  
 Bilbray Cravaack Graves (GA)  
 Bilirakis Culberson Graves (MO)  
 Bishop (UT) Davis (KY) Green, Gene  
 Black Dent Griffith (VA)  
 Bono Mack DesJarlais Grimm  
 Boustany Diaz-Balart Guinta  
 Barton (TX) Duffy  
 Brooks Duncan (TN) Hanna  
 Broun (GA) Ellmers Harris  
 Buchanan Farenthold Hayworth  
 Bucshon Flake Heinrich  
 Buerkle Fleming Hensarling  
 Burgess Flores Herger  
 Burton (IN) Forbes Herrera Beutler  
 Calvert Fortenberry Huelskamp  
 Camp Foxx Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren	Mica	Royce	Reyes	Scott (VA)	Towns
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Runyan	Ribble	Scott, David	Tsongas
Hurt	Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Richardson	Serrano	Turner
Issa	Miller, Gary	Scalise	Richmond	Sewell	Van Hollen
Jenkins	Mulvaney	Schilling	Roby	Sherman	Velázquez
Johnson (IL)	Murphy (PA)	Schmidt	Rogers (AL)	Shimkus	Visclosky
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Schock	Rogers (KY)	Shuler	Walz (MN)
Jones	Neugebauer	Schweikert	Ross (AR)	Shuster	Wasserman
Jordan	Nugent	Scott (SC)	Rothman (NJ)	Simpson	Schultz
King (NY)	Nunes	Scott, Austin	Roybal-Allard	Sires	Waters
Kingston	Olson	Sensenbrenner	Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Watt
Kinzinger (IL)	Paul	Sessions	Rush	Smith (NE)	Waxman
Kline	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Welch
Labrador	Pearce	Smith (TX)	Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Lamborn	Pence	Southerland	T.	Stark	Womack
Lance	Perlmutter	Stearns	Sanchez, Loretta	Sutton	Woolsey
Landry	Peters	Stivers	Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Wu
Lankford	Petri	Stutzman	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Latta	Pitts	Sullivan	Schiff	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Lewis (CA)	Poe (TX)	Terry	Schrader	Tierney	Young (FL)
LoBiondo	Polis	Thornberry	Schwartz	Tonko	
Long	Pompeo	Tiberi			
Lucas	Posey	Tipton			
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Upton	Ellison	Gutierrez	Marchant
Lungren, Daniel E.	Quayle	Walberg	Giffords	Hinchez	
Mack	Reichert	Walden			
Manzullo	Renacci	Walsh (IL)			
Matheson	Rigell	Webster			
McCarthy (CA)	Rivera	West			
McCaul	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland			
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Rogers			
McCotter	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)			
McHenry	Rokita	Wittman			
McKeon	Rooney	Wolf			
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall			
Rodgers	Roskam	Yoder			
	Ross (FL)	Young (IN)			

## NOES—239

Ackerman	DeLauro	Kind
Aderholt	Denham	King (IA)
Alexander	Deutch	Kissell
Altmire	Dicks	Kucinich
Andrews	Dingell	Langevin
Austria	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Baca	Dold	Larson (CT)
Bachus	Donnelly (IN)	Latham
Baldwin	Doyle	LaTourette
Barletta	Dreier	Lee (CA)
Barrow	Duncan (SC)	Levin
Bass (CA)	Edwards	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Emerson	Lipinski
Berkley	Engel	Loebsack
Berman	Eshoo	Loftgren, Zoe
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Lowey
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lujan
Blackburn	Filner	Lummis
Blumenauer	Fincher	Lynch
Bonner	Fitzpatrick	Maloney
Boren	Fleischmann	Marino
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Markey
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	Matsui
Braley (IA)	Fudge	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	McCollum
Butterfield	Gerlach	McDermott
Capito	Gibson	McGovern
Capps	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Capuano	Gowdy	McKinley
Cardoza	Green, Al	McNerney
Carnahan	Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Carney	Grijalva	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Guthrie	Michaud
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	Miller (NC)
Chandler	Harper	Miller, George
Chu	Hartzler	Moore
Cicilline	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Clarke (MI)	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (CT)
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Nadler
Clay	Higgins	Napolitano
Cleaver	Himes	Neal
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Noem
Coble	Hirono	Nunnelee
Cohen	Hochul	Olver
Connolly (VA)	Holden	Owens
Conyers	Holt	Palazzo
Cooper	Honda	Pallone
Costa	Hoyer	Pascrell
Costello	Inslee	Pastor (AZ)
Courtney	Israel	Payne
Crawford	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Critz	(TX)	Pingree (ME)
Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Platts
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Price (NC)
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Rahall
Davis (IL)	Keating	Rangel
DeFazio	Kelly	Reed
DeGette	Kildee	Rehberg

There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 350

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Mr. Courtney.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 2354 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 337, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except: pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees for the purpose of debate; amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 21, 26, 27, 53, 63, 66, 67, 70, 75, 76, 80, and 81; an amendment by Mrs. ADAMS regarding limiting funds for a Department of Energy Web site that disseminates information regarding energy efficiency and educational programs to children or adolescents; two amendments by Mrs. BLACKBURN regarding across-the-board cuts; an amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia regarding limiting funds for certain programs, projects or activities in Energy Programs-Science; two amendments by Mrs. CAPPs regarding limiting funds for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant; an amendment by Mr. COHEN regarding funding levels for the Solar Energy Program; an amendment by Mr. DENHAM regarding limiting funds to implement section 10011(b) of Public Law 111-11; an amendment by Mr. ENGEL regarding limiting funds for lease or purchase of new light-duty vehicles; an amendment by Ms. ESHOO regarding limiting funds for contracts with business entities that do not disclose political expenditures; an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding limiting funds for Advanced

## NOT VOTING—5

Ellison  
Giffords  
Gutierrez  
Hinchez  
Marchant

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1512

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. WEBSTER) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD, 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. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Ethics:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 14, 2011.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I write to inform you that I have notified Chairman Bonner and Ranking Member Sanchez of my resignation from the Ethics Committee of the House of Representatives.

It is because of my high regard for the Ethics Committee and its vital, non-partisan role enforcing the standards of official conduct in the House of Representatives that I make this decision. Having recently announced my candidacy for the United States Senate, I want to ensure my status as a candidate for higher office does not in any way cause the work of the Ethics Committee to become fodder for politics or partisanship.

It has been a privilege and an honor to serve on this committee.

Sincerely,

MAZIE K. HIRONO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

Research Projects Agency-Energy; an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding limiting funds for Fossil Energy Research and Development; amendments by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN regarding funding levels; an amendment by Mr. GOSAR regarding the Davis-Bacon Act; an amendment by Mr. GRAVES regarding limiting funds to be used in contravention of the 2006 Missouri River Master Manual; an amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida regarding limiting funds to be used in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898; an amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington regarding limiting funds for the McNary Shoreline Management Plan; an amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington regarding limiting funds for the Office of Nuclear Security; an amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington regarding limiting funds for Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project No. 2342; an amendment by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas regarding limiting funds to be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act; an amendment by Ms. KAPTUR regarding funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; an amendment by Mr. LUTKEMEYER regarding the study pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007; an amendment by Mr. ROHRABACHER regarding limiting funds for loan guarantees for carbon capture and sequestration; an amendment by Mr. ROHRABACHER regarding 10 percent of loan guarantee funds for non-water advanced nuclear reactors; an amendment by Mr. ROHRABACHER regarding loan guarantees for carbon capture and sequestration projects not exceeding funds for non-water advanced nuclear reactor loan guarantees; an amendment by Mr. RICHMOND or Mr. SCALISE regarding funding for Corps of Engineers construction; and an amendment by Mr. SHERMAN regarding limiting funds for international activities at the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; and, further, that each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, or by the Member who caused it to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or a designee, shall not be subject to amendment, except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations (or a respective designee) each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; and, further, that each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and, further, that an amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337 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. 2354.

□ 1520

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. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOLD (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 bill had been read through page 62, line 2.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment may be offered except those specified in the previous order, which is at the desk.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement any rule, regulation, or executive order regarding the disclosure of political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, in April a draft Executive order was circulated that would force companies, as a condition of applying for a Federal contract, to disclose all Federal campaign contributions. In my opinion, if implemented, this Executive order would lead to a significant politicization of the Federal procurement process. Instead of judging companies on the basis of their past work performance, their demonstrated ability to do the job or their price, we would actually introduce potentially the element of their political participation and contributions and activities into the consideration process.

This Executive order would not, in fact, lead to more objectivity in the evaluation process. It would, instead, chill the constitutionally protected right of people to donate politically to whatever candidate or cause or political party they choose to. Those very same people would fear repercussion to their bottom line as, frankly, I'm sure this Executive order intends to do.

The draft order claims that these burdensome and intrusive disclosure

requirements are necessary to ensure that contracting decisions, quote, deliver the best value to the taxpayer and are free from the undue influence of extraneous factors such as political activity or political favoritism. If one accepts this rationale—and I certainly don't—then delivering the, quote, best value to the taxpayer would require such disclosure by anyone receiving Federal dollars.

This Executive order would not apply to Federal employee unions that negotiate with the government to provide billions of dollars in benefits for their members, nor would it apply to many nonprofits that receive Federal grants, many of whom have strong political agendas of their own.

My amendment would prevent any funds from this act going towards the implementation of any rule, regulation, or Executive order regarding political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of the enactment of the act. It is important to recognize, Mr. Chairman, my bill does not change Federal campaign law in any way. It does not change the current disclosure requirements.

My amendment has already been agreed to on three previous pieces of legislation: the Defense Authorization bill for FY 2012, the Homeland Security appropriations bill, and also the Defense appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, "pay-to-play" has no place in the Federal contracting process. Requiring the disclosure of campaign contributions for government contracts in my opinion does just that.

Congress considered the proposed Executive order, something like it, during the 111th Congress as part of the DISCLOSE Act and rejected it. This Executive order is a backdoor attempt to implement the DISCLOSE Act by executive fiat.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment.

The Department of Energy relies heavily on a dedicated contractor workforce to manage and operate our national laboratories. Therefore, such an Executive order would impact nearly every program at the Department of Energy.

I urge a "yes" vote on the gentleman from Oklahoma's amendment, a member of our committee.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the chairman.

I rise once again in strong opposition to Representative COLE's amendment to block transparency and disclosure for taxpayers. That's what this issue is about.

It is with continuing curiosity that when I listened to the gentleman, Mr. COLE, present his view, if in fact you believe in disclosure, bring a bill to the floor. The reason that the House has passed what you keep offering is the House is not presented with an opposing view because my amendment is continually blocked and not accepted to be debated on the floor.

What this is about is the following: there are businesses large and small that receive billions of taxpayer dollars for services and products in doing business with the Federal Government. In return for this public money, they should have the obligation, which is not burdensome, to simply disclose how they use it. That's all this is. When they spend it in our elections, they know it, the recipients know it, but the taxpayers don't know it. That's one hell of a deal. For those who want to keep it in a dark corner, it's a great deal for them.

The American people have spoken clearly. Last year, a CBS/New York Times poll found that 92 percent of the American people support requiring campaigns, independent groups, businesses to disclose how much money they've raised, where it came from, and how it was used.

I am going to offer my own amendment again, for the fourth time, to require the disclosure which Representative COLE's amendment forbids. I expect, once again, that the majority is going to block it. It's an unfortunate turnaround, I think, from just a few years ago when Republicans led the fight for disclosure. They were for it before they decided to be against it. Does that tag line ring some bells for you? You were thinking that it would be better than restricting contributions. That was the thinking at the time. But now that the Supreme Court allows unlimited corporate spending, they're against any restrictions whatsoever.

We should oppose any amendments that are designed to keep the public less informed rather than more informed about what happens with their tax dollars. That's what this is about. The majority has made a big deal and talked incessantly about spending. What about this spending? Does this not mean something in terms of the Federal Government and the taxpayers? I think with public dollars comes public responsibility.

This does not present any constitutional issues, no freedom of speech issues. It is not burdensome. It is simply disclosure. If you want to stand with the uber-lobbyists who are representing lobbyists in support of the gentleman from Oklahoma's amendment, be my guest. I didn't come to Congress to do that.

I think that the President's Executive order is sensible, I think it should be put into place, and I think that any legislation brought to this floor to prevent that from happening is really on the wrong side of history.

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

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

I would just remind my friend from California that when Republicans brought disclosure, they didn't link it to the contracting process, which this potential Executive order does. I think that's out of bounds.

I would also remind my friend the Democrats opposed that and when Democrats were in the majority, and overwhelmingly in the majority, they failed to enact legislation similar to what she suggests in the DISCLOSE Act.

I think this is something that this legislative body has looked at. If my friend from California wants to introduce a bill to do this, that's perfectly appropriate to it, but doing it in the context of the contracting process is simply wrong. People that are submitting bids will somehow think inevitably that they will be helped or hurt by their political activity. That has no basis in judging the quality of a bid for a Federal contract.

In addition, frankly, my friends have never wanted to apply that same standard to labor unions or to affiliated groups applying for Federal dollars. I would actually agree with them on that. I don't think it has any place in a disclosure in those areas either. There's a place to do this, and there's a place not to do it. Doing it on a contract is inevitably meant to try and use the Federal dollars to impact, one way or another, what groups do politically. That's wrong, we shouldn't allow it, and we should never, never risk politicizing the procurement process.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would say to my friend from Oklahoma, through the Chair, that he makes a very compelling case. I agree with him. I think that the secret groups that are funding massive—usually negative—ad campaigns against people running for office should be held to exactly the same standard labor unions are held under present law. If a labor union uses dues money or PAC money or any money to advocate for or against a candidate or a cause, they must disclose it to the public and to their members. That is precisely the principle that Ms. ESHOO is standing for, and I am proud to stand with her.

If you really believe in something that you say, then you shouldn't be ashamed to let everyone know that you

said it. If you really believe that what you're advocating is right for the country, then you will let everyone know that you said it. It's a simple principle of disclosure. It is something that I think is long overdue. Let's not have anybody hide in the shadows of the American political process.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I would just urge the body to support the amendment.

I would disagree with my friend. Sham groups are quite often formed in labor unions or underneath, but that's another debate for another day. Let's just keep outside money out of the procurement process.

I yield back the balance of my time and urge adoption of my amendment.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment and join with my colleagues from California and New Jersey in their opposition.

The amendment is a legislative attempt to circumvent a draft Executive order which would provide for increased disclosure of the political contributions of government contractors, especially contributions given to third-party entities.

The argument is made that companies should not disclose more information because people in power would misuse that information to retaliate against them. Using that logic, all campaign disclosures are bad. Government contractors already disclose contributions and expenditures by their PACs and those who contribute to them. By extension, we ought to take that law and ensure that the voters of this country are protected so that they also know what those corporations are doing with their money as far as involvement in the electoral process.

The provisions, as drafted, are, I think, very good. The information is required to be provided, and the Executive order that the amendment would circumvent enhances the quality of information that people and citizens ought to have before they go to the polls. Disclosure is good. And for that reason I rise, again, in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

Ms. ESHOO. 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 with a corporation or other business entity that does not disclose its political expenditures.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the fourth time this year to call for transparency in our political system. I maintain the view shared by the overwhelming majority of the American people that transparency in the use of our tax dollars is absolutely critical.

There are thousands of companies that do business with the Federal Government, receiving billions of public dollars for their services and their products. Our constituents deserve to know whether they spend any of these dollars to influence our elections. My amendment will accomplish this, and I once again urge my colleagues to support it.

Now, some say, as we just heard a few moments ago, that this disclosure requirement will politicize the procurement process. It's difficult to maintain that view with a straight face. As I've said before, when a business contracts with the Federal Government and spends money in elections, the process is already politicized. Even in the Citizens United decision legalizing corporate expenditures, eight out of nine justices specifically endorsed prompt disclosure of expenditures. Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote, "Disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way." This is not an onerous burden. As Justice Louis Brandeis famously said, "Sunlight is the best disinfectant."

I want to share an example from my home State of California that illustrates the importance of disclosure. Last year, in 2010, Proposition 23 was on the ballot. It was an effort to kill the State's tough new global warming rules. The airwaves were flooded with ads, but because California requires disclosure, voters were informed. The oil companies financing the ads had to stand by them each and every time the ad aired, stating that they had paid for them. So voters were informed. They made up their minds. Prop 23 lost by 23 percent in November because voters knew who had paid for the ads and what and whom were behind them. It wasn't just someone skipping through a field, it was going to have an effect on them. It was disclosure.

As he has a half-dozen times this year, my colleague, TOM COLE, has offered an amendment to prevent the very disclosure I'm asking us to endorse. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject it. Preventing transparency puts us all on the wrong side of history every time.

Republicans supported disclosure before they were against it, and the record is very clear on that. So I urge those from both the other side of the aisle and my colleagues on this side—I don't believe this is a partisan issue—I believe that disclosure is good for America, it's good for our system. It is not burdensome, it is not anti-constitutional, and it's simple. The voters should know, taxpayers should know.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part, "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

For the reasons stated by the Chair on February 17, June 2, and July 7, 2011, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

□ 1540

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. I have an amendment at the desk, the Gosar-Altmiere-Gibbs amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 327.13(a) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of our amendment that would defund a Federal regulation, a regulation that has the force of law across the United States that is, in my view, unconstitutional and simply wrong.

Currently, as a result of law passed in the 111th Congress, a person licensed

by a State to carry a personal sidearm for personal defense can carry that weapon in a national park or refuge. Prior to 2009, our own Federal Government trampled the Second Amendment and prohibited citizens from protecting themselves in some of the most dangerous remote lands we have. The ability to carry a firearm in case of emergency is imperative. Later we learned that when Congress changed the law, the bill language omitted the Army Corps of Engineers, creating confusion and uncertainty.

The Corps owns or manages over 11.7 million acres, including 400 lakes and river projects, 90,000 camp sites, and 4,000 miles of trail. Soon after the law's passage, the Army Corps proudly declared that it would continue to ban self-defense on its lands. There is a bill pending, H.R. 1865, that seeks a long-term fix, but this amendment is a short-term fix. It defunds a Federal regulation by which the Army Corps of Engineers enforces, creates, and authorizes its ban on self-defense firearms.

This bipartisan amendment to the Energy and Water appropriations bill will clarify this confusing policy. We are simply asking that the Secretary of the Army not use any fiscal year 2012 funding to enforce a regulation that prohibits firearm possession that complies with State law on Corps projects and lands. The amendment would not, however, allow firearms in Federal facilities, such as Army Corps headquarters, Corps research facilities, or lock and dam buildings. This is a commonsense amendment that upholds our Constitution and gives people who use our public lands the right to defend themselves, if needed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would take a different tact on the issue of common sense and security. I would like to talk about the security of our Nation and about our economic infrastructure and about these Corps regions.

I understand that the intent of the gentleman's amendment is to prohibit the Corps from preventing individuals from having handguns on projects administered by the Corps. I understand it's aimed at those who obviously support the Second Amendment. I do, myself. The fact is, I believe the gentleman's amendment is injurious to our national security. I do not think it is a good idea to allow individuals to walk around with guns over dams and water treatment plants that are administered by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Now, I assume that some of my colleagues disagree with me. However, this amendment also prohibits the Corps from implementing or enforcing rules on explosives and fireworks and other weapons. I don't believe there are

other Members in this body who believe the Corps should not be able to stringently enforce rules on explosives at dams and water projects and treatment facilities that they have jurisdiction over. Further, what if there's danger of fire on the Corps land? Unless there is some other law that supersedes the regulations that your amendment is aimed at, Corps employees would not be able to prevent people from launching fireworks, despite the dangers of wildfires.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment and would hope that he would consider withdrawing his overly broad and misguided amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gosar-Gibbs-Altire amendment, to prohibit funding the Secretary of the Army to enforce a regulation that prohibits firearm possession in compliance with State law on Corps projects and lands.

Earlier this year, Representative ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania, Representative GOSAR from Arizona, and myself introduced H.R. 1865, a stand-alone bill that would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from enforcing any regulation that keeps an individual from possessing firearms on Army Corps of Engineer water or resource development projects.

Gun owners need to be able to exercise their Second Amendment rights when they are legally camping, hunting, and fishing on Army Corps property. Last Congress, this House passed national parks language that became law to allow for guns on national parks land; and the Army Corps of Engineers immediately issued the following release: "Public Law 111-024 does not apply to Corps projects or facilities. The passage of this new law does not affect application of title 36 regulations." This policy preempts State regulatory framework from transporting and carrying firearms, thus invalidating concealed weapon permits and other State laws that allow law-abiding citizens to transport and carry firearms.

This amendment is a bipartisan effort that would put a temporary fix to end the patchwork of regulations that govern different lands managed by different Federal agencies.

I urge all Members to support the Gosar-Gibbs-Altire amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

I rise in support of the Gosar-Gibbs-Altire amendment to protect the Second Amendment rights of our Nation's sportsmen.

The Army Corps of Engineers owns or manages more than 11 million acres of Federal lands, where Americans are not allowed to carry firearms for self-defense, including 90,000 camp sites and

thousands of miles of trails where law enforcement is scattered.

Our amendment will simplify regulations for law-abiding citizens by defunding a Federal regulation that bans firearms for self-defense on Army Corps lands. This will not change rules against bringing firearms into Federal buildings, such as Army Corps headquarters, or locks and dams. It will simply guarantee that sportsmen are able to defend themselves while they legally hunt and fish on property that the Army Corps owns and operates.

To correct this problem in the long term, Mr. GIBBS and I have also introduced the Recreational Lands Self-Defense Act. But this amendment is a necessary first step and is supported by the National Rifle Association and Gun Owners of America.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the Second Amendment is a key component of national security. And in that aspect, it allows citizens to carry. This is about possession of sidearms only. It does not apply to explosives in or around structures.

I will finish up by saying that I wish everybody would support this amendment, and I look forward to its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I will reiterate my strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

We are talking about allowing people with weapons in areas where we have dams and water treatment plants, and the Army Corps of Engineers ought to be able to exercise control over those for the protection of those major economic infrastructures. I would respectfully disagree with the gentleman, that he would also reduce their ability as far as the regulation of people with explosives. And I think that, again, is very detrimental relative to our national security. For these reasons, I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1550

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. 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. \_\_\_\_ For "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy" for the Solar Energy Program, as authorized by sections 602(b), 604(e), 605(d), 606(d), and 607(i)(5) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development" is hereby reduced by, \$16,000,000 and \$32,000,000, respectively.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is at an energy crossroads. Either we can further increase our addiction to fossil fuels and use advanced technologies to suck out every last drop of oil, coal, and natural gas that exists underneath the Earth's surface, no matter what the economic or environmental cost, or we can decide to break our addiction to fossil fuels by investing in clean, renewable energy sources that have the capacity to power our Nation forever.

The majority's decision to cut funding for renewable energy programs and increase spending on fossil fuels makes it clear that they haven't quite gotten off their addiction to dirty energy, but this amendment offers them an opportunity to do so. Their decision is shortsighted, will endanger American prosperity, and threaten our economic viability.

To help rectify this situation, this amendment's offered to cut \$32 million from the Fossil Energy Research and Development account and increase the Solar Energy program by \$16 million, to give my friends on the other side an opportunity to let the Sun shine in and join with God's wonderful source of energy. My amendment has a net impact of zero on the budget authority and does not increase 2012 outlays.

Despite overwhelming evidence that the U.S. needs to invest more in solar and spend less on fossil fuels, the majority has decided to reduce funding for solar research and development by 37 percent. This severe cut is unacceptable and especially egregious since the majority has allocated an additional \$32 million to the Fossil Fuels account, a 7 percent increase.

This amendment that I have offered seeks to create some parity to 2011 funding by cutting the Fossil Fuels account back to its 2011 level and increasing the Solar account by 10 percent. Solar is the future and fossil fuels aren't.

If the majority wants to fulfill their commitment to create jobs and increase American energy security, then they need to start seriously investing in solar. Recent studies have demonstrated investments in solar can create three times as many jobs as funding for traditional fossil fuels. And if the government decided to invest \$1 million in solar development, that investment would create at least 17 jobs. But that same million dollars in fossil fuels would create but five jobs. And jobs is what the American public is interested in.

The 17 jobs created would be high-paying jobs in the manufacturing and construction sectors, the kind of jobs that once were the backbone of our Nation and the jobs that the American

people are clamoring for, giving the middle class an opportunity to have jobs and participate in the American economy.

I have witnessed the power of solar in my own community to create jobs, spur economic development, and transform the lives of everyday Americans. As a result of previous Federal solar investments, Sharp Solar, which is located in my district, is a burgeoning solar industry and operates a manufacturing facility that employs nearly 500 Memphians. Additional Federal investments in solar will create thousands of new jobs in my district and millions of new jobs across the country, some of which will be in New Jersey.

Not only is solar a superior job creator, but it's also a far better long-term investment. Fossil fuel proponents may not publicly admit it, but renewable energy will power the future. So establishing dominance in this sector is critical to our national energy security and economic security. Supplies of fossil fuels are diminishing rapidly, and their nonrenewable nature makes them a short-term solution to a long-term problem.

Recognizing the critical role renewable energy technologies like solar will have, nations across the world are making massive investments in clean technology so they can establish themselves as leaders and exporters of the future's energy. I recently visited Germany, and solar is everywhere. The Germans are investing and supplying many of their buildings with solar, and they are a leader, just as China is. But America's being left behind.

As is demonstrated by this appropriations bill, the U.S. is not making the requisite investments in solar to compete in the emerging global marketplace. Unless the majority decides to change course and support the efforts that we've made here to make unprecedented investments in renewables, the United States will transition from importing oil from the Middle East to importing clean energy technologies from China and Europe, not what we should be aiming for.

My \$16 million amendment alone will not determine the course of America's energy future, because we need to be investing billions in solar energy to keep up with the Chinese, the Germans, and other countries, but this zero cost amendment will create jobs and push America a little further down the road to a clean energy economy. The amendment offers a clear signal to the American people and the world the United States is serious about ending its addiction to fossil fuels and becoming a world leader in the renewable energy sector.

We shouldn't just orbit around the Sun; we should harness its energy and use it to supply energy for this planet. The Sun is there for a purpose other than just an anchor.

I urge support for this important amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. His amendment would increase funding for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy's Solar Energy program at the expense of fossil energy research. Our bill applied solar energy research to \$97 million below fiscal year 2011 because, especially within today's budgetary constraints, we cannot afford to spend taxpayers' dollars on activities like demonstrations of proven technologies that should be funded by the private sector. But our bill preserves funding for the cutting-edge research that will advance American industry and help us lead globally. By the numbers, I can't support an amendment that adds funding back into this program.

Fossil energy generates 70 percent of our Nation's electricity and, may I add, generates, I believe, close to 55 percent of your State's energy. And it will continue to provide the lion's share of your and our Nation's energy's needs well into the 21st century.

The Fossil Energy Research program receives \$477 million in our bill for research that's let us squeeze more energy out of our domestic fossil energy resources. This research aims to increase the efficiency of our fossil energy plants across the Nation. If we were to increase the efficiency of our fossil energy plants by just 1 percent, we would increase the output of our power plants by 12 times the total output of solar power in the United States. That's without using 1 pound or 1 liter of extra fuel from the ground.

I appreciate, truly, the gentleman's desire to move towards solar technologies, coming from a State that is a leader in that regard, and that's why we have included \$166 million in our bill for that purpose. The Energy Efficiency and Renewable account has nearly \$9 billion in unspent stimulus money. We've heard that before in earlier debates. And the importance of using fossil energy sources well is too great; so I can't support cutting into further fossil energy research and development. Therefore, I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COHEN. 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 Tennessee will be postponed.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. 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 under this Act may be expended to administer or enforce the requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 or title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act), except with respect to a contract that exceeds \$20,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 2354 that seeks to defund title 40, U.S.C. section 31, up to \$20 million instead of the current \$2,000 threshold.

Right now we are in serious and prolonged economic recession. The construction industry has been hit the hardest throughout the United States. My amendment defunds the Davis-Bacon Act up to a certain amount in order to allow small business and small contractors the ability to compete on the smaller government contracts.

This amendment will assist the small businesses that do not have the resources to compete for the larger contracts that compel compliance with all the requirements of Davis-Bacon. That is why this amendment defunds contract applications for smaller contracts under the \$20 million threshold, but the larger projects are still subject to the Davis-Bacon Act. This is a temporary measure for the duration of the fiscal year in direct response to the recession.

Now, on average, research establishes that Federal public projects that are forced to operate under this law spend 22 percent more than projects not bound by this law. By eliminating the onerous cost for small projects, there will actually be more work, up to 22 percent more work, for the same dollar and the smaller contractors will be able to compete for jobs that otherwise are out of their reach.

Yet this agreement preserves the application of the act to the larger projects, so that those big projects across the U.S., where larger contracts typically get the contracts in any event, these companies can more readily comply with the provisions of the act and have deeper pockets to handle the administrative and other requirements mandated by the act.

We also know that one study concluded that the Davis-Bacon Act will waste \$10.9 billion in 2011. We also know that the Government Accountability Office states that this act is extremely difficult to administer, and the GAO has advocated for its repeal as

far back as 1979. To a certain degree, this amendment seeks to reduce that waste, but the most important aspect of this amendment is encouraging small business participation in these government building contracts.

I have stated before that we, as Members of Congress, we are stewards of the public Treasury. We have an obligation to spend taxpayer money wisely. The government does not earn money. The government does not generate wealth. We have an obligation to spend this money wisely, and we have an obligation to help the businesses of the country, and those that build our infrastructure need our help. This amendment addresses that need.

The Heritage Foundation suggests that for every billion dollars, Federal construction spending supports 14,000 workers. Then the savings from the suspension of the Davis-Bacon law for 1 year would support 163,000 new construction jobs.

My amendment addresses this very issue and seeks to boost employment and work for small businesses and small contractors who can compete for smaller government contracts temporarily if the Davis-Bacon requirements are defunded for 1 year.

I ask that you support this amendment, support small businesses, more efficient spending of our taxpayer money, spreading our limited resources and keeping more American construction workers in a job, a livelihood, and a mission to rebuild this America together.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, Davis-Bacon is a fairly simple concept, and it is a very fair one.

What it does is to protect the government and the taxpayers, as well as the workers, in carrying out the policy of paying a decent wage on government contracts.

The Davis-Bacon Act requires that workers on federally funded construction projects be paid no less than the wages paid in the community for similar work. The fact is that opponents claim Davis-Bacon requires union wage jobs. However, more than 75 percent of Davis-Bacon wage determinations are not based solely on union wages.

The quality of work on energy and water projects, for example, is crucial to the communities depending on them, and we do need individuals who are trained, who are more efficient, and who are going to do the job right the first time. One of the things that tends not to be noted when we have a discussion and debate about Davis-Bacon is the money it saves to the taxpayers that are hidden costs by those who do not use union labor and do not pay union scale wages.

By including fringe benefits in wage calculations, the Davis-Bacon act de-

livers health care and pensions for workers on Federal projects, ensuring that they aren't part of the many uninsured Americans who rely on Medicaid and cost the American taxpayers. The Department of Labor survey methods also incorporate hourly investments in training and apprenticeship, where appropriate, to ensure the skilled, productive, future workforce.

I would also point out that in the past the House has taken two votes on this issue, the first vote taken included a limitation on Davis-Bacon and was considered in H.R. 1, and it failed by a vote of 189-233. The second vote was a limitation taken during consideration of the FAA bill, and it failed 183-238.

But, most importantly, and the gentleman indicated that he is spurred on to action here because of the recession, is because of the money involved relative to those who work in the United States of America. Since 1977, we have fortunately had great growth in this general economy.

But I would point out to all of the Members that according to the Department of Labor in 1977, the real hourly wage that a human being in the United States of America earned for 1 hour's worth of labor was \$19.57. In 2010 the Department of Labor reported that a human being in the United States of America for their human labor for 1 hour now earns \$19.04.

People today, for an hour's worth of work, make less than they did in 1977, despite the growth of our economy. The last thing we need to do here today is to put more downward pressure on the ability of an American citizen to work at a good-paying job that guarantees them a decent living, and I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The recommendation I brought to the full committee prohibited Davis-Bacon provisions on any sort of construction, roads, bridges, dams, and buildings, because the taxpayers, as a result, pay more.

Unfortunately, this provision was stricken, impacting right to work States and, quite honestly, short-changing them.

You do the math. There have been plenty of studies. Davis-Bacon provisions inflate costs for construction projects as much as, in some cases, 22 percent. These added expenses come at a time when we are really close to being broke as a nation. How many more jobs, union or nonunion jobs, could we provide to put America back to work by supporting this amendment? Plenty more, and thus I am pleased to support the amendment.

I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1610

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, at a national unemployment rate of 9.3 percent, this is a jobs amendment. Davis-Bacon does not protect the Federal Government nor the taxpayer. It only increases the cost to the taxpayer and the Federal Government by 22 percent. There are no studies that show that there is any difference in outcomes. As a contractor and working in contracts, we're held to the same standards. This is a temporary measure meant to help all our small companies and business contractors. It's also an investment into increasing the number of build-outs of our vital infrastructure projects.

I urge my companions on the other side of the aisle to join in this and look at this fairly and increase the access to this funding, properly and fairly, to make sure that we get more people to work and get this vital infrastructure back and get America back to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition. I would close by indicating that there has been discussion about the burden that this act imposes upon small businesses. And I would, again, wish to contradict that.

I also believe that the administrative requirements of the act are critical to prevent a fraud against government agencies. First, to comply with the IRS and overtime regulations, all law-abiding contractors must retain records on hours worked, wages, and benefits. Second, electronic transmission of data has streamlined reporting. Third, the integrity of the whole program relies on this reporting to avoid kickbacks, misclassification of workers, and cheating under the Davis-Bacon Act. It is important to remember that Federal overtime law, including the Fair Labor Standards Act, requires all employers—not just those that must comply with Davis-Bacon—to keep records.

So, again, I would ask that my colleagues oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science" may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and ranking member for the courtesies extended to me.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will protect funds provided for science under title 3 of the Department of Energy's energy programs. This amendment addresses the need to increase programs that educate minorities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, known as STEM, as well as the need to train teachers and scientists in advanced scientific and technical practices.

Let me, first of all, say I consider this a jobs bill. I'm excited when we talk about jobs here on the floor of the House and recognize that America has changed. As a former member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and a member of the Aviation subcommittee and Space subcommittee dealing with NASA's commitment and mission in human exploration, I believe that America's future is not only today but in front of her and focused on science and technology. The importance of developing a highly skilled technical workforce is crucial.

Over the last 50 years there have been major changes in the United States in terms of both the economy and the population. Now let me be very clear. I'm a member of the Manufacturing Caucus, and I believe that we should restore manufacturing in this country. We are so well placed to be multitasked, boosting our manufacturing and then, as well, moving forward to processing and analyzing information. In this information-driven economy, it is important that we recognize that our valuable assets are human resources. Therefore, in order to compete successfully in the global economy, the U.S. needs citizens who are literate in terms of science and mathematics, and a STEM workforce that is well educated and well trained.

I believe my amendment focuses on that very program and focus. By investing in the scientific advancement of our workforce and our youth, we are investing in our future, we're investing in job creation, and we're investing in greater job opportunities for Americans. It is important to note that under this legislation, workforce development for teachers in science has taken a hit. But I believe what we should do is make sure that we emphasize that those resources be kept in and at some point add to those resources. And the reason I say that is, workforce development programs for teachers and sci-

entists provide funding to graduate fellowship programs that help train the Nation's top scientists, a crucial, crucial effort.

The United States faces a critical shortage of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers. We will need an additional 283,000 teachers in secondary schools setting up by 2015 to meet the needs of our Nation's students. This qualified teacher shortage is particularly pronounced in low-income districts. So in order to move forward, let us protect the scientific aspect of the work of this government.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, about 30 percent of fourth-graders and 20 percent of eighth-graders cannot perform basic mathematical computation. So I have long recognized the need to improve the participation performance of America's students in science, technology, engineering, and math. I worked with one of our corporate leaders to ensure that private funding was given to one of our inner city school districts to establish a program without comparison in its excellence focusing on science, technology, engineering, and math.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We would be happy to accept your amendment as it restates current law, and we appreciate your advocacy in this regard.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much. And as I conclude with that generous offer, let me mention in 2006 only 4.5 percent of college graduates in the United States received a diploma in engineering compared to 25 percent in South Korea and 33 percent in China.

So let me close, Mr. Chairman, by saying that we have had programs that have been very effective, such as the Harmony Science Academy in Houston, that devotes an impressive amount of time and resources educating the city's youth, minority youth in math and science and even doing research in cancer.

Finally, I want to thank Dr. Reagan Flowers, who has implemented a dynamic program on STEM technology in the Houston area and a national program. I would like to congratulate Mae Jemison, one of our astronauts, the first African American woman to go into space, who likewise has an outstanding program, and the Ron McNair Program, one of our astronauts who lost his life sacrificing for the American people, challenging us and challenging our capacity. His program run by his family is another excellent program.

In conclusion, from Ben Franklin to NASA to Silicon Valley, the success of the competitiveness of America has always depended on the knowledge and skills in the STEM field. This amendment will help us focus on expanding that for all Americans.

I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2354, the Energy and Water Appropriations Development Bill. My amendment will protect funds provided for science under Title III of the Department of Energy's Energy Programs. This amendment addresses the need to increase programs that educate minorities in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM, as well as the need to train teachers and scientists in advanced scientific and technical practices.

As a former Member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I recognize the importance of developing a highly skilled technical workforce. Over the last 50 years, there have been major changes in the United States in terms of both the economy and the population. The economic base has built upon the base of manufacturing of durable goods and added the processing and analyzing of information. In the 21st century we can manufacture goods and expand information technology—both create jobs. In this information-driven economy, the most valuable assets are human resources. Therefore, in order to compete successfully in the global economy, the U.S. needs citizens who are literate in terms of science and mathematics, and a STEM workforce that is well educated and well trained (Friedman 2005, National Academy of Sciences 2005, Pearson 2005). Consequently, we cannot—literally or figuratively—afford to squander its human resources; it is imperative that we develop and nurture the talent of all its citizens.

The jobs of tomorrow will require workers who possess strong advanced science, engineering and math backgrounds. Other countries are training and educating their citizens in these areas and we must do the same. By investing in the scientific advancement of our workforce and our youth, we are investing in our future . . . we are investing in job creation . . . we are investing in greater job opportunities for Americans. This investment is the only way to address the increasing knowledge gap between our Nation's workforce and those of our international counterparts. We must invest in our citizens. My amendment will ensure the funds that have been made available will be utilized for that purpose.

PROGRAM 1: WORKFORCE AND DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS AND SCIENTISTS

The workforce and development program for teachers and scientists is vital to ensure that we have an adequate amount of properly educated and trained teachers and scientists. Under H.R. 2354, workforce development for teachers and scientists is funded at \$17,849,000, which is \$4,751,000 below the fiscal year 2011 level, which is a devastating \$17,751,000 below the President's requested amount. This is a draconian cut which will have drastic effects on an already struggling workforce. My amendment would ensure that the amount provided to this program would remain intact.

The workforce development program for teachers and scientists provides funding to graduate fellowship programs which train and develop our Nation's top scientists, engineers, and teachers. These individuals go on to become researchers and innovators—contributing to American business and, moreover, the U.S. economy. Fellowship programs like these are exactly what our country needs in order to develop a highly skilled technical workforce.

As we have heard time and time again in many different contexts, our country suffers

from a shortage of scientists and engineers. Moreover, our country is dealing with a lack of qualified instructors, at all levels—elementary, secondary, and post-secondary—to teach STEM subjects—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

The United States faces a critical shortage of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers, we will need an additional 283,000 teachers in secondary school settings by 2015 to meet the needs of our Nation's students. This qualified teacher shortage is particularly pronounced in low-income, urban school districts. As BHEF reported in *A Commitment to America's Future: Responding to the Crisis in Mathematics and Science Education*, high teacher turnover in conjunction with increasing student enrollment and lower student-to-teacher ratios will cause annual increases in the mathematics and science teacher shortage culminating in a 283,000-person shortage by 2015.

Fewer American students than ever are graduating from college with math and science degrees. In 2006 only 4.5 percent of college graduates in the United States received a diploma in engineering compared with 25.4 percent in South Korea, 33.3 percent in China, and 39.1 percent in Singapore.

The problem is systemic. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, about 30 percent of fourth-graders and 20 percent of eighth graders cannot perform basic mathematical computations. Today, American students rank 21st out of 30 in science literacy among students from developed countries and 25th out of 30 in math literacy. If this trend continues, there will be dire consequences for our children and our economy.

To be sure, in order to train and develop the amount of scientists, educators, and teachers of STEM subjects that our country needs, we would really need more of these graduate fellowship programs. As reflected in the budgetary request, which H.R. 2354 fails to meet, an increased number of graduate fellowships would be ideal to invest in our future.

At the very least, we would want to keep the same amount of graduate fellowships available. Unfortunately, the proposed amount appropriated to these programs under H.R. 2354 ignores the current shortage of scientists and teachers, and irresponsibly ignores our future by providing for lesser amount of graduate fellowships.

PROGRAM 2: SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS (STEM)

I have long recognized the need to improve the participation and performance of America's students in Science, Technology, and Engineering and Math, STEM, fields.

Traditionally, our Nation recruited its STEM workforce from a relatively homogenous talent pool consisting largely of non-Hispanic White males. However, this pool has decreased significantly due not only to comprising an increasingly smaller proportion of the total US Population but also to declining interest among this group in pursuing careers in STEM. It is important to note that the need to improve the participation of underrepresented groups—especially underrepresented racial/ethnic groups—in STEM is not solely driven by demographics and supply-side considerations; an even more important driver is that STEM workers from a variety of backgrounds improve and enhance the quality of science insofar as they are likely to bring a variety of

new perspectives to bear on the STEM enterprise in terms of both research and application (Best 2004; Jackson 2003; Leggon and Malcom 1994).

The current state of STEM education is deplorable. In 2006 only 4.5 percent of college graduates in the United States received a diploma in engineering, compared with 25.4 percent in South Korea, 33.3 percent in China, and 39.1 percent in Singapore. Today, American students rank 21st out of 30 in science literacy among students from developed countries and 25th out of 30 in math literacy. If this trend continues, there will be dire consequence for our children and our economy.

These numbers are discouraging, but the statistics on minority students in the STEM fields are even more alarming. In 2004, African American and Hispanic students were among the least likely groups to take advanced math and science courses in high school. Even as African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans comprise an increasingly large portion of the population, they continue to be underrepresented in the science and engineering disciplines. Together, these three groups account for over 25 percent of the population, but only earn 16.2 percent of bachelor's degrees, 10.7 percent of master's degrees, and 5.4 percent of doctorate degrees in the science, math and engineering fields. This fact directly contributes to the unacceptable underrepresentation of African American and Hispanics in the STEM workforce. If we choose to continue to ignore this problem, we are not only shortchanging our students' success, we will be giving up on our Nation's future.

Many school districts across the nation have begun to recognize this problem and work towards a strategic solution. In my home district for example, several public schools and charter schools have started to allocate funds towards programs aimed at increasing STEM performance.

For example the Harmony Science Academy in Houston devotes an impressive amount of time and resources towards educating the city's youth in the sciences. Small class sizes, high expectations for students, and well-qualified teachers helped this school make it to Newsweek magazine's list of best high schools in America. Harmony Science Academy is a success story we can all be proud of. Unfortunately, schools like this are the exception and not the rule.

In many school districts there simply are not enough resources available to make our children science and math literate. There is a shortage of qualified teachers, many classes are woefully overcrowded and some schools just cannot afford the materials and books that students need in order to master basic math and science concepts. I cannot stand idly by while we fail to give our children the educational tools they need to succeed in life and gain employment.

This amendment recognizes the importance of equipping young minds with the technological and scientific knowledge necessary to compete in a globalized economy. Further, within the context of globalization, I strongly believe that this country's ability to achieve and maintain a high standard of living is dependent on the extent to which it can harness science and technology. Thus, in order to enhance the international competitiveness of the country, it is critical for us to promote and support students pursuing careers in STEM fields.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we invest in a workforce ready for global competition by creating a new generation of innovators and make a sustained commitment to Federal research and development. We need to spur and expand affordable access to broadband, achieve energy independence, and provide small business with tools to encourage entrepreneurial innovation.

The establishment and maintenance of a capable scientific and technological workforce remains an important facet of U.S. efforts to maintain economic competitiveness. Pre-college instruction in mathematics and scientific fields is crucial to the development of U.S. scientific and technological personnel, as well as our overall scientific literacy as a nation. The value of education in scientific and mathematics is not limited to those students pursuing a degree in one of these fields, and even students pursuing nonscientific and non-mathematical fields are likely to require basic knowledge in these subjects.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has a great history of scientific innovation. From Ben Franklin to NASA to Silicon Valley, the success and competitiveness of America has always depended the knowledge and skills in the STEM fields. Funding my amendment today will help ensure that the American legacies of intelligence, innovation, and invention continue. Today I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and invest in America's future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 implement or enforce the recommendations or guidance proposed by the Army Corps of Engineers in the final draft of the McNary Shoreline Management Plan, Lake Wallula, Washington.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

For years, the Walla Walla District of the Army Corps of Engineers has managed several miles of the public shoreline along the Columbia and Snake Rivers in the Tri-Cities area of my congressional district.

Five years ago, in 2006, the Corps sought to update its McNary Shoreline Management Plan, which had last been revised in the early 1980s. The existing management plan includes a permit program for private property owners that seek to build or use docks along the river shoreline.

The 2006 revision was so controversial that the Corps was forced back to the drawing board. It proposed a variety of restrictive measures, including a moratorium on the building of docks by private property owners along the shoreline and requiring existing dock owners to tear out their docks at great personal expense in order to keep their permits.

□ 1620

The Corps got an earful at a public meeting on the proposal and this year came back with a similarly controversial proposal, which included new questionable mandates from the National Marine Fisheries Service—including specific requirements for the length, width, color, and transparency of each dock, all of which NMFS claims would help save salmon.

Mr. Chairman, with all existing local docks as is right now, salmon runs are at near record levels along the Columbia River, and the Corps itself acknowledges that juvenile salmon in the McNary area average 20 to 30 million. Mr. Chairman, docks aren't killing salmon.

Regrettably, the Corps did little to justify their plan's sketchy science at another recent public meeting at which over 200 people attended to voice their opposition.

This amendment will ensure that the Army Corps will not charge ahead with a shoreline management plan until it answers questions about the questionable NMFS mandate and addresses concerns raised by a substantial number of citizens. Without this amendment, the Corps' unwise shoreline plan would be implemented and force questionable regulations on local residents and recreational activities.

Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that the Corps should not be allowed to implement a revised shoreline plan, but it should not do so based on shaky science and without ensuring that the local public's concerns are adequately addressed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We have no objection to your amendment. We are pleased to support it. Certainly anyone who lives near the Columbia and Snake Rivers knows this is a beautiful part of the country. We are aware of this issue and commend you for addressing it forthrightly.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the chairman's concurrence on this. If that is the same on both sides, I will be more than happy to yield back.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. 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. \_\_\_\_ . The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Departmental Administration", and by increasing the amount made available for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy" (except for Program Direction), by \$10,000,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to help promote a dynamic energy market in America through continued development of our budding solar industry. My amendment conservatively would transfer \$10 million from administrative costs within the Department of Energy and shift those to solar energy research and development within the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account.

Certainly I understand the difficulty in drafting this bill, given the large allocation cuts for the Energy and Water Subcommittee, and I appreciate the chairman's work and the ranking member's work in helping America meet the energy and water challenges of our Nation, which are huge. Yet this bill cuts research in solar energy by more than one-third from last year and over 60 percent from the President's request, providing \$166 million—\$97 million below fiscal year 2011 and \$291 million below the request.

The \$10 million transfer I propose from administration to implementation represents less than 5 percent of the funds in the administrative budget of the Department of Energy. I want to make clear that this amendment does not target other programs that are critical to our Nation's energy needs. Rather than cut fossil fuels and nuclear power, this amendment asks the Department of Energy to tighten its administrative belt a little bit more to prioritize the administration's core mission, the promotion of a viable energy future for America, and to do it in a sector that is growing jobs in our country despite what we face in terms of international global competition.

While this amendment proposes a modest 5 percent cut from the Department's administrative accounts, these dollars will go far in supporting additional energy options for American consumers and companies.

Solar energy production has nearly tripled in the last 5 years. In 2006, we generated 508,000 megawatt hours. Today, we produce 1.4 million megawatt hours annually. And I can't wait until it is 100 million.

Ernst & Young predicts the cost of solar will decrease by as much as half next year. And while the U.S. economy is anticipated to increase jobs by just 2 percent over the next year, in the solar industry that number is 26 percent, according to Cornell University. As costs go down and production capacity grows, solar energy becomes a viable alternative to imported energy sources. And this is exactly what our country needs right now: a vibrant energy market that gives Americans choices and encourages economic growth here at home.

Now, some would argue that with numbers like these, solar energy doesn't need anything, any additional funding, but I disagree. It is precisely because of our investment in this fledgling, cutting-edge industry that is high tech that such successes are possible. We cannot allow America to be complacent. Right now we are in competition to be the energy leader of the future in this sector. For years, we were the leader in developing new technology, but we have been falling behind. And guess who has been right at our heels the whole time: China. China knows that our technology will power the future, and they are setting themselves up to be the new global leaders in solar. I can verify that.

As we sat back and patted ourselves here, China exponentially increased their funding for solar and other clean energy technology. In addition, they are providing 15-year tax holidays for firms that locate production there. So as we develop this very fledgling industry here, they are more than willing to outsource it there. So we must redouble our efforts and continue our investment in research and bring this market to scale in America.

Right now, we are powering homes and some bases with solar. We should be powering neighborhoods and entire communities. That's what it means to have the real thriving, new energy market that Americans are demanding, and the jobs that go with them.

This amendment will create increased efficiency within the Department of Energy and promote American industry and energy independence. I ask my colleagues to think about it and help me by supporting this amendment which merely takes less than 5 percent of the administrative budget of the Department of Energy, \$10 million—we are not talking about billions here—and shifts it to the Solar Energy account. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Kaptur amendment for solar.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentlewoman's amendment would reduce funding in the departmental accounts. Because of quite a few amendments we

have already passed on the floor, your reduction would not be a 5 percent reduction; it probably would be a 10 percent reduction.

I know generally there is not a lot of sympathy for administrative responsibilities in the Department of Energy, but this would leave Secretary Steve Chu with not perhaps enough people in his operation to oversee a lot of issues that he has before him, including solar energy.

May I say for the record, the Solar Energy account in the Department of Energy budget is \$166 million. It is less than perhaps what it should be, but if you take it from the Department administrative account, we will have, I think, cause for more managerial problems to deal with. We also, may I say, have in the Energy Efficiency and Renewable program, as I have mentioned on a number of occasions, \$9 billion of unspent stimulus funds. So there is plenty of money in here, and I don't think that the Department salaries and wages ought to suffer and be reduced at a time when they need the additional leadership over there. I somewhat reluctantly oppose your amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Ms. KAPTUR. May I inquire as to my remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee very much, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, as well as the ranking member, Mr. VISCLOSKY, for allowing me this time.

I am going to ask for a vote on this amendment, but I am hoping that as this moves towards the Senate and final consideration that, as to some of those who just happened to get to the microphone earlier, we might find a way to move some of those dollars around to support an industry that truly is a cutting-edge industry for our country, which deserves the kind of support that this Congress should give to new technology to try to create good jobs in this country and help us wean ourselves off our chief strategic vulnerability—imported energy.

I ask my colleagues to support the Kaptur amendment on solar.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following:  
SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to move the Office of Environmental Management under the authority of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, last Friday, the Department of Energy made a surprise announcement that not only was the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management—or EM—leaving but that they were restructuring the entire \$6 billion program under the Under Secretary of Nuclear Security, who also serves as the head of the NNSA.

EM is responsible for cleaning up the nuclear waste created during our Nation's defense program that helped end World War II and the Cold War. The Federal Government has signed legal agreements with the States to clean up this waste. The major restructuring was simply declared by DOE with absolutely zero consultation with Congress, the States, the communities or the stakeholders.

I haven't been given sufficient answer to the simple question: How does EM benefit from this change?

We have no idea how this decision was reached or why restructuring was considered. Given what little has been made public, I believe there are some real risks, including the potential for cleanup to become less of a priority under as structure that has always been focused—and rightfully so—on nuclear security.

In the late 1980s, DOE moved the cleanup program out of the weapons program in order to provide more definition, transparency and to focus on cleanup. Now DOE wants to put them back together.

I ask again: What is the benefit to EM?

In DOE's own words from this past Friday: "The Office of Environmental Management has made unparalleled progress in cleaning up our Nation's Cold War nuclear legacy at sites across the country." Yet, out of nowhere, they decide to throw the program into a state of flux.

Without sufficient answers, I can't stand idly by while the department makes a seemingly snap decision that will impact something as important and as complex as nuclear waste cleanup. So my amendment would prohibit the use of funds to move the Office of Environmental Management under the Under Secretary of Nuclear Security.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to support your amendment. Of course, I will reserve judgment as to what Secretary Chu's plans are as they're somewhat on the drawing board; but we would agree with you that he needs to come to the Appropriations Committee and explain fully how he is going to have a better program for environmental management. It's too important to the Nation, not only to your State, but to other clean-up operations and sites around the Nation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would make the point that this past Friday, the Department of Energy said that the Office of Environmental Management has made unparalleled progress in cleaning up our Nation's Cold War nuclear legacy at sites across the country, and then they announced restructuring. This subcommittee held a hearing on the issue of cleanup in April of 2006. We find ourselves here in 2011 still talking about it, let alone the cost.

I appreciate the gentleman's concern. My point would be I have some ambivalence, as I'd mentioned to the gentleman earlier, simply because I had a conversation with the Secretary relative to the change. My observation to the Secretary is I appreciate he knows he has a problem, and I also appreciate he has done something about the problem.

I certainly appreciate the attentiveness of the gentleman, of your involvement and your good work on this, and I certainly do not object to what you're trying to accomplish here, because I do think, the stronger the message, the more diligent the department will be on this matter. I thank the gentleman for raising the issue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I will simply say that this may be a good idea; but for goodness sakes, what is the benefit to a \$6 billion program that only 6 days ago was announced is moving under another structure? There may be a good reason, but tell us what that reason is. So this amendment, hopefully, will elicit that answer, and we can move forward.

With support on both sides, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. 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 by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance, which requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment simply echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Energy and Water appropriations bill from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum. I have introduced similar amendments to the Department of Defense, Homeland Security, and the Agriculture appropriations bills. All three were accepted by the majority and passed by voice vote.

Our transportation sector is by far the biggest reason we send \$600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that when implemented broadly will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet, with just over 15,000 being used by the Department of Energy. By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage the development of domestic energy resources, including biomass, natural gas, coal, agricultural waste, hydrogen, and renewable electricity. Expanding the role these energy sources play in or transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies; it will increase our Nation's domestic security, and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world's oil markets.

I just want to say very briefly on a similar note, I have worked with my colleagues JOHN SHIMKUS, ROSCOE BARTLETT and STEVE ISRAEL to introduce the bipartisan Open Fuel Standard Act, which is H.R. 1687. Our bill would require 50 percent of all new automobiles in 2014, 80 percent in 2016, and 95 percent in 2017 to be warranted to operate on non-petroleum fuels in addition to, or instead of, petroleum-based fuels. Compliance possibilities include the full array of existing tech-

nologies, including flex fuel, natural gas, hydrogen, biodiesel, plug-in electric drive, and fuel cell, as well as a catchall of new technologies.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1640

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are prepared to accept your amendment and commend you for it.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

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. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, for the last time, 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 to the Corps of Engineers by this Act may be used for the removal or associated mitigation of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project number 2342.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, in these tight budget times, it is more important than ever that the Federal Government focus its funding on the most essential and core functions. The Federal Government, however, should not subsidize private companies' business decisions, particularly when that business decision involves tearing out a 14 megawatt hydropower dam that has served two rural counties in my district.

The Condit Dam, a privately owned and operated hydropower-producing dam located in my district, was constructed in 1913 on the White Salmon River, which is a tributary of the Columbia River. Since 1947, the Condit Dam has been owned and operated by PacifiCorp and has held a license with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Over the past 20 years, rather than agree to the rigorous and costly measures associated with the FERC relicensing process, PacifiCorp opted to pursue actions to surrender its license to operate the dam and now wants to remove that dam at its own cost. This amendment will ensure that no Federal tax dollars will be used by the Corps of Engineers to remove or mitigate for the removal of the Condit Dam.

Recently, PacifiCorp representatives communicated to my office that they acknowledge that PacifiCorp itself, and not the Corps, is responsible for all impacts that removing this dam might cause to the Federal Columbia River navigation channel. My amendment simply ensures that the Federal taxpayers do not get left holding the bag for a private company's actions that could cost this private company, by their own admission, up to \$32 million.

Having said that, I do want to say this, Mr. Chairman. While I give tacit approval to a dam being removed in the Northwest—it's a private decision by a private company—I want to reiterate and continue my opposition to any attempt to remove any of the Federal dams along the Columbia or Snake River. This is a private company making their decision, and they should pay for it; and that's what this amendment attempts to address.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am pleased to support your amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman very much.

With that concurrence on the other side, I yield back the balance of my time and urge adoption of the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 609. None of the funds provided in this Act may be expended by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the purposes of the license renewal process for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, until advanced, peer-reviewed seismic studies are completed and lessons learned from the earthquake and resulting tsunami that severely damaged Japan's Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant on March 11, 2011 are taken into account.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

My amendment would ensure the Nuclear Regulatory Commission does not move forward with the license renewal process for the Diablo Canyon power plant, located in my congressional district, until advanced seismic studies are completed and independently reviewed.

Over the last several months, I've called for a short pause in the relicensing effort currently under way at this nuclear power plant until a myriad of seismic questions at the facility are answered. Further studies are needed to demonstrate if the plant's design and operations can withstand an earthquake and other potential threats, including a previously undetected fault line, the Shoreline Fault, which runs within a few hundred yards of the plant. Even PG&E, the plant's operator, has acknowledged the validity of these concerns.

Earlier this year, the utility acceded to my request and asked the NRC to delay the finance issuance of the plant's license renewal while it completes recommended advanced seismic studies of the area. The NRC agreed to review those findings before making a final decision. PG&E also asked the California Public Utilities Commission to suspend proceedings associated with license renewal for Diablo Canyon until the studies are submitted to the NRC.

But, Mr. Chairman, PG&E and the NRC are only talking about delaying the final decision. The relicensing process is still going forward, despite the fact that virtually all of the decisions that would be made about the relicensing of the plant would be affected by what the seismic studies tell us. The cart is clearly being put before the horse here, and we need to rectify this.

My constituents deserve answers to questions regarding the ability of the plant to withstand an earthquake and nuclear accident at the same time and how long the plant would be self-sustaining in the event of such damage. It is particularly pertinent given that in March the NRC confirmed that Diablo Canyon is one of two nuclear power plants in the highest risk seismic areas in the country.

I am, to put it lightly, concerned that the NRC has not taken this seismic risk seriously enough. For example, it has failed to support the recommendations from a 2008 California Energy Commission report clearly delineating that more information is needed to determine the true seismic risk at Diablo Canyon. And just yesterday, an NRC task force review of the Japanese reactor meltdowns determined that our reactors are not sufficiently prepared to respond to catastrophic events or even simple power outages, like the one that triggered the Fukushima meltdown.

The NRC should quickly move to adopt the recommendations of this report as well as the full complement of lessons that can be learned from this disaster, and it should do it before moving forward on issuing new operating licenses to PG&E to run Diablo Canyon long into the future.

Finally, it is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that there is no hurry to relicense Diablo Canyon. The current operating licenses run to 2024 and 2025. Surely that's more than enough time to adequately investigate seismic con-

cerns in a thoughtful and transparent manner.

To be clear, I'm not calling for Diablo Canyon to be shut down or for the plant to be denied new operating licenses. What I am doing with this amendment is asking that the relicensing process be paused, briefly, until comprehensive, independent analyses of the seismic issues are completed and that they be considered as part of the relicensing process.

Diablo Canyon provides over 3 million people in California with affordable electricity. It provides many jobs in my district. It's an important element of the tax base of San Luis Obispo County; but this is an issue about safety, and we all agree that safety must be everyone's number one concern here.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that would ensure that this is the case.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I insist on my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment imposes new duties on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 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.

□ 1650

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy.

Mr. FLAKE (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I know there are a lot of people that are offer-

ing amendments, so I will try to move very quickly here.

This amendment would simply prohibit funds from going to the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, or ARPA-E. There is ARPA-Defense, there is ARPA other stuff, there is ARPA-E. This is what we are trying to do is prohibit funding from going to ARPA-E, or energy.

ARPA-E is currently set to receive about \$100 million in this appropriation bill. The most compelling argument given to defund ARPA-E is found on its own Web site, which states that it was established "to focus on creative, out-of-the-box transformational energy research that industry by itself cannot or will not support due to its high risk, but where success would provide dramatic benefits." It is this kind of, I guess, out-of-the-box thinking that has gotten us into this deficit that we're running, about \$1.6 trillion.

We are broke. We are borrowing 41 cents on every dollar that we spend, yet still we find within our budget reason to find \$100 million to fund energy research in private companies that others won't fund because it's too risky.

Now, we're not talking about products for defense for which there is no commercial application; we're talking about private sector research that could reap a windfall for some private company, and has in a number of other areas. But yet we believe that it's prudent to borrow—because we're borrowing everything here—borrow money from the taxpayer to pick and choose favored companies to receive this research money.

It's not right. We ought to defund it. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. My colleague's amendment would eliminate funding for ARPA-E. The committee's top responsibility, of course, is to reduce government spending, and I appreciate my colleague's amendment and perhaps some of his other amendments for that reason. To that end, our bill reduces spending for energy and water development to near the 2006 level, \$100 billion below fiscal year 2011, and a full \$5.9 billion below the request.

I certainly share many of my colleague's concerns about this program. The committee has taken a very close look at it. Right now, ARPA-E must not intervene where private capital markets are already acting, and it must not be redundant with other programs of the Department of Energy.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield to the ranking member, Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the chairman yielding and would join him in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

We just had a vote earlier in the Chamber adding \$79 million to this program. But setting that particular vote

aside, as I have mentioned several times, while I have great trepidation about people at the Department of Energy talking to each other and the Department not having the same vigor, if you would, that they have for ARPA-E, instilling that in other research centers, it does appear that this is a successful program in its infancy. We certainly ought to make sure that it has a chance to show that it can be successful over a limited number of years—they are talking about 3. My emphasis with them is to distill that same effort across the Department of Energy.

So I would join my chairman in opposing the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to this amendment, too. The bill would provide \$100 million for ARPA-E, which is already \$80 million less than FY 2011 funding—and of course we have to take into account the amendment that was just passed—and \$450 million below the President's budget request.

ARPA-E is a promising new program that can drive innovation to support our scientific competitiveness. As I stated previously in my opening statement, ARPA-E has shown potential as a new organizational model. And I am disappointed that the same vigor that led to its creation has been largely absent when it comes to addressing the systemic and organizational problems in other existing applied programs, which was an element of the justification used for ARPA-E.

ARPA-E is modeled on DARPA. And as the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, DARPA has been one of the great leaders of innovation in the national security area.

So again, I'm sorry to say it, but I think we have to defeat the Flake amendment.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I'm just hoping that this amendment doesn't rise to the level of being the most ridiculous amendment that the gentleman from Washington has ever seen.

Mr. DICKS. Close.

Mr. FLAKE. They usually do.

But I would just say again here, we're not talking about things in national security or in defense for which there is no commercial application, for which companies that invest in this kind of research would not reap a windfall, the reason for which the profit motive incentivizes companies to invest in these things. Why in the world does government have to be the investor of last resort in what are, quote, transformational energy research for which the industry by itself cannot or will not support due to its high risk? I mean, if it's that high risk, believe me, we shouldn't be taking it.

If venture capital out there won't do it, we shouldn't be doing it either with

money that we're borrowing from venture capitalists and others who have a little better idea than we do. When we go out and support corn ethanol for 30 years, for crying out loud, or some of these other things and we keep doing it and saying, Yeah, it's going to come around one of these days and this is just a promising new area of research, come on. We're \$14 trillion in debt. We have negotiations going on right now over at the White House or somewhere else trying to figure a way to raise the debt ceiling to spend more.

Isn't it time that we review programs like this, where we are trying to replace what is not happening in the private sector or trying to outguess the private sector?

And I just tell you, if we can't cut here, I don't know where we're going to cut, I really don't. The gentleman made the point that we are down to 2006 levels. Great. We ought to go further than that. I mean, 2006, we act as if that was a Great Depression year, "Grapes of Wrath" music playing or something. It wasn't exactly that. We have seen ramping up year after year after year in some of these programs. We are spending more than we ever have.

So I would urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds provided in this Act may be expended by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to issue a draft supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) for Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my hope that we can simply all agree to this amendment. It would simply bar the NRC from issuing a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the license renewal of the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant.

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that the NRC does not move forward with the relicensing effort currently underway at Diablo Canyon until advanced, peer-reviewed seismic studies of the area are completed and the findings are shared with the NRC. These advanced seismic studies are needed because the USGS—U.S. Geological Survey—announced in 2008 the discovery of a previously undetected fault line, the Shoreline Fault, which runs within a few hundred yards of Diablo Canyon.

□ 1700

The NRC also recently confirmed that Diablo Canyon is one of two nuclear power plants in the highest risk seismic areas in the country. Without these studies, we cannot say for certain whether an earthquake along the Shoreline Fault or others nearby would result in a severe nuclear accident.

It's important to note, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment only affects the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant. It will not shut down the power plant, nor will it stop the relicensing effort or even prevent PG&E, the plant's operator, from gaining new operating licensings to run Diablo Canyon in the future. Instead, it would simply ensure the NRC gets answers to the unstudied and unresolved seismic questions before it issues the draft environmental report.

My amendment is also consistent with PG&E's own request that the NRC delay the final issuance of the plant's license renewal until its seismic research in the area is completed. The NRC has also made it clear it will review those findings before making a decision on whether to grant renewed operating licenses for the plant to PG&E.

Moreover, last month, PG&E asked the California Public Utilities Commission to suspend proceedings associated with license renewal funding for Diablo Canyon until its advanced seismic studies are finished and the findings have been submitted to the NRC. Unfortunately, however, work on the relicensing effort continues, even though the seismic studies have not been completed and won't be for several years and even though the outcome of these studies could very well affect every operation at the plant.

Mr. Chairman, we need answers about the seismic risks at Diablo Canyon and what steps are needed to address them and prepare for any disaster, and we need them before the relicensing process moves forward. So I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this straightforward amendment, to ensure an evaluation of the risks that the offshore faults pose to Diablo Canyon.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We respect the gentlewoman's efforts to protect the interests of her State and district; however, her amendment intervenes in a specific local project by prohibiting funds for a required step in the licensing process. I do not believe this is an appropriate Federal role in a process that should be driven by the State and local communities while being carefully evaluated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I, therefore, must oppose the amendment and urge other Members to oppose it as well.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to yield to the ranking member from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I reluctantly join him in his opposition. Again, I understand what the gentlewoman from California is attempting to do. I appreciate her endeavors here and certainly would commit to working with her to ensure that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is moving forward in a considered and responsible manner on this license application.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Fossil Energy Research and Development program of the Department of Energy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment would prohibit funds from going to the Fossil Energy Research and Development program.

The Fossil Energy Research and Development program is set to receive nearly \$500 million through this appropriation bill. The committee report recommends that no less than \$25 million be used to continue research in certain areas. But we shouldn't have any money going to subsidize Big Oil.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman's amendment would eliminate funding for the Fossil Energy Research and Development program, causing hundreds, if not thousands, of job losses and threatening our Nation's ability to compete in the rapidly growing portion of the energy sector.

I may also note for the record, Mr. Chairman, that Arizona itself is dependent, I believe, with close to 60 percent of its energy coming from fossil energy. So fossil energy is a part of the Nation's equation, and we had better be careful before we eliminate research and development.

Let me say, I appreciate and recognize the gentleman's passion for cutting spending and spending that is duplicative, but this type of research is important.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I want to join the chairman in his opposition.

Recognizing that 70 percent of our energy consumption comes from carbon fuels, it's very important for this government and for this Nation to learn how to, as efficiently and as effectively, use them. And again I think, for that reason alone, we should oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I appreciate the chairman yielding.

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

Mr. FLAKE. You know, with an energy resource as old as fossil energy, we're talking fossil fuels, we're talking Big Oil. We always hear from the other side of the aisle, Quit subsidizing Big Oil. And here we are directly saying we're going to give them research.

You know, some of the companies that directly receive grants under the plan I think are companies like Chevron or others to develop energy in the gulf or whatever else. Why in the world are we subsidizing that? We are hearing that they have profits, billions and billions of dollars just in the quarter, not just the year, and yet here we are subsidizing them again to more efficiently use fossil energy?

Now, fossil energy has been around a long time. It's not exactly a notion that no research goes into it. And it's going to be around for a lot longer still. Why in the world is the Federal Government saying we need to subsidize these companies who are conducting research on use and efficiency for fossil energy?

If we can't cut here, again, where can we cut? If we're going to stand up for Big Oil when it comes to spending money here, then where can we cut? I'm just flabbergasted when I come down to the floor and look at what

we're funding and subsidizing here. But yet I hear the rhetoric about how we need to make sure that they're paying taxes and whatever else. I think they should. I think we ought to get rid of the corporate subsidies, all of these kinds of corporate subsidies. But why in the world are we developing programs to spend billions of dollars overall, millions in this case, to help these for-profit companies that we blast in one breath and then subsidize with the next? Where does it end, Mr. Chairman? If we can't cut here, where can we cut?

Again, this is fossil energy. It's been around a long time. It will be around a long time. We don't need to subsidize it.

And remember, every dollar we spend here is a dollar that we have borrowed from people across the country, from taxpayers, from investors, from venture capitalists, from others who would invest it far more wisely than we would here. The best allocation of capital resources is through the free market, not by government fiat or subsidy. We've learned that over time, but yet we persist in doing this time after time after time.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1710

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, 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. 6. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement section 10011(b) of Public Law 111-11.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chair, the underlying bill has already removed the funding for a program that is failing to show any positive results and has done more harm than good. The San Joaquin River Restoration Program continues to push forward on an ill-advised path of wasting water out to the ocean under the guise of saving salmon. What this amendment does is to prohibit the premature reintroduction of an endangered species into an uninhabitable

river, a river biologists say is not ready for salmon, a program that is supposed to occur after the construction of fish screens and the completion of an environmental study, neither of which is complete.

All Central Valley salmon runs are struggling to regain healthy numbers. This amendment ensures that bureaucrats don't purposely reduce the numbers of available salmon in other streams to plant them into the San Joaquin system and further threaten or endanger current runs. The Bureau of Reclamation needs to be provided with more time to complete the environmental studies and build the infrastructure required by the San Joaquin River Restoration Program before this river can sustain a salmon run.

Finally, even the National Marine Fisheries Services has doubts about the success of reintroduction. Contained within the final draft of their Reintroduction Strategies, NMFS expressed concerns that the San Joaquin River Restoration Program will not complete necessary channel improvements for a successful reintroduction.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from California. In 2009, Congress ratified the San Joaquin Settlement Act, which ended 18 years of litigation in the Central Valley of California over water. The agreement was supported by the previous administration and California's then-Republican Governor Schwarzenegger.

The Federal authorizing legislation was initially cosponsored by Congressman Pombo in the House and Senator FEINSTEIN in the Senate. The underlying bill zeroes the \$9 million request for the San Joaquin River Restoration Fund and rescinds \$66 million in mandatory funds for these activities.

As we stand on the House floor today, we are undermining this agreement, which, if it were to stand, that is the amendment, will land this case simply back into court. If the court is forced to take over river restoration, the Friant water users would be at risk of losing over 20 years of water supply certainty provided by the settlement. The amendment, I believe, is an attempt to end the broadly supported and bipartisan effort to restore the river, while also improving water supply management, flood protection, and water quality.

The amendment is piling on, if you would, given that the vast majority of funding for the settlement has been cut. There is no need to eliminate all funding just to ensure water attorneys can make a few more boat payments.

As I said at the outset, I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, it's apparent that the gentleman from Indiana has not seen the river in my area, or simply just doesn't understand its flow. But to take an endangered species from Northern California, truck it down to the Central Valley, put it into a river that does not have fish screens, that does not have fish ladders, that does not have the environmental study just to watch these fish die is not only irresponsible, but it's a waste of money.

So I would invite the gentleman from Indiana to come visit us anytime. But certainly don't make the mistake of killing an endangered species. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. In closing, I would again point out that in 2009, Congress ratified this settlement to end 18 years of litigation. I do not think we should adopt the amendment and potentially begin another 18 years of litigation and would ask my colleagues to oppose the 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. DENHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. 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. \_\_\_\_ For "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Construction" there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Expenses" is hereby reduced by, \$1,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment with my fellow Louisiana colleague, Democratic Congressman CEDRIC RICHMOND. And what our amendment does is it transfers \$1 million out of the Corps of Engineers' expense account and into the Corps' construction account for critical coastal restoration efforts.

If you look at what we're dealing with here, what we're trying to address, not only can we maintain fiscal responsibility, but we need to also maintain and restore America's wetlands.

And just what is happening to America's wetlands? What are we trying to address with this amendment? Louisiana alone has lost 25 square miles of coastal wetlands every year.

And I want to hold up this football to represent that every single hour, Mr. Chairman, every single hour the State of Louisiana alone loses an entire football field of land, an entire football field of land that's eroded away. And

what exactly does that wetland, America's wetland, protect that's eroding away?

I want to show a chart here of the oil and gas infrastructure, the pipelines that move America's energy throughout the country. In the gulf coast alone, just in Louisiana, we produce about one-third of America's energy. And we talk all the time about our interest in reducing our country's dependence on foreign oil, and I strongly, strongly support that effort. In fact, Louisiana is at the forefront of doing that.

But that energy that we produce, and we ought to be producing more of it, we have the opportunity to produce more, but the energy we do produce is distributed throughout the entire country through pipelines that are in jeopardy right now because of that erosion of our coast, this wetland in America.

And not only is it the oil and gas infrastructure that's at risk, but also seafood production. The gulf coast of Louisiana, we produce a third of the country's seafood. And just looking at this chart makes me hungry when you look at the oysters, and the crabs, and the fish, this great product that we produce off our coast. But all of that comes from America's wetland, from that wetland that's evaporating, eroding away. And we're trying, we're bringing a bipartisan amendment to stop that from happening.

Louisiana's put its own skin in the game to the tune of over a billion dollars, over a billion dollars of money that Louisiana's put in. But there was a project that was authorized by this Congress, because this is a national issue. And, in fact, Congress has recognized this is an issue that shouldn't just be left up to Louisiana, because we're talking about something that protects and serves the entire country. And that's why in 2007, the LCA project was authorized by Congress. And all we're trying to do is keep that project alive, moving a million dollars from the expense account over into the Corps' construction account.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in reluctant opposition. First of all, I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy for coastal restoration, and should we say literally carrying the ball for coastal restoration and for his remarkable props. We know on this committee what a high priority it is for his district and his State. May I thank him also for coming to the floor earlier to make a case, obviously, for controlling spending, but also doing some things that are very important to his constituents and others affected by the devastating floods. I want to commend him for his strong advocacy.

□ 1720

The bill before us includes more than \$16 million, or more than 15 percent of the entire investigations account, to continue work on coastal restoration through studies, engineering, and design on various components of the program.

The committee had to make some tough choices in the bill, though, and although the Corps of Engineers construction account has increased \$86 million above the President's request, let me say, above the President's request, it is still a reduction from fiscal year 2011.

The Corps had numerous projects under construction that were not included in the President's budget request and so were likely to be funded in construction year 2012.

While construction funding is trending downward, I believe it is most prudent to prioritize funding for these ongoing projects so they can be completed and the Federal Government can realize some benefits from previous spending, rather than starting new projects, as important as they are.

And even given that this project is currently authorized at approaching \$2 billion and may continue to grow, it would not be prudent to begin another major new project while we have so many new commitments.

For these reasons I must oppose the amendment, but I sympathize with the gentleman on the purposes for which he is here.

I yield to the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I also would use the word "reluctantly" because I understand the need that the gentleman has in his region in this country. I appreciate his efforts in this regard.

But, again, I do support the Chair's policies as far as no new starts, given the fact that over the last several years we have terminated hundreds of ongoing projects. This is going to be a significant cost.

Until we can have the intestinal fortitude with the administration to provide the necessary funds for ongoing funds alone, it is difficult to begin a new endeavor. The gentleman indicated his efforts to increase a request made by the President, despite his best efforts to add money to the bill. We are now \$677 million below what we are spending on water projects in this country in fiscal year 2010.

So, again, with all reluctance I am constrained to join with my chairman in opposition.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the interest by both gentlemen in dealing with the backlog that the Corps currently has, and, in fact, that's one of the reasons why, when I worked closely with my colleague from New Orleans, CEDRIC RICHMOND, on this amendment, we first of all made sure

not to take anything away from existing projects, so those existing projects in the pipeline are not affected at all by this amendment.

And, in fact, the Corps's overall budget is not increased by our amendment, and we worked very hard to get to that point that we weren't taking away from other vital projects but pointing out that this is not a Louisiana-specific issue, this is a national issue. And as we talked about that pipeline, that series of pipelines that goes throughout the entire country to supply the energy needs of our Nation, and we talk about the vital seafood production and the things that make our gulf seafood so appetizing to people all around the country and around the world, but I also want to go back to this football and talk about the football field of land that erodes every hour. Just the last hour we have been sitting here, an entire football field of America's wetlands has eroded away, and we can reverse that trend without taking away from any other projects.

I understand the importance of that and, like I said, that's why we worked so hard to put the amendment together in the way that we did. I would urge adoption from all of my colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SCALISE. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy" is hereby reduced to \$0.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates funding to the Department of Energy's Office of Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

We should be developing the vast quantities of proven energy resources readily available in this country, but instead the government continues to subsidize green technologies that are

not yet ready to be used wide scale. They are neither efficient nor affordable, and Federal agencies should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. If these technologies were viable, the Federal Government would not need to give them handouts and, instead, they would be able to succeed on their own.

Further, this legislation provides millions of dollars of foreign assistance to countries like China and India to implement renewable energy programs. At a time when our Nation is broke, and we are broke, why are we sending taxpayer money to our foreign competition?

I urge support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to my colleagues that the amendment, as stated by the gentleman, would eliminate all funding for the Office of Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

The bill already includes a reduction of \$491 million from the current year level, which is a 25 percent cut.

The debate, relative to energy policy in this House—and not necessarily restricted to this amendment—talks about subsidies. But there are two parts to a Federal budget: There are spending-side issues and there are revenue- and tax-side issues.

I would hazard a guess as we stand here that there is not an energy source in the United States of America, be it coal, be it nuclear, be it gas, be it solar, be it wind, that does not somehow receive some benefit either by loss revenue or direct spending of the Federal Government in its endeavors.

What we do have to do is necessary research to make sure that we do expand the mix of energy utilization in this country, and certainly that is the purpose of the Renewable Energy Program Research at the national level. With 70 percent of our energy now generated through coal or natural gas, this cannot continue.

As I have said in earlier debates during the week, my senior Senator from Indiana, Senator LUGAR, has always described our energy problem as a national security issue given where petroleum products tend to be bought in the United States of America. Without this type of very serious research, we are not going to solve that national security problem, and we are not going to assiduously create job opportunities and economic opportunities.

I would respectfully object and oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my colleague for yielding.

Very briefly, while I am very respectful of my colleague's attempt here to

do what he can to cut clear back on spending, this is a very important area of our committee's responsibility.

The amendment would totally eliminate funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. It is a bit, a step too far, and I associate myself with the remarks of my colleague and reluctantly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana's comments, and I submit that the best way to make sure that we have that national security that my colleague from Indiana was talking about is for us to open up all of our God-given resources of energy here in this country, and we are not doing that.

Mr. Chairman, we need to start doing everything we can to develop every energy source that we have, and I believe in an all-of-the-above energy policy.

□ 1730

The best way to determine what energy policy is going to be viable and is best for America is by letting the marketplace work. I believe in the brilliance of the marketplace. The marketplace, unencumbered by taxes and regulation as well as free from government meddling in the marketplace by picking winners or losers, is the best way to develop those drastically needed energy resources. And I believe in renewable energy. But is it viable economically? And is this country going to be viable economically if we continue spending like we have been spending?

And, in fact, many Members of Congress seem to have the idea that this country is going to totally dry up and blow away if the Federal Government doesn't supply everything to every entity's needs. I hear over and over again from colleagues that they want to continue this spending and that spending. In fact, in the committees—I serve on three committees—I hear my colleagues, particularly other side, talk about we have a tremendous debt that we need to deal with.

But it reminds me—as I hear them also talking about not cutting programs—it reminds me of an old saying back from our founding era when our Founding Fathers were talking about the discussion in taxes. Today's mantra is "don't cut me, don't cut thee, cut the fellow behind the tree." Well there's nobody behind the tree.

I believe we are in an economic emergency as a Nation, and Congress needs to face the fact. We're headed towards an economic collapse as a Nation. We've got to stop picking winners and losers and let the marketplace do that. Let people vote with their dollars instead of our funding this and not subsidizing that, subsidizing this and not subsidizing that. The best way to do these things, the best way to figure out who should be the winner or loser is let the marketplace do what it does best and let people vote with their dollars. Let

people invest in things that make sense and not invest in those things that don't make sense.

And we've got a lot of renewables such as this corn-based ethanol that doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense economically, and it doesn't make sense even from an energy perspective. In fact, I'm a good Southern boy. I love my grits and cornbread. It makes absolutely no sense for me to be burning up my grits and cornbread driving down the road putting it in the gas tank of my GMC Yukon.

So we need to let the marketplace do its thing. We need to reel in the spending that Republicans and Democrats alike over the last several decades have been using to grow the size and scope of government. So I encourage my colleagues on both sides to support this amendment. It makes sense economically.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. VISCLOSKY. I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I would just point out that there are no amendments left on our side that I know of, and I hope that your side can be more expeditious. Thank you. Some of us have important ball games to go to.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the activities specified in section 505 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13255).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I will try to be expeditious and comply with my friend from Washington's request to not delay this.

This amendment simply prohibits the Department of Energy from spending

money to implement the Vehicle Technologies Deployment Subprogram within the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy's "Clean Cities" program.

Earlier, I offered an amendment to cut funding from this program and transfer it into the spending reduction account. As I mentioned before when I presented my previous amendment, it is not appropriate for the Federal Government to be spending dollars on programs that the private sector should be doing or that local and State government can do. This program, this Vehicle Technologies Deployment Subprogram, is corporate welfare. I remind my friends, this is corporate welfare. And, in fact, I have heard over and over from my friends on the Democrat side that we need to stop doing corporate welfare. And I hope that they will support this amendment because that's what this simply is.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The amendment of the gentleman from Georgia would prohibit funds for the Vehicle Technologies activities at the Department of Energy that work with cities across the country to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. The gentleman should know that the committee closely evaluated the alternative fuels program and slashed it to \$202 million below the budget request, leaving only \$26 million that we found to be well justified.

So we are making some progress and we are making some tough decisions. And even though the gentleman's heart is in the right place, we do need the \$26 million to continue the program, and thus I oppose the gentleman's amendment, albeit reluctantly.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the committee's cutting this program down to the \$26 million. But, again, this is corporate welfare to Fortune 100 companies, many that get these funds. We do need to reduce this country's dependence upon foreign oil, but this is not the way to do it. The way to do it is to open up exploration of our own energy resources here in America.

This is a commonsense amendment to strike out about \$26.5 million out of funding that we just simply don't have. It's money that we're borrowing from our foreign competitors as well as here in this country, and it's creating more and more debt. So I urge passage of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment, which would address another restrictive and misguided Federal regulation. Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prevents Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of an alternative fuel unless its "lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions" are less than or equal to emissions from conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum resources. Simply put, my amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on Federal agencies funded by the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

□ 1740

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plan to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuels, based on the opinion of environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel produces more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum. I recently offered similar amendments to the MilCon-VA, Ag, and DOD appropriations bills, and each time those amendments passed this House by voice votes. My friend Mr. CONAWAY also had language added to the Defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation. But section 526's ban on fuel choice applies to all Federal agencies, not just the Defense Department. That is why I am offering it again today.

Federal agencies should not be burdened with wasting their time studying fuel emissions when there is a simple fix, and that is not restricting their fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, policies, and regulations like section 526. With increasing competition from other countries for energy and fuel resources, and the continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is more important than ever for our country to become more

energy independent and to further develop and produce our domestic energy resources. Placing restrictions on Federal agencies' fuel choices is an unacceptable precedent to set with regard to America's energy independence and its energy policy.

Section 526 makes our Nation more dependent on Middle East oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help American energy, improve the American economy, and create American jobs. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, section 526, I believe, is a commonsense provision that stops Federal agencies from wasting taxpayer dollars on new, alternative fuels that are dirtier and more polluting than the fuels we use today. The section simply bars agencies from entering into contracts to purchase alternative and unconventional fuels that emit more carbon pollution than conventional fuels on a lifecycle basis. I think that is just a rational, commonsense requirement.

The effect of this provision that has been in place is to spur development of advanced biofuels. These fuels are being successfully tested and proven today on U.S. Navy planes at supersonic speeds. And I believe it is a testament to American ingenuity.

I think the path that the gentleman wants to pursue is the wrong one. It is unsustainable in the longer term, and it will not lead us to energy security. Therefore, I am opposed to his amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am prepared to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. His amendment strengthens national security by allowing the Federal Government more alternatives to imported petroleum fuels.

More than half of the oil the Nation consumes each year is imported, as we know, and today the price of gasoline is hovering around the \$4-a-gallon mark. By declaring some new fuel options to be off limits, section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 limits our Nation's ability to reduce its dependence on oil imports.

His amendment puts all alternatives back on the table, which I think is needed, so the Nation can begin to develop and use fuels that are made with resources from here in the United States. Energy self-sufficiency is a national security issue, and this amendment takes us in the right direction. I

am pleased to support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. I want to respond to what my amendment really does, and let me read a letter from the Department of Defense general counsel to Senator INHOFE from July of 2008. I quote: "It creates uncertainty about what fuels DOD can procure, and will discourage the development of new sources, particularly reliable domestic sources of energy supplies for the Armed Forces."

Let me go on. Let me give you a practical, real world example as to what section 526 does.

Our closest neighbor with stable energy supplies is Canada. We import 650,000-plus barrels a day of oil that is produced from oil sands in Canada. That oil makes its way throughout the refinery system throughout the United States and gets blended into jet fuels, gasoline, and diesel fuel. A literal interpretation of section 526 would say that the U.S. military, the United States Government, more broadly, cannot utilize any of those fuels. There is no technical or commercial way that the military of the United States Government can make sure it is not using any fuel source that came from that crude oil.

Let me go on and wrap up like this. You are going to hear a lot of remarks from the other side of the aisle regarding the claims about section 526 or about my amendment. My amendment does nothing, nothing to remove the ability of the Federal Government to use alternative fuel sources. It can use whatever fuel source it wants to under my amendment.

Section 526 increases our reliance on Middle East oil. It hurts our military readiness, and its national security and energy security. It prevents the increased use of safe, clean, and efficient North American oil and gas. It increases the cost of American food and energy, and it hurts American jobs and the American economy.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. If I could ask the author of the amendment just one question.

On the letter, was that a letter from Senator INHOFE to the Department of Energy or from the Department of Energy to the Senator?

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. It is from the Department of Defense to Senator INHOFE.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the clarification.

I remain opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

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 NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF INDIANA

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries of Department of Energy employees to carry out section 407 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our Nation's unemployment rate currently sits at 9.2 percent, a full 1.6 percent higher than when President Obama took office. I am hearing from my southern Indiana constituents, and I've heard this for months now, that the President's failed experiment of spending our way to prosperity and creating great uncertainty about future tax rates and interest rates must end.

A step in the right direction would be supporting this modest amendment which my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and I have worked on together. The amendment would merely restore eligibility criteria for the Weatherization Assistance Program to pre-stimulus levels.

By way of background, prior to 2008, the Weatherization Assistance Program enabled families at or below the 150 percent poverty level to reduce their energy bills by making their homes more energy efficient. Since the stimulus bill increased this eligibility threshold, the Weatherization fund has exploded and currently has accumulated an estimated \$1.5 billion in unspent funds.

Moreover, the program has been a model of government waste and inefficiency. Late last year, for example, New Jersey's State auditor audited just \$614,000 worth of Weatherization funds disbursed in his State. He found that \$33,000 of this \$614,000 that were spent actually went to no services at all. So over 5 percent of the funds spent in that State were spent on nothing.

This sort of waste and inefficiency, no doubt, is being seen all across the country. We have seen recent audits of Weatherization programs in Illinois, Delaware, Tennessee, and Texas yield similar results.

Personally, I agree with those who say that most Americans already have sufficient incentives and means to reduce their energy bills by weatherizing their own homes and that government lacks sufficient incentives to spend our tax dollars responsibly. That is why we should adopt this modest amendment that would merely limit this program to our neediest citizens by restoring eligibility criteria back to pre-stimulus levels.

So I would say let's improve our climate for private sector job creation however we can. Let's eliminate wasteful and nonessential spending wherever we can find it. That is what this amendment does.

□ 1750

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. We accept the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We accept the amendment as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of individuals appointed to their current position through, or otherwise carry out, paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It prevents the misuse of recess appointments while preserving the Founders' intent by allowing the President to quickly make emergency recess appointments if the need arises.

I know this may surprise many Members, but current law actually prohibits the salaries of recess appointees, which was a law passed in 1863 that stayed on the books until 1940. It prohibited those who received recess appointments from being paid. Then some exceptions were made, and those exceptions basically took the intent of the law out. So these exceptions, these loopholes, are so broad that they make the prohibition against recess appointments useless, but the administration can always find a way to make these recess appointments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. These are legal appointments made by the President of

the United States—by this President, the last President, the President before that, the President back to George Washington. It is the administration's priority to make these appointments.

While each of us, or collectively, disagree with some of the individuals put into particular positions, until we change the law, the House should not pick and choose the staff for the executive branch any more than it should be picking ours.

If the gentleman wants a say in the President's hires and appointments, I suggest he work to change the Constitution. Article II, section 2 gives the Senate say over Presidential appointments and gives the President power to make recess appointments.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANDRY. I don't argue the legality of the President's recess appointments.

I am doing what many Congresses have done prior, all the way since 1860, when they realized that this was a problem when Presidents and administrations tried to bypass the will of the people. I am using the power of this House, which is the power of the purse, to make sure that, when the President makes recess appointments—look, this isn't the 1800s anymore. Congress is not out for months and months at a time. If the President needs to make an appointment in an emergency, he certainly has the time, and he will be able to take that recess appointment and put it before the Senate. I am simply saying, until that recess appointee is confirmed by the Senate, he or she shall not receive any pay.

My friends across the aisle have spent most of the past month talking about closing loopholes, so I hope they will join me in protecting the taxpayers by closing the loophole in the law that currently exists. Let's bring the law back to the intent of it, which is to prohibit recess appointees from receiving salaries until the appointees are confirmed. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, this is a constitutional issue, and we have no business in it. I would urge my colleagues to vote against the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LANDRY. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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. \_\_\_\_ Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill before us today includes \$30.6 billion in funding. That falls \$1 billion below last year's level and \$5.9 billion beneath the President's budget request.

While I applaud our appropriators for the great work they've done in reducing this spending, I am one of those Members of the House who believes there is still room for improvement. We are in an extraordinary time when it comes to our budget and when it comes to the budget of this Nation in the spending, and this extraordinary time does require some extraordinary measures.

That's why I am introducing a 5 percent across-the-board spending reduction amendment. This amendment has the backing of 10 national conservative groups. This amendment would reduce the funding appropriated by this bill by an additional \$1.5 billion and would take Federal spending back to just above the fiscal year 2007 level.

Across-the-board spending cuts effectively control the growth and the cost of the Federal Government. They give agencies the flexibility to determine which expenses are necessary and which are not. In fact, in my State of Tennessee, as I have mentioned many times as we have debated these across-the-board amendments—and Mr. Chairman, I know many of my colleagues are probably a little bit tired of hearing of these across-the-board spending cuts—we bring them forward because the States have used them, and they've used them successfully.

A Governor in my State, who is of my colleague's party across the aisle, made a 9 percent across-the-board spending reduction to bring that budget back into balance, to put our State on a firm fiscal footing. Our States that have balanced budget amendments take these actions, and they take them carefully, cautiously, and with an eye towards securing fiscal stability.

It is time for us in Congress to begin to enact these very same measures. Removing a nickel from every dollar is a way we can help our departments find new efficiencies and to reform wasteful business practices. It would save taxpayers millions of dollars in the process. Indeed, if we had been doing this for years, we probably wouldn't find ourselves in the situation that we are

in right now. It's a step in the right direction, so I encourage the support of my colleagues on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentlewoman from Tennessee's amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. First of all, I do appreciate the fact that she recognizes the committee made some tough choices. In fact, our overall bill is really down close to the 2006 level. Obviously, in some quarters, that doesn't satisfy every Member of Congress, but I'm respectful of her desire to go further.

Cuts of this magnitude, quite honestly, go far too deep. The types of things we do in our bill—our responsibility for the reliability of the nuclear stockpile—that's utmost, as is our responsibility for cleaning up nuclear waste. In fact, there are consent decrees where things have to be cleaned up because of things left over from World War II. There is research and development, which is important, and water issues. We heard for 2½ hours earlier today of the types of things that can happen to our Nation when water infrastructure is not kept up and modernized. There is the loss of human life, the loss of livelihoods, the loss of tens of thousands of jobs.

□ 1800

I am respectful of the gentlewoman's perspective, but in reality this would be very damaging to our national security and to things that are important to life and property.

I am happy to yield to the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the chairman for yielding and join with him in opposition. I think he has stated the case very well.

I would also add the expenditures in this legislation on nonproliferation. I think one of the greatest threats our country faces is the issue of nuclear terrorism. Again, we have to be very thoughtful. The chairman has had to make some very serious and profound choices. I think he has done an excellent job doing so, and we ought to stop where we are.

I am opposed to the woman's amendment.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. In closing, I do appreciate the comments that have been made, and I appreciate the work of the Appropriations Committee. I do agree that the issues that are dealt with are important issues. So is the fiscal stability of this Nation, I think. That's a very crucial and very important issue that is laid before us at this time. So is sending a message to our constituents and to the taxpayers of this Nation, that, yes, indeed we are

going to require the bureaucracy to tighten its belt.

One of the questions I am most often asked by my constituents is, in our homes, in our businesses, in our churches, we're all tightening the belt. Why is the bureaucracy not tightening its belt? Why does Washington seem to be recession-proof?

They want to see this bureaucracy engaged in this. They want to see the bureaucracy join us in the fight to put this Nation on a firm fiscal footing.

When it comes to our Nation's security, I would just remind my colleagues that on July 6, 2010, Admiral Mullen made the comment that the greatest threat to our national security is our Nation's debt.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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. \_\_\_\_ Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the time to speak on this and to bring this amendment forward.

Again, this is a cut amendment. Every year, I say let's look at 1 percent, 2 percent, 5 percent. Let's look at where to make these reductions. I do it because I know that we all realize and probably many of us in this Chamber agree with the sentiment that Ronald Reagan regularly expressed, and that is that the closest thing to eternal life on Earth is a Federal Government program. We are reminded of that fact today as we are here debating this funding bill.

This amendment calls for a clean 1 percent across-the-board reduction in each account of this act. One penny on a dollar. We are doing this, yes, for today; yes, to send a message to constituents that we are working to reduce the spending; yes, to send a message to those that are watching the

growing debt in this country; yes, a message that we are getting the fiscal house in order. We are also doing it for our children and our grandchildren, to make certain that they have an America that is strong, that is safe, that has its fiscal house in order.

We are in a time where every child that is born in this Nation is now seeing \$46,000 worth of debt heaped on their head, Federal debt, that is theirs. It is so important that we make this cut. It's an extra \$306 million that would come out of this budget.

As I said in my previous remarks, the appropriators have worked hard. They have worked diligently to make certain that they were reducing and coming in below last year's level, and they are to be commended for that. But these are extraordinary times and it requires that we put the focus on going a step further, that we engage those that are running the bureaucracies, and that we have them go save a penny out of a dollar and that they do it for future generations.

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

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. First of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee again for her steadfastness in trying to reduce spending.

Our committee had the lowest—our spending level went back to 2006. One of the benefits of serving on the committee and one of the reasons I traditionally oppose across-the-board cuts, 1 percent, 5 percent, 3 percent, is when you serve on the committee and you've already made substantial reductions, you do it in a careful and thoughtful manner. And when you're dealing with issues that relate to the nuclear stockpile, the reliability of that stockpile, the responsibility for taking care of nuclear waste and meeting consent decrees and court orders and you're dealing with lives and property that relate to issues of flooding and things that affect lives and property literally, billions of dollars of commerce that we heard about earlier this afternoon from those who represent Missouri and the Mississippi, really the bedrock of, I think, 44 percent of our Nation's economy, making these types of cuts, while it may feel good, without having the benefit of what we have the benefit of, which is debate and input from some of the Nation's greatest experts as well as obviously people from the administration, there is no way that I would support this reduction.

I would be pleased to yield to the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I think you have stated the case well and do want to join with you in my strong opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady.

I want to thank you for your amendment, because you bring forth such an incredible issue that we can't just stop with what was passed out of the Appropriations Committee. There are Members all across this body that had the opportunity to scour the legislation—and I'm on the committee—and to improve upon the legislation. That's exactly what she's doing here by offering additional cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring out the fact that in the House over the last five appropriations bills, there have been 250 amendments offered. Only 11 cutting amendments have been passed, and eight of these were by voice vote. So here on the floor of the House, and I guess I'm speaking to my colleagues in the Republican Party, we are not cutting any more than what comes out of the committee. So far, out of these five appropriations bills, there's been \$691 billion spent, and yet we've only cut \$304 million in addition to that.

Mr. Chairman, as I think about where we are, I brought the analogy and trying to put this in context of where we are as a Nation, that's 2 cents, just two pennies out of a gallon of gas. Just two pennies.

I leave you that—my 2 cents' worth on this appropriations bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise in support of this amendment. This is the last opportunity we have, really, to rein in spending that's literally bankrupting our country in this bill.

It's interesting. All the talk of the billions of dollars of subsidies that we continue to dole out to dubious enterprises are all unfulfilled promises of energy independence. You would think after 30 years those promises are starting to ring hollow. After 30 years of such promises, we're more dependent on foreign energy than when we began and even deeper in debt.

I rise also to draw to the attention of the House a provision of this measure relating to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

□ 1810

Under current law as that reserve is drawn down either for maintenance or for market manipulation, the proceeds from the oil must go back into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. That guarantees that it's maintained in a constant state of readiness to provide for our national security. Whenever a dollar comes out of that reserve, a dollar has to be put back into it—until

this bill. There is a half-billion dollars going out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, not to replenish the reserve, but to fund additional spending in this budget. That is a scandal.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would just remind my colleagues, all the issues we address are important issues, but as Admiral Mullen has said, "the greatest threat to our national security is our growing national debt."

We are calling for another \$306 million to be reduced from this bill. Ten conservative groups support this. Let's tighten our belts. Let's engage the bureaucracy. Let's put our country back on the path to fiscal health.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. 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:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund any portion of the International program activities at the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department of Energy with the exception of the activities authorized in section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief because this amendment follows up on an amendment that was adopted by a voice vote by the Committee of the Whole just 2 days ago.

This amendment is the second part of the amendment I offered on Monday of this week. That amendment reduced funding by \$6 million from the EERE, and that would be enough to cut the funding that this amendment limits that would reduce funding for the international programs of EERE. It was an amendment endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste.

The international programs are a subset of the EERE budget and do not have their own line item in an appropriations bill, so because of that, this limitation amendment would be required to properly implement the

spending reduction amendment, again, passed by the committee on Monday.

This amendment clearly states that no funds may be spent on the international program activities of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, with the exception of the activities authorized in section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. So we removed \$6 million in funding on Monday, \$8 million was recommended by the committee, therefore leaving \$2 million in the program. The United States Government has \$1.5 trillion in debt, borrowing 40 cents out of every dollar, and now is not the time to take our hard-borrowed dollars and spend them overseas.

This program literally—and I will read the programs funded under the international program—assists manufacturing facilities in China and India to reduce their energy use. Mr. Chairman, we should be keeping that money to help our factories reduce their energy use, not our international competitors. Improving energy efficiency in the Chinese building sector. Mr. Chairman, we should be improving our energy efficiency, not the Chinese building sector. Partnering with the Kazakhstan Government to provide training on industrial efficiency. Mr. Chairman, when we're borrowing this amount of money, we should be using it to promote our industrial efficiency, not the Kazakhstan Government.

Furthermore, it does things like help build windmills in Mexico. Now Mr. Chairman, we don't have the money to build windmills here, we have to borrow the money to do that. We shouldn't be borrowing money to build windmills in Mexico.

Again, this amendment implements the spending reduction already adopted on Monday.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The amendment eliminates, as we know, international cooperative programs at the Department of Energy that focus on developing innovative energy technologies.

I appreciate and share the gentleman's concerns that activities that simply fund energy projects—like installing windmills—in other nations are not an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. There is nothing in this program that funds windmills, with all due respect. This is especially true when we must rein in spending and eliminate waste all around. But this is a good example of when a scalpel is needed to save the worthwhile programs instead of a blunt instrument that eliminates the entire program.

The gentleman is correct that this program includes several small activities that the United States should not bankroll. However, many of the large

activities in this program not only engender good will in countries like China, India, and Brazil—and Kazakhstan, which has been a tremendous ally in the war on terror—but they also increase economic activities abroad.

The energy sectors in China and India are increasing by leaps and bounds. In just the last 10 years, China's energy consumption has more than doubled. China and India and other nations' energy sectors represent an enormous economic opportunity for whoever will develop and supply energy technologies used in these rapidly growing countries. Cooperative programs eliminated by this amendment help the U.S. industry and researchers gain access to these booming markets. These programs don't cost much, but they leverage much more in international contacts and economic opportunities. For this reason and many others, I oppose the amendment.

I yield to the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and would join him in his opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Again, I think the chairman has stated the proposition very well, but I would point out that the program's technical assistance activities really do help prime markets for clean technologies in major emerging economies to support and encourage U.S. exports.

So again, I am opposed to the amendment and appreciate the gentleman yielding.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, just so we dispel any misconceptions that the committee might hold about what these programs are, let me read from the EERE Web site, because we were saying these are developing countries. Well, China is not a developing country, Mr. Chairman. This is what it says: "The U.S. Department of Energy today announced \$1 million in available funding to train energy assessors who will assist manufacturing facilities in China and India to reduce their energy use." Mr. Chairman, those aren't my words; they're the words of the Department that is asking for funding, for us to borrow money from China so that we can go to China to "reduce their energy use."

It goes on to say, "The EERE engages in multiple technology and policy efforts to improve energy efficiency in the Chinese building sector." These aren't my words, Mr. Chairman; these are the words of the DOE that wants us to borrow money from China to spend money in China to improve energy efficiency in the Chinese building sector.

Let's go further on. It says, "EERE partnered with the Kazakh Govern-

ment to provide training on Save Energy Now industrial efficiency." In Kazakhstan. I would offer that if we want to do foreign aid, that we do it in the Department of State budget.

With regards to these cooperative programs, they're not zeroed out. The chairman should know that these programs are partially funded through the Department of State, and we don't affect the Department of State budget in this appropriation. What we do say is the Department has egregiously spent American taxpayer dollars. They are wasting taxpayer dollars. And with regards to wind power and windmills, I don't know what they're building in Mexico, but let me read from their Web site—not my words, their Web site: "EERE is involved in several projects currently underway, including wind energy in Mexico." Now Mr. Chairman, unless there is something else beside windmills that uses wind energy, the Department says they are involved in projects involving windmills in Mexico.

This country can't afford to make Chinese factories energy efficient and to build windmills in Mexico when we are borrowing 40 cents out of every dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. 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 Maryland will be postponed.

□ 1820

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

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

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

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the gentleman from New Jersey, the subcommittee chairman, to engage in a colloquy on the importance of solid oxide fuel cell technology and the need to maintain sufficient funding levels for research and development of this critical asset.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend you on the fine bill. This bill, which I know was full of difficult choices and competing priorities, comes in more than 16 percent less than the administration's request, marking a clear commitment to fiscal discipline and restraint. I understand that within the Fossil Energy Research and Development account the committee has appropriated \$25 million for the research, development, and demonstration of solid oxide fuel cells.

Is my understanding correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Ohio is correct. As the committee states in the report accompanying H.R. 2354, we believe solid oxide fuel cell systems have the potential to substantially increase the efficiency of clean coal power generation systems, to create new opportunities for the efficient use of natural gas, and to contribute significantly to the development of alternative fuel vehicles.

Mr. RENACCI. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate his kind words about this particular innovative technology.

I believe that properly funding solid oxide fuel cell systems is an important step towards an all-of-the-above energy policy. The technology will help increase American energy capacity, reduce emissions, reduce our dependence on imported oil, and encourage the sustainable use of domestic hydrocarbons, including coal, oil, and natural gas, particularly newly discovered shale gas in the Marcellus and Utica formations located within my home State of Ohio.

It is my understanding that the Department of Energy's Solid State Energy Conversion Alliance, or SECA, is a model example of a public-private partnership that creates jobs, promotes private investment, and enhances our energy security. It is also my understanding that preserving the current funding level is paramount in protecting over 700 existing SECA-related private sector jobs. Moreover, ensuring timely commercialization of this technology will provide the basis for broader domestic economic growth, potentially paving the way for creating thousands more high-tech, high-skilled American manufacturing jobs.

Does the chairman agree with this understanding?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I want to assure the gentleman from Ohio of my agreement with the economic, environmental, and energy security benefits of this technology and that I will work to maintain this already reduced funding level as the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill moves forward.

Mr. RENACCI. I appreciate the gentleman's commitment to this technology and to working to ensure that this funding level, approximately 50 percent less than in fiscal year 2011, is not needlessly reduced any further for the coming fiscal year.

I again thank the gentleman from New Jersey and the ranking member from Indiana for their hard work on this bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the study of the Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 111-8).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, the Missouri River basin is currently facing some of the worst flooding in its history. This devastation, combined with the ongoing economic crisis and our aging inland waterways infrastructure, means that now, more than ever, we must be focused and responsible with taxpayer-funded river projects.

My amendment would prohibit funding for the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, also known as MRAPS. This \$25 million earmarked study comes on the heels of a comprehensive \$35 million, 17-year study completed in 2004 that showed that the current authorized purposes are important and should be maintained.

For river communities, few issues are as important as flood control, water supply, power, and navigation. People in these communities rely on the river for their livelihoods and will do so today, tomorrow, and long after the floodwaters have receded.

This Congress and this administration need to focus on protecting human life and property and maintaining the safety and soundness of our levees. We also must support the important commercial advantages provided to us by our inland waterways system.

The Missouri River moves goods to market and is an important tool in both domestic and international trade. That's why the National Corn Growers Association, the American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, and the Missouri Farm Bureau support this amendment.

This study puts in jeopardy the lower Missouri and the Mississippi rivers, which could result in devastating consequences for navigation and transportation, resulting in barriers for waterways operators, agriculture, and every product that depends on the Missouri and Mississippi rivers to get to market.

The current authorized uses of the Missouri River provide necessary resources and translate to continued economic stability not only for Missourians but also for many Americans living throughout the Missouri and Lower Mississippi River basins.

We've said we want to focus on creating and maintaining jobs. This Congress is on the brink of passing three major trade agreements, and the ability of our inland waterways to transport manufactured and agricultural goods, goods purchased and grown by Americans, is as important as it ever has been.

This study is duplicative and wasteful of taxpayer dollars. On this exact issue we've already spent 17 years and \$35 million on hundreds of public meetings and extensive litigation. I offered identical language during our first debate on the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution. That amendment passed by a vote of 245-176. I appreciate my colleagues who offered their support and hope to have their support again.

While there is no funding in the underlying bill for MRAPS, I will remind my colleagues that in committee an amendment was adopted to allow the Corps of Engineers to use and receive non-Federal funds to continue and complete ongoing Federal studies. The need for my amendment is as urgent as ever.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 21, sponsored by my friend and colleague from Missouri.

This amendment is a commonsense idea to save tax dollars and ensure that the Missouri River focuses on protecting human life and property. It ensures \$25 million of taxpayer dollars won't be wasted on a second study of the purposes of the Missouri River. A 17-year, \$35 million study was just completed in 2004 to look at the purposes of this river. We don't need a second study, and we don't need to squander the taxpayers' money in this way.

Think about how much money is proposed for this study: \$25 million. That's a lot of money. As a commonsense person from Missouri, I have to ask: How does government spend that much money on a study? \$500,000 is a lot of money where I come from. How about \$1 million or \$2 million? Think of what the average family could do with \$1 million or \$2 million. But this study thinks that's not enough. It wants \$25 million to study a river that's already been studied.

Now is the time for common sense. Now is the time for fiscal sanity. Now is the time to stop spending money we don't have on things we don't need.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. The lady before me said it so eloquently and so simply: Why do we want to spend a whole lot of money? We're already in a crisis now. Huge debates about how are we going to control Federal spending. And here we find this proposal to drop another \$25 million to do a study that we have already done before.

First of all, we could save a lot of money in this, and that's a good idea. Of course, why is it that somebody would make the proposal after we've done a study that's supposed to work for 17 years and want to do it all over again? Well, it's because they didn't like the results of the first study, quite obviously.

What did the study prioritize? Well, it prioritized, first of all, protecting

human lives. That's not exactly a bad prioritization. And that's in the context of flood control. But it also talked about their livelihoods, not just their lives but their livelihoods. And that was the transportation part. That should also be a part of what the Missouri River is about. And of course the water supply and the safety. Now the proposal is to make the priorities on something else.

Look, the Missouri River is a great resource. We need to use it that way and prioritize our people, their property, and their prosperity.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Who seeks time in opposition?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. 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 continue the study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, in recent months the Midwestern United States has been pummeled by severe weather that has destroyed land, homes, and even lives, particularly along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Citizens living in communities along the Missouri River have endured what is beginning to be referred to as the worst flooding in history.

Just in this year alone, millions of taxpayer dollars have gone towards environmental restoration and recovery programs, while operations and maintenance of our infrastructure has been terribly neglected. Because of this neglect, this year's record rainfall, snowfall, and subsequent snowmelt have created extremely dangerous conditions that are growing more serious with each passing day.

President Obama in his fiscal year 2012 budget requested more than \$72 million for the Missouri River Recovery Program, which would primarily go towards the funding of environmental restoration studies and projects. This funding dwarfs the insufficient \$6.1 million that was requested for an entire operations and maintenance fund that supports the area covering the entire region from Sioux City to the mouth of

the Missouri in St. Louis. It is preposterous to think that environmental projects are more important than the protection of human life.

The Missouri River Ecosystem Restoration Plan, or MR-ERP, is slated to receive \$4 million of the more than \$72 million in Federal funding that will go towards the Missouri River Recovery Program. This program is only one of the many Missouri River ecosystem recovery programs funded by American taxpayers, and MR-ERP is one of no fewer than 70 environmental and ecological studies focused on the Missouri River. The people who have to foot the bill for these studies and projects, many of which take years to complete and are ultimately inconclusive, are the very people who are at risk of losing their farms, their businesses, their homes, and even their lives today.

I do not take for granted the importance of river ecosystems. I grew up near the Missouri River, as did many of the people I represent in Congress. But we have now reached a point in our Nation where we value the welfare of fish more than the welfare of human beings. Our priorities are backwards.

My amendment, supported by the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River and the Missouri Farm Bureau, proposes a prohibition of funding for the MR-ERP program. The end of the study will in no way jeopardize the Corps' ability to meet requirements under the Endangered Species Act. What this amendment will do is eliminate one of the many ecosystem studies along the river, a study that has become little more than a tool of the administration for the promotion of the return of the river to its most natural state, with little regard for navigation, trade, power generation, or the many people who depend on the Missouri River and adjacent lands for their livelihoods. This study has the potential to result in river management that is environmentally driven rather than focused on balancing the needs of the environment with those along the river and our wonderful communities.

We've seen this same scenario played out on a nationwide basis. The result is increased unemployment, reduced trade, economic depression, and sometimes questionable environmental results.

Mr. Chairman, should the funding for MR-ERP go forward, we must stop and think about what we are doing. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, to support our Nation's river communities.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Representative LUETKEMEYER.

I rise today in support of this amendment. Like he said, this amendment is about priorities. What is important? Or better yet, who is important? I would contend that people are important, people along the Missouri River, people who are seeing their homes flooded and their livelihoods destroyed due to

flooding. Crops, businesses, and homes are underwater as levees have been breached and overtopped in parts of Missouri.

Now is the time to refocus our attention on what matters as we manage the Missouri River. We need to protect people and property. The President's 2012 budget, as Representative LUETKEMEYER said, requested \$72 million to "recover" the river for two birds and one fish, but only \$6.1 million for operations and maintenance on the levees from Sioux City to St. Louis. Now, that's an example of wrong priorities.

This amendment ensures that the Corps of Engineers continues to focus on people and keep flood control and navigation as the focus. It's time to get our priorities back and to save tax dollars while we're doing it. That's a good combination.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. The WRDA 2007 Act, which was passed with such bipartisan support that it overcame a Presidential veto, authorized the Corps to undertake the Missouri River Ecosystem Restoration Plan and develop the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee to consult on the study. This authority provided a venue for collaboration between the 70-member stakeholder group of tribes, States, affected groups, and Federal agencies to develop a shared vision and comprehensive plan for the restoration of the Missouri River ecosystem.

By prohibiting the Corps from expending any fiscal year 2012 funding on the study, this amendment will result in a scheduled delay of the study, potentially additional start-up expenses and schedule impacts, and potential erosion of trust of the delicate partnership in this basin. There also could be legal implications associated with the National Environmental Policy Act if funding were prohibited for this study in the longer term. A 1-year prohibition would not allow work described above to be done and could push the entire schedule of the report out.

I also do believe that it places the Army Corps in jeopardy of not being in compliance with the act, which could also adversely affect their operation of the dams on the waterways. In the long term, the study represents the required programmatic NEPA coverage for the Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery Project; and 13 Federal agencies, eight States, and 15 tribes have formally agreed to cooperate with the agency under the act. The fact that this was authorized in 2007 in an overwhelming fashion, that you have had this collaboration, and there are risks

involved in adopting the gentleman's amendment, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, very quickly, I think I understood the gentleman to say that this would affect some of the Corps' operations. This will in no way affect the Corps' operations whatsoever. This is a study that does nothing more than dictate how some things should be done after the study is over with. And in Missouri, our experience with these kinds of studies is such that we always come out on the short end.

We have farmers, and businesses, and communities along the river right now who have been dramatically impacted by previous studies which have protected fish and birds over the welfare of our citizens, our communities, and our businesses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that my colleague's relief stands with the authorizing committees. We have a law in place since 2007. Perhaps he might want it amended through the authorization process. At this point in time, I think it is unwise policy to slow this study down and would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1840

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Earlier this week, 233 Members of this body, our colleagues, voted in repealing the 100-watt light bulb ban. This ban comes as a result of the 2007 energy legislation that in-

cluded a provision that regulates what type of light bulb the American people may buy and may use in their homes. The Federal Government has no right to tell me or any other citizen what type of light bulb to use at home. It is our right to choose.

Clearly a majority of this body, 233 Members, agree with the American people. Stay out of the decisionmaking and give the choice back to the consumer. Consumers want the 100-watt light bulb, and some consumers need the 100-watt light bulb.

Now after our debate earlier on the floor this week I got this message from a constituent named Dave. Dave wrote: I need my 100-watt light bulb to do the type of work that I do. It is very detailed work. I need to see my work with a 100-watt light bulb, and sometimes I use a 200-watt light bulb. It is necessary. I cannot do my work with less wattage because I have to strain my eyes to do my work and that causes me headaches, and then I am unable to work. Those types of light bulbs, 100-watt light bulbs, are like having sunshine at your home and at your work bench. LEDs do not suffice. Neons don't work, nor any other type of new-tech bulbs that are so-called energy savers, and I don't want to purchase those lights that have mercury in them. Nobody should have the right to dictate what types of lights we buy and use in our homes. I cannot read the very fine, small print of some of the product labels using those weak light bulbs. Stop that ban on those light bulbs that will serve us well with proper light for working on very detailed projects and reading product labels that have very small print.

That is what Dave said. Dave should have the right to choose what sort of light bulb he uses when doing his work at home.

Now, look, I work in a Federal building. I understand the Federal Government gets to tell me what type of light under which I must work in that Federal building. But when I go home at night to read my Denton Record Chronicle, I should be able to choose what type of light I use for that illumination.

In 2010, the last major GE factory that manufactured the incandescent light bulb closed its doors as a result of the reckless 2007 legislation, and as a direct result 200 people lost their jobs. This wasn't the only plant to close as a result of that 2007 legislation.

These policies kill jobs. It's the clearest example of how real consequences affect real people with this reckless legislation. These jobs are being sent overseas. General Electric has said that the new lights cost about 50 percent more to make in the U.S. than in China.

The overregulating government policies have to stop. It would not only be better for the environment and our pocketbooks, but it would bring those jobs back to America.

My amendment at the desk would give Dave his choice of light and would

allow every other American to choose, yes, choose what light bulb they want to use when they are in the comfort of their own home.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. I am pleased to do so.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. As the gentleman pointed out, we had this debate earlier this week on the House floor. I would point out that the performance standards for light bulbs were established in an act in 2007. It's the law of the land.

At that time the bill enjoyed strong bipartisan support, with 95 House Republicans voting for final passage and the bill being signed into law by President George Bush.

As far as I am aware, the issues that inspired this standard have not changed and, if anything, have gotten worse. Families continue to struggle every day to meet rising energy bills and there are real savings to be had by moving to more efficient illumination.

It is estimated that efficient lighting will save the average American family around \$100 every year. Further, while claiming that the incandescent bulb is dead makes for a good sound bite, it doesn't affect reality. As a result of the 2007 law, manufacturers are already making a variety right of new energy-saving bulbs for homes, including more efficient incandescent bulbs.

These bulbs look, light and turn on like those we have used for decades, but are 28 to 33 percent more efficient. What we are talking about here is a standard, not the definition of a discrete bulb.

This progress has been made because of the standard and goals that were set in that bill. I do not think it is time to turn the clock back. I do think we ought to enjoy these energy savings, and I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. The fact is, the United States Congress, the Federal Government, should not pick winners and losers. Yes, there is new technology. It didn't happen as fast as the proponents of this legislation articulated in December of 2007, and the technology that was promised for 5 years later, which is now, in fact, has been slow to develop, but it will develop and then let them meet in the marketplace.

Let the consumer decide. Let the consumer pick the winners and losers in this argument, not the United States Congress, not the Federal Government.

We had no business restricting the sale of the 100-watt light bulb. We had no business restricting what light people should use in their homes. This is

one time we should back off and let the American people make the choices that are right for them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say again we are talking about a standard that was adopted under law in 2007. We ought to try to achieve that standard to save energy in this country.

I remain opposed to the gentleman's amendment. I would ask my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

Mr. CRAVAACK. 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 to develop or submit a proposal to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund described in section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 9505(c)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, in March of this year, Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, testified before the House Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment that the administration is preparing to plan draft legislation to expand the scope of projects eligible to receive Harbor Trust Fund moneys.

In the hearing, Assistant Secretary Darcy alluded to the Administration's interest in using Harbor Trust Fund moneys for port security, among other things.

While I fully support funding port security through the general appropriations process, I oppose the efforts to divert Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund moneys until the Federal Government demonstrates it has fully used these trust funds to their intended purpose, and that is dredging.

As many of you know, the Harbor Maintenance Tax is an ad valorem tax assessed on the maritime shippers that use America's ports. By law, revenues of this user tax are to be dedicated to the United States Army Corps of Engineers' operations and maintenance budgets to ensure American navigation

channels remain dredged to their authorized depths and widths.

Despite the significant revenues and the roughly \$6 billion supposed balance in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, our Nation's maritime infrastructure has largely fallen into disrepair.

Only one-third of our Nation's navigation channels are at their authorized depths and widths. Portions of the important Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway have been closed to commercial navigation due to lack of maintenance dredging. Eight out of the ten of our Nation's largest harbors are not dredged at their authorized depths and widths.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake, this has a direct impact on American job creation and prosperity. When American ships have to "light load" to clear the shallowest channel, American economic productivity is lost.

For example, for each inch silted in, the American Laker fleet collectively, per voyage, leaves 8,000 tons of Minnesota ore on the docks in Duluth. That's enough to produce over 6,000 cars. I know I don't have to tell the ranking member and fellow Steel Caucus member what this means.

Moreover light loading causes increased transportation costs for our exports, decreases our national economic competitiveness. Every billion dollars in exports, Mr. Chairman, translates to 15,000 American jobs.

Given the economic straits we are in it is imperative we don't hold back American business with increased transportation costs caused by unmaintained channels.

□ 1850

We must, Mr. Chairman, ensure that the moneys intended for dredging are not siphoned off for other programs. My amendment will prohibit moneys from being used by the administration to develop a plan or draft legislation to expand the scope of the projects eligible to receive Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund moneys.

American shippers are taxed specifically to maintain the channels they, and our Nation, depend on. It is imperative that we ensure that harbor trust fund moneys be spent as they are intended, thereby ensuring American competitiveness and the proliferation of American jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me thank the gentleman for his amendment and tell him that I'm pleased to accept it. I know that you included the fact that you wouldn't have to tell the ranking of the important purpose of your amendment. I also share those same sentiments. We don't want to downgrade the purposes for the harbor maintenance fund from the express purposes now. There are too many pri-

orities that are out there. We don't need to expand them.

I'm very pleased to lend my support.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I associate myself with your support of the amendment.

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank the gentleman for their kind comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. Of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16513), the amount of funds made available by the Secretary to carry out projects described in subsection (b)(5) of that section shall not exceed the amount of funds made available by the Secretary to carry out projects described in subsection (b)(4) that use coolants different from those commercial technologies that are in service at the time the guarantee is issued.

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

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment which would require that the amount provided for in title 17 of the Energy and Water development appropriations bill for loan guarantees for advanced nuclear energy facilities be equal to or exceed that for loan guarantees targeted for carbon capture and sequestration projects.

In laymen's terms, my amendment would specify that we cannot use more funds in this act for loan guarantees for carbon capture and sequestration projects than we make available for projects using nuclear technologies such as small modular gas-cooled reactors.

The purpose for this is simple. These new technologies hold significant promise of meeting our ever-increasing energy needs with safe, clean, reliable, cost-effective, proliferation-resistant noncarbon-producing American-built nuclear reactors.

As a member of the Science Committee, I, along with my colleagues, have studied this technology over the past 7 years. And let me note, the bureaucracy has studied this technology almost to death. Well, the time has

come for that study to be left behind. It's time for the study to be over, and it's time for us to act. There are commercial companies out there right now trying to bring these technologies to market, and this amendment will help make this a reality.

I would like to also note that the GAO and the committee have stated that there is a lack of transparency in this loan guarantee program. We cannot expect to perform proper oversight without knowing where and how these funds are being used, and it is critical that we become more specific in stating how we intend the funds to be used. And that's what this amendment would do.

It would also be important that we require the administration to report back to Congress with a full explanation of how these funds are being used. Thus I ask for support for this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from New Jersey continue to insist on his point of order?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman reserves his point of order.

Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. But may I say I have always found him to be very thoughtful and considerate, and I know that he is extremely knowledgeable about this and is committed to the whole issue of taking a look at these types of loan guarantees.

When we put together our bill, we had several guiding principles, and chief among them was to get the Federal Government out of the private sector's way. You should understand that.

The loan guarantee program is at the heart of that debate, and our bill begins to ramp down this temporary program while including funding to help new technologies so that the private sector could take them over. The gentleman's amendment, however, appears to dictate which technology should receive funding through this program and which should not.

Mr. Chairman, responsible private sector entities have sunk literally hundreds of millions of dollars into their applications; and this amendment would, I think, potentially cut off those applicants, despite their investments in good faith efforts. And even more importantly, however, the amendment would determine which technologies win and which would lose. I don't think in our committee or in this Congress we should be determining the winners and losers. We should let the market decide.

So I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will kindly state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I believe that it is Congress' job to make decisions. We are the ones who should be actually designating exactly where money is going. I'm a senior member of the Science and Technology Committee. We have studied this issue directly, and this is my recommendation. And I think that what we're supposed to do here is make sure that rather than having money, saying we can just spend all we want in sequestration and accepting that alternative, that we must designate what we think is the best use and most efficient use of the taxpayer money. That sounds within the rules to me.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination of whether a certain type of coolant is used on a project. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I have another amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out projects described in section 1703(b)(5) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16513(b)(5)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I rise in support of my amendment which would require that none of the funds provided for in title 17 of the Energy and Water development appropriations bill be used for the purposes of providing loan guarantees for "carbon capture and sequestration projects." If you think that carbon capture and sequestration is an important goal—and I'm sure there are some people who believe it is.

Let me just note that I do not believe that, and I think that having heard the debates that have been going on about this particular issue over the years, that there are large numbers of my colleagues who do not believe that as well.

Well, if you do not believe in carbon sequestration and capture as an important goal, then I would suggest that the best sequestration—if you really believe that we must sequester carbon and that that is an important goal, then let me suggest this, and that's what my amendment is all about: it's better to leave the oil and coal in the ground if that's what you really want to do is capture this carbon and sequester the carbon and capture it.

□ 1900

And I would suggest that the best way to do that is by promoting new nuclear technologies such as the new, inherently safe, small, modular nuclear reactors, especially those that do not use water as a coolant. We can provide all the clean, safe electricity that we need. And I would hope that any funds that the Secretary might have, in terms of his opinion, determined to use in carbon capture and sequestration, instead that the Secretary will use that limited amount of money that he has available to him on a positive program that will permit us an alternative to oil and gas. I personally, however, do not believe that oil and gas necessarily and the capture of carbon sequestration is an important goal; but if you do, you should be supporting—instead of basically using that as an expensive tool that will hurt the economy, we should be using the funds that are available instead to promote this positive alternative of nuclear energy, especially the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I said earlier, respectfully, I still think this amendment, as with the previous one, is an issue where we are determining winners and losers, and I believe the market should decide.

Let me say, the committee is strongly supportive of the whole issue of development of small, modular nuclear reactors, and it is amazing how much interest there is out there. There is incredible ingenuity that is going into it.

We do have support for nuclear loan guarantees. I think there is \$11 billion in unused funds and \$6 billion for fossil fuels. We have money available for the development of these types of technologies which hopefully you will find to be reassuring.

But for reasons I said earlier, without repeating myself again, I oppose your amendment at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, let me just suggest that, again, we should be taking responsibility, especially when we see something as important to the American people as the issue of energy, especially clean energy, and how we are going to make sure that it is supplied to the people of the United States.

Specifically designating that these funds won't be used for sequestration and carbon capture, I mean, that seems to me that is what we should do. We should determine whether or not we believe this is an appropriate use of government funds. I suggest that it is not, especially when we have alternatives that are available to us, like these new technologies in the nuclear field, that can give us what we need in terms of not producing carbon and making sure that you don't even need sequestration then. If you have those alternatives, then we shouldn't be spending the money on this other approach, on the carbon capture and sequestration approach. That makes sense to me.

We need, as Members of Congress, to set these type of parameters on the spending of our limited dollars in a way that will have the most positive impact, and the carbon capture and sequestration concept is not the best way to spend our money when we have these other alternatives.

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

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. 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 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following:  
SEC. 609. Not less than 10 percent of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16513) shall be available for carrying out projects described in subsection (b)(4) of such section that use coolants different from those commercial technologies that are in service at the time the guarantee is issued.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which would support advanced nuclear reactors, particularly those reactors that do not use a light water coolant, which happens to be technology used for decades and seems to be what certain members of the business world are trying to foist off on the American people. No, it is time to upgrade, to update, and innovate.

Since I understand that a point of order has been raised against this amendment, I intend to withdraw it. But before I do so, I would like to make some remarks as to why it is important for these new reactors to come forward.

As I stated earlier, these new technologies, such as the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactors hold significant promise of meeting our ever-increasing energy needs with safe, clean, reliable, cost-effective, noncarbon-producing, proliferation-resistant, American-built nuclear power plants. A number of our commercial companies out there right now are ready to bring forth this cutting-edge nuclear technology and put it on the market and create new, high-tech private sector jobs for the American people. Their success should be our goal.

There is some mention of these technologies in the committee report. I am very grateful for that, but I would like to draw attention to why these are so vitally important for our country.

First of all, the small modular nuclear reactors, especially those that do not rely on decades-old light water coolant systems, exemplify the next wave of nuclear power, and we should pursue it far more aggressively than we are today. Specifically, we should be more aggressively pursuing the next generation nuclear plant and make the best use of the technologies that have been developed which include inherently safe reactors that don't require extraneous engineered safety devices to protect the public. We have a new level of safety that is almost unimaginable in these new reactors. We should understand that we need the high fuel burn-up rates that will greatly reduce the proliferation concerns. So we have reactors now that will be available that will not leave the residue and the leftover material that can be turned into nuclear weapons.

We also have reactors that are modular, scalable, and can be delivered on the back of a truck. This would make them far more economical and far more feasible for various communities throughout the world. Read that, we can manufacture these somewhere in America and transport them around the country or around the planet.

The Department of Energy should encourage and partner with industry to build working reactor prototypes using these technologies to provide the data required for commercial licensing.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should encourage applications from private companies for the purpose of

building working commercial reactors incorporating these new technologies. The NRC should also consider these applications immediately upon receiving them and expedite the processing.

□ 1910

Ideally, the NRC should be able to complete the process within 2 years of the receipt of the initial application. That should be more than a goal. That should be a commitment.

I hope I've made it clear how vital these technologies are to our energy future. We are either going to lead the world in the nuclear arena or we are going to be left behind as a country.

Now, I understand that there is a technical problem with this amendment, but I would like to make sure that my colleagues understand the significance of this new technology.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ADAMS

Mrs. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, after line 2, insert the following:  
SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy for maintaining, developing, or creating any Web site which disseminates information regarding energy efficiency and educational programs on energy efficiency specifically to children under 18 years of age, including the current Web site operated by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy titled Kids Saving Energy and the current Web site operated by the Energy Information Administration titled Energy Kids.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. ADAMS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mrs. ADAMS. I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2354, which would eliminate wasteful spending at the Department of Energy.

Why did the foolish gardener plant a light bulb? He wanted to grow a power plant.

How did Benjamin Franklin feel when he discovered electricity? He was shocked.

Mr. Chairman, what's shocking about this is how our hard-earned taxpayer dollars are being used. While some may find these jokes humorous, there are those of us who don't believe it's funny. There is nothing funny about the source of wasteful funding for these jokes. These riddles, along with numerous others just like it, are displayed on the U.S. Energy Information Administration's "Energy Kids" Web site, as seen here. This Web page also has Sudoku and crossword puzzles about greenhouse gases and coal power. These riddles and games are being paid for by

you, the taxpayer, at a time when our country is facing enormous debt.

In November, the American people sent a resounding message to Congress, calling on them to stop wasteful spending and to prioritize Federal dollars towards job creation. With our Nation facing a \$14.3 trillion debt, this is the kind of wasteful spending we must stop. Rather than using taxpayer dollars to reduce energy prices for all Americans, the Department of Energy has instead decided to spend your hard-earned taxpayer dollars towards creating and maintaining this Web site.

This Web site is not the only Web site of its kind. There are others just like it. The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy maintains a "Kids Saving Energy" Web site. This Web site has videos with Tinker Bell telling children to use energy-saving light bulbs and quizzes asking children how many kilowatt hours an average U.S. home uses each month. While I have no problem with Tinker Bell—I am a huge supporter of Disney World, which is just outside my district—I do have a problem with wasteful government spending, and that's where the problem lies.

In this tight economy, Congress must prioritize funding, and these Web sites are a blatant misuse of taxpayer money. Now, Mr. Chairman, I recently asked Secretary Chu how much money the Department of Energy spends to maintain and operate these Web sites, but the Secretary refused to provide the amount. In today's economy, Congress and the Department of Energy should be squarely focused on reducing our national deficit, encouraging job creation in the private sector and making energy more affordable for American families.

My amendment would ensure that no Federal funds in the underlying legislation may be used to maintain, develop or create these and other similar Web sites, and I would encourage you to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, there is a Web page that has been described by the proponent of the amendment at the Energy Information Agency. Over the past 12 months, the Web site has had over 26 million visitors. There are 224 million pages of information. It is not an underutilized site. The fact is that young people access the kids' page more than any other one on this Web site, visiting 16 million pages. "Energy Kids" gets nearly 10 times as many hits, if you will, as the adult version.

The gentlelady talks about puzzles and other very elementary approaches as far as education. I think education, not being an educator myself, ought to be age appropriate. I would also point out that there have not been signifi-

cant changes as far as the update for this site in that they're trying to hold down the cost. To the extent that work has taken place, \$10,000 has been spent in fiscal year 2011, not necessarily in the coming year. There is no anticipated incremental cost for the "Energy Kids" Web site in the fiscal year 2012 President's budget.

But the reason I really rise in opposition is not necessarily over the details but with respect to the idea that we should not look for ways to educate young people in this country. We are having a tax on science; we are having a tax on scientific knowledge; we are having a tax on education. What is wrong at this late date with educating young people and having the Federal Government reach out and provide information on conserving energy, on using it wisely, recycling, so that we can reduce our dependency on energy?

We have programs—and have had them for years—on drugs. Maybe for those under 18 we shouldn't have any Federal expenditures to educate young people about drugs because, well, we've got to save money. We're at a spot where we just can't spend any more Federal funds on education. We have an obesity problem in this country. Youth obesity is at a crisis level, but maybe what we should do is say, If you're under 18, we don't want to spend any money educating you because we can talk to you when you're 19. We have a problem as far as people not getting enough exercise. Too many people use elevators. They park their cars close to the door. So maybe we shouldn't spend any Federal resources educating young people about, you know, you should walk once in a while. You shouldn't sit on that couch all day. You shouldn't watch that TV all day.

So let's stop educating. Let's stop using any Federal money because we've got a debt crisis here—and I acknowledge that. So let's just stop educating young people. Let's just stop, and we'll wait until they're all 18 and they have type 2 diabetes. Then we'll stop because they've got a drug problem, and maybe we can convince them to get off of drugs when they're 18. Maybe we'll convince them they ought to get on a treadmill when they're 18. In this case, when are we going to start?

As a parent myself and not an educator, my sense is the damage is done for young people. That's why we have a Head Start program by the time they start school. Children have that impression. They gain that knowledge. They have values that are transferred to them by their parents. I certainly think there is an absolute role by the Federal Government to help young people know what are the values and what are things to do that will improve our society for them and their generation. So I am strongly opposed to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ADAMS. I appreciate that. I too want to encourage our young people to get outside and exercise instead of

staying on their computers and playing Sudoku games and other games through this Web site.

We need to look at the funding that's being spent. While you've quoted numbers, the Secretary couldn't give me any numbers in committee. We've asked for those numbers, and he still has yet to provide them.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The gentlewoman talked about getting people away from their computers, and I would agree that we need a balance in life. That's why we should educate people—children—that there is a value of sitting in front of that computer, in gaining knowledge through that computer and in using it for their homework—but then getting out and exercising, making sure they know they shouldn't do drugs, making sure they should eat appropriately.

Not being a terribly compliant person as far as technology, I understand that you could take a walk and still access that site. So why don't we do both. I would ask the gentlewoman to consider withdrawing her amendment, but I will state my opposition to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1920

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. ADAMS).

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

Mrs. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New Jersey.

Throughout this debate on the Energy and Water appropriations bill, we have discussed the importance of research and development of new energy technologies. However, I would like to highlight the importance of demonstration projects that are carried out within the Department of Energy's Building Technologies Program.

The Department of Energy spends millions of dollars each year on research and development for new technologies. However, that R&D often reaches a point known as the Valley of Death. The Valley of Death is where promising new technologies fade into obscurity because they can't attract the capital investments to move from concept to commercialization.

In essence, on one side of the Valley of Death is research and development;

good ideas. On the other side is the actual deployment and commercialization. A demonstration project takes the research and development just a little bit further and bridges this divide so that private entities will be interested in deployment, private entities will be interested in commercialization.

This good use of federally funded demonstration projects is critical to reducing the risk to private sector investors and allows technologies to cross the Valley of Death and establish commercial viability for investors and, indeed, attract their interest.

I strongly believe that in the course of our discussion about funding for the coming fiscal year, it is important to highlight the importance of the Building Technologies Program's demonstration projects. I very much appreciate our previous discussions that I have shared with the chairman and ranking member, and I would be interested in the chairman's insight into this matter.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree with the gentleman about the importance of projects that develop new, extraordinarily beneficial technologies that would never be developed without Federal investment. It is critical that we maintain a national investment in activities at the Department of Energy that protect our country's security and competitiveness.

The Building Technologies Program at the Department of Energy has played a significant role in developing technologies that are too risky for the private sector to invest in alone and that will substantially reduce energy costs for American homes and businesses. The government's role in energy should not extend to commercializing new technologies. It is the role of the private sector to deploy them.

However, without many of the projects that develop these new technologies, it would be too risky for private companies to invest. I want to thank the gentleman for his deep commitment to advancing American technology and innovation, and I look forward to continuing to work with him on this important issue.

Mr. WU. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their engagement in this issue, and I look forward to working with them.

The chairman knows that fully 40 percent of total energy use in America is in buildings and fully 70 percent of electricity use is in buildings. So when we make buildings more efficient, this is indeed the low-hanging fruit toward future energy efficiency, and in fact the ability to bring new, innovative American-made technologies to market is key to rejuvenating our economy. Successful projects in the Building Technologies Program will result in the manufacture and sale of new products here in the United States and result in rejuvenating our economy and building good American jobs here.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the ranking member.

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

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. BASS of New Hampshire) having assumed the chair, Mr. REED, 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. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HR

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

#### HR

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to have an important discussion that we should focus on, I believe, here in the House, in the Senate, and in the White House. That is a discussion focusing on jobs. We need to get America back to work. We have been focusing now on this side of the aisle, in our committee work, day after day after day to present proposals. We've moved them. We've adopted them here in the House. The focus is on policies that are going to promote the private sector, that are going to promote the development of an environment where people will take the risk and become job creators and put people back to work here in America.

I talk often in my office back in the district, as I go out to town hall meetings and have conversations with people as I go down the street to our local supermarket and to our local stores. I focus on four areas that we need to adopt legislation on here in Washington, D.C., or repeal legislation on in Washington, D.C., that will create an environment where jobs will be created for generations to come.

The first and probably the most appropriate and important focus that we should be spending time on today is the question of getting our fiscal house in order. We have had a lot of debate over the last few months, weeks, about this debt ceiling that's coming to roost and the vote that we're going to have to take here in the House, I would imag-

ine. One of the reasons why that issue is so critical to us at this point in time is we need to demonstrate to the world that America is going to get its fiscal house in order once and for all so that our markets recognize that we are serious about this issue, that we recognize that \$14 trillion of national debt is just not sustainable and that it really will destroy America as we know it, and, more importantly, what it will do when we send a message. If we can adopt a policy here out of Washington, D.C., that deals with the debt ceiling but fundamentally deals with the underlying debt, it will send a message that the American market is something that you can invest in again, around the world, that foreign investors, domestic investors, will have the confidence and the certainty that America is a place to invest your dollars, your foreign currency, to create the new environment, the new marketplaces, the new facilities, the new manufacturers, the new industrial base to put people back to work again.

□ 1930

I am extremely confident that we here in the House of Representatives, and particularly on our side of the aisle, can come to a reasonable solution to this debt ceiling issue and do it in such a way that takes care of the debt ceiling crisis but that also takes care of the underlying debt crisis that put us into this situation and will continue to put us in this situation unless we get serious and deal with it now. This is the time. This is the moment. And that will send that indication to the world that America is strong, and we can invest here and put people back to work.

The second thing that I tell people as I go around and I talk to them in my district and I talk to people on the street and see them as we go down the road is that what we need to do in Washington, D.C., is to set the agenda out of the House that will create an environment where regulations out of Washington, D.C., are cut, are repealed, are streamlined, so the bureaucratic red tape that our job creators, that the private sector in America faces day in and day out—as a private business owner myself before I came to this Chamber, starting and opening four businesses, I can tell you, as I went through employing people and taking the responsibility and taking the risk of putting my capital on the line, putting my family on the line for all the time and the resources that we committed into it, the bureaucracy that I dealt with in creating those businesses and putting those people back to work was mind-boggling.

I talk to business owners all across America and people that want to go out and start their own businesses, and what they tell me is all I want to do is manufacture my widget, all I want to do is go out and provide the service that I enjoy doing, that I have made my career or my passion in life. But

yet what I find myself doing when I go down this path is complying with paperwork, complying with regulations, spending hours upon hours—not innovating, not creating new technology, not figuring out a better way to deliver services at a better price and in a better fashion or creating a new widget or creating a new product in a more efficient manner. I spend hours filling out paperwork to comply with regulations coming out of Washington, D.C., and out of my State capitol.

And I will tell you, that resonates with me. That's why we need a policy here in Washington, D.C., that calls upon every regulatory body in Washington to look at the impacts of their regulations from an economic point of view, how it's going to impact that creation, that innovation of the private sector in a negative way, and balance that in relationship to what the goal of the regulation is.

And sometimes those goals are very good. A lot of our environmental laws are reasonable and regulations are reasonable, but they take a balanced approach to accomplishing what we all want—clean air, clean water, a clean environment to pass on to our kids and to the next generation.

But at the same time, we can't do it without recognizing that if we kill the American way of life, that there will be no America for our children to enjoy. So we have to have a commonsense, balanced, reasonable approach to this government and this regulatory expansion that's coming out of Washington that needs to be crippled and needs to be cut and needs to be repealed.

So I have focused a lot of my effort—and a lot of my colleagues have spent a lot of time—talking about and implementing legislation that will cut the agency's ability to promulgate those regulations that will destroy America unless they're reined in. So we need to focus on that second point.

The third point, I have talked to so many folks about our Tax Code until I'm blue in the face. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I can tell you that going through the 70,000 pages plus of the Tax Code and the tax regulations is mind-numbing. And the problem is that we're forcing all Americans to try to comply with that Code. We have talked about this.

Since we took the majority, since I came here in November as an elected new Member of Congress, I have spent a tremendous amount of time trying to advocate for comprehensive tax reform that will streamline the Code, make it much more competitive, bring down the corporate rates and the individual rates to a point, with the pass-through entities that have to be taken care of, so that we are competitive on the world stage in dealing with our Tax Code.

I was glad to see the President the other day talking about, in this debt ceiling debate, how he was targeting some loopholes and exemptions and the corporate jets. Like we're here on the

Republican side, we came to Congress, we left our families, we left our businesses because we want to protect corporate jets. Come on. That's not being honest with the American people. We have been talking about comprehensive tax reform from day one. We're ready to go. I'm glad the President now has conceded that that's where we have to go and that's part of the debt ceiling conversation, and it needs to be.

So the bottom line is we make that Tax Code more competitive. We streamline it so honest, hardworking Americans can comply with it, and we revamp the Code, reform the Code in such a way that it's a competitive Tax Code that doesn't excessively burden those in the private sector and all taxpayers across America with that tax burden that's just going to kill America if we don't get this spending under control, which those revenues from the Tax Code go to take care of.

The fourth point that I stress to people as I go around and I talk to them is that we need a domestic-orientated energy policy that taps into our energy in such a way that it's comprehensive, it is an all-of-the-above approach. And what I mean by that is, when I was the Mayor of the City of Corning and we would have people coming in and talking to us about siting a new facility or a new manufacturing base or a new operation, there was always the part of the conversation that we got to that was, Okay, why should I invest in the City of Corning in the State of New York? What are your tax rates? What is the tax burden I'm looking at? What are the insurance costs that I'm going to have to pick up by coming to the State of New York, the City of Corning?

The other issue that was repeatedly discussed in the top three of those conversations was, what are your utility costs? What is the cost to me, for producing this new product or this new technology going to run me? And that's where, if we have a comprehensive energy policy focused on domestic supplies of energy, not only will we be taking care of a national security issue with having these supplies of energy being produced from domestic sources of things such as natural gas from the Marcellus shale, or Utica shale in my part of the State, or shell formations and tight sand formations all across America, but we have oil supplies that have been identified and are available to us. If we just unleash those resources, we have to say we go after these energy sources in a clean, responsible manner, environmentally safe.

And everybody I talk to supports that on our side of the aisle. No one here is going to destroy the environment for the sake of getting energy out of the ground, for the sake of hurting our children or our grandchildren. That's not what we stand for. But we stand for focusing on those energy supplies that are here and promote those energy supplies so that we have a source of energy that's dependable,

that will provide us with long-term, low-cost sources of energy supplies to our manufacturing and industrial bases and reignite America again so that we become a powerhouse in the area of employment and put our people back to work.

So those are four key principles that we bring to the table. And one additional piece that I'd like to talk about tonight that is ripe and ready for us to take is the expansion of opportunities of our exports.

We have three free trade agreements that are ready to go. We have South Korea; we have Colombia; we have Panama. They have been negotiated. There has been a long history, many years of going back and forth with these countries and asking these countries to engage in honest negotiations that deal with all the issues that you deal with when you enter into a free trade agreement. And both parties—we as the United States of America, the Governments of South Korea, Colombia, and Panama—have come to the table in good faith, and we have finally gotten to the point where we are ready to move on these agreements. All the issues have been negotiated. All the issues of the free trade agreements have been taken care of. Now, I know there is an issue in Washington, D.C., that we're still dealing with when it comes to trade adjustment assistance, but, fundamentally, the free trade agreements have been negotiated and worked out with these countries, and we're ready to go.

But what are we doing? We're waiting on the White House to send them up here. We're waiting on the President, who set, in his State of the Union message, a goal of doubling our exports. A great goal. I applaud the goal. But in order to double our exports out of America, we've got to create an environment in which the private sector flourishes, such as those four points, and focus on those four points that I just talked about. But we also have to expand the markets upon which those new products and our existing products can be sold to so that we can increase and meet that export goal. That's why I supported the free trade agreements when I came to Congress and as I went out on the campaign trail.

□ 1940

We have three great agreements that are ready to move, be moved, and ready to be voted on, and I think have strong support on both sides of the aisle. Under the President's own numbers, these three agreements are looking to create at least 250,000 jobs. This is coming out of his administration. The agencies under his control are projecting that these agreements will provide opportunities for at least 250,000 new jobs. To me, this is a no-brainer. We shouldn't be haggling back and forth and trying to figure out what's holding these agreements up, ready for a vote. These countries have negotiated with us in good faith. We've had

those hard negotiations, and now we're ready to go. The President even mentioned the other day on TV when I was watching some news reports that he wants to move forward on these agreements, but yet he hasn't sent them up to the Congress, as he's required to do by our laws, in order to get them implemented.

I think it's troublesome when you hear the President talk about setting a goal of increasing exports by 50 percent and say to the public that he is committed to these free trade agreements and that all Congress has to do is pass them, but yet when you look at the details, all he has to do is send it up to Congress, and we'll take care of it. But he hasn't taken the step necessary to do that, and that is solely under his control to do.

So I call upon the President: Send these free trade agreements up. We're ready to go. We have support. Let's open up the South Korean markets. Let's open up the Colombian market. Let's open up the Panama markets. Let's give our people in America the benefits of these new export opportunities that each of these countries represents.

I come from a part of the State of New York where we have a lot of wine, grape growers, wine producers, apple growers. And I will tell you, in the agricultural area, this is going to be a great asset in particular. These markets will represent new sources of opportunity to farmers who have been plowing and working this land for generations. Yet we here in Washington, D.C., just cannot figure out how to get this done because the President won't send it up for us to get the process taken care of. So I call upon the President to move on these free trade agreements as soon as possible. He's indicated to the American public his support for them. He indicates that he's ready to pass them and sign them. And I'll just tell you, I'm here to call him out on it and say, We need to do it. Let's do it.

One other thing I wanted to talk about tonight is kind of my concern about the whole issue of this debt ceiling debate and where we're going with it. And I'll tell you, I am greatly concerned about the political rhetoric that we seem now to be committed to. I see us in Washington, D.C., going down a path where we're talking about situations where we're going to hold back Social Security checks, we're going to hold back payments for funding our troops, and I just don't see how that's productive.

What we have is a debt problem. We have clearly articulated a plan on this side of the aisle. We have come up with budgets that we've passed out of this House. We have put down on paper proposals of where cuts could be made. We went through the whole process of H.R. 1 back and forth for 7 days, with an open debate on the floor of the House in front of the American people, identifying areas that could be cut and that

could be streamlined, and we laid out our plan. It's in black and white. But today, I still don't know where the President of the United States is.

I hear a lot of news reports about some type of position that the President has taken on \$4 trillion, and it supposedly has \$3 trillion worth of cuts and \$1 trillion worth of tax increases. I've never seen that. Actually, I've heard discussions that have cited sources in the White House or sources off the Hill that show the package having \$3 trillion of tax increases with only \$1 trillion worth of cuts. Now, I don't know if that's the case, because I don't know what the President's really standing for because I have never seen it in black and white. But what I would ask is that the President put it on a piece of paper, because if he's asking me as a Member of Congress to support debt ceiling relief in exchange for \$3 trillion worth of new taxes, I'm not going to do that because that taxes everybody in America, every man and woman and business in America. It violates a campaign pledge made by the President in his campaign where he would not raise taxes on the middle class. So I want to see what he's proposing.

I am greatly concerned that we're also at the point where we need to have this conversation in front of the American people. We need to have the American people weigh in on what the detailed proposal is. You know, we've been very transparent; we've been very open—we here in the House, especially on this side of the aisle. The House Republicans have put the budget out, have gone through H.R. 1, have put documents out that have been scored by the CBO as to what impact they'll have financially. But we haven't seen anything from the President. And the American people deserve the opportunity to know where the President is at in these discussions.

What we cannot do, we cannot get to the 11th hour and say, Here it is, America. Take it or leave it. That's just not right. That's just not responsible governing. What we need to do is have a thoughtful, honest debate back and forth with our positions.

Mr. President, you said the other day, Don't call my bluff. I'm going to go to the American people.

I tell you, Go to the American people.

I want to go to the American people. I came to Congress to have this discussion in the open, in front of the world, because it's time. We need to. And until we see a plan, we can't have that honest debate that our forefathers, our Founding Fathers, and so many have sacrificed to give us, the transparency of democracy, the transparency to come to this Chamber that is filled with so much history and have the debate.

Go to the Senate floor and go into the living rooms of the American public and say, This is what we're talking about. This is what we're fighting about.

Now I am ready to have that debate. I'm ready to have that conversation, and I know at the end of the day where I will come out. I will stand for a product that gets this Nation taken care of for generations because its fiscal house is, once and for all, taken care of. If that means we have to compromise, we'll compromise, but let's have it. We can only compromise upon which we know. That is why it is so important that the President come forth in written fashion with his proposal.

I sent a letter to the White House today with many of my colleagues in the freshman class, of which I am a proud member, calling upon him to do that, and hopefully he will do that. My intent is to go down there physically next week with, hopefully, numerous other members of the freshman class and stand in front of the White House and say, Hey, we're new Members of Congress. We're here to have the conversation. We're ready to act. Give us what you stand for. Put in black and white what you stand for and what your position is, and let's debate. We're ready to go.

So the bottom line is that as we go down this path through this debt ceiling crisis—and we do have two crises. We have the debt ceiling crisis that everyone knows about, August 2, but we have the underlying debt crisis that causes us to have this debt ceiling problem that we now face. We have to take care of both because—make no mistake about it—if we just do a simple raise the debt ceiling or something gimmicky that gets us through that August 2 or whatever the final date shall be and if we do it in such a way that there's really no meat on the bone and there is no substance to the proposal—make no mistake about it—the world markets are going to look right through that and see right through it, and they're going to say, You guys are not serious about this \$14 trillion worth of debt. You guys in America are not serious about getting \$1.6 trillion of annual budget deficits under control.

□ 1950

Do you know what? We have an obligation now to advise all of those members of the world who are going to invest in America that this is not that AAA rating that we have all enjoyed since 1917, I believe. That America will be downgraded on its debt regardless if we default or not because we have not taken the moment; we have not seized the moment to be honest with the American people and with the world and said we're going to get it taken care of.

That's where I am at. I am ready to get it taken care of. That's what I came to Washington, D.C., to do. That's what I know many of my fellow colleagues in the freshman class came to Washington, D.C., to do. We don't care about reelection. We don't care about politics. We're talking about the substance that will make sure that America is here for generations to come.

A few of my other colleagues had intended to join us this evening, but I know we have a tradition here in the House that I am becoming aware of with the baseball game that's going on between the Democrats and the Republicans. And I think as they attend to that—and that's a great tradition, and I applaud my colleagues for taking the time to continue on in that tradition—I know I have got another Member potentially coming down here, I have been given word.

I don't stand on these issues alone. I don't stand with these comments in a vacuum. I don't stand here today as one man in 435 Members of Congress who believes in what I am articulating. There is an army of people in Washington who are standing with me and with whom I am standing who believe the same way: that it is time to get our fiscal house in order, that it is time to advance an agenda out of Washington, D.C., that once and for all shows a firm commitment to the private sector and reins in government so that government does not kill the private sector and the dreams of all the Americans that are yet to come.

So I am looking forward to continuing this debate and moving forward on the issues that we have talked about. And as we deal with these issues, I do it mindful of the situation that we face on a day-to-day basis of the politics of Washington, D.C. But I will tell you, even though I am aware of those politics, the issues that we are talking about today—the issues that we are facing—transcend politics.

I was pleased today that I was able to get an amendment offered on the floor in some of the debates in our appropriations process where I reached across the aisle, to a colleague of mine from Buffalo from the other side, and we legislated. We adopted policy. We adopted an amendment to that appropriations bill that I think is going to be good for America. And it showed I think in that instance to me, and I hope to many others, that we can work together, that we can work together in a bipartisan fashion to tackle the issues that are facing America such as that which we took care of today between Mr. HIGGINS and myself. And that philosophy is alive and well.

I know the press likes to gin up headlines based on the partisan debate that we often have here in the Chamber, and they try to paint us all as we are in one camp on the Republican side and they are in the other camp on the Democratic side. I can tell you, in living it day to day, that truly is not the case. There are many good people on both sides of the aisle that are more than willing to sit down and talk to each other and try to work out these issues.

But a lot of times that rhetoric, those headlines, cause us to act in ways that are extremely divisive and kill that bipartisan effort and support that we should be nurturing and promoting. That's why, today, I was pleased to see the results of that effort

on our behalf and on Mr. HIGGINS' behalf to pass that legislation.

So I am going to continue along those avenues. I am going to call out and hold people accountable for their positions. There's nothing wrong with that. There's nothing wrong with having a good, old-fashioned, honest debate and passionately disagreeing with people with different philosophies so long as you do it in an honest and respectful manner.

I work day to day whenever I get into a disagreement with some of my colleagues and also Members from the other side of the aisle, and I always start with the premise, okay, where are you coming from? Why do you believe you are right? And I try to look at it truly from the eyes of the people that have the contrary opinion. Many times that has opened up my eyes and allowed me to learn from that exchange and strengthen my position, maybe cause my position to bend a little bit or, as I learn and grow, to maybe change those positions. But I can tell you that we should always start by having that conversation.

I have seen where a lot of times people don't want to do that. They don't want to really take the effort, or make the effort, or take the time to really try to look at it through the eyes of the other person, understand where they're coming from and what their philosophy is really all about. I think if we at least do that, if we at least promise to each other that we're willing to do that, this Chamber would work tremendously much better as a body, as a whole. My colleagues in the Senate would also be working in a much better fashion. And as we work with the White House and with the President of the United States, we could also develop that type of relationship.

So I encourage all my colleagues and all my friends to continue with that effort, as I pledge here today to do. As we go forward, I guess I will keep that in heart, and I will continue to do my part in that effort.

As I started this conversation tonight, ladies and gentlemen of America and Mr. Speaker, this is about jobs. This is about adopting a philosophy, a new culture in America that recognizes that the private sector is that engine that's going to be the spark of this economic recovery, and we need to focus on that. We need to expand on our opportunities that are right before us with these free trade agreements when you talk about South Korea, Colombia, and Panama.

I would ask all my colleagues to always focus on getting Americans back to work because, if we do that, we will have a recovery, and we will address much of this budget deficit problem because of the increased revenue that will come from that expansion of getting people back to work and getting that economy going; and we will have a much better world upon which to legislate going forward.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 15, 2011, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2458. A letter from the Chief, Planning & Regulatory Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—National School Lunch Program: School Food Service Account Revenue Amendments Related to the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (RIN: 0584-AE11) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2459. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Insurers: Rules Relating to Internal Claims and Appeals and External Review Processes (RIN: 1210-AB45) received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2460. A letter from the Deputy Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, OSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standards Improvement Project-Phase III [Docket No.: OSHA-2006-0049] (RIN: 1218-AC19) received June 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2461. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program: Revisions to the Vaccine Injury Table (RIN: 0906-AA74) received June 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2462. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medical Devices; Exception From General Requirements for Informed Consent [Docket No.: FDA-2003-N-0212] (formerly Docket No.: 2003N-0355) received June 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2463. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Indiana; Michigan; Minnesota; Ohio; Wisconsin; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1179; FRL-9436-7] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2464. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for 1997 8-Hour Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0635; FRL-9437-8] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2465. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0721-201126 FRL-9436-4] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2466. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirement for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0720-201123 FRL-9436-3] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2467. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirement for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0426-201124 FRL-9436-5] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2468. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirement for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0722-201125 FRL-9436-6] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2469. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Major" final rule—Federal Implementation Plans to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone in 27 States; Correction of SIP Approvals for 22 States [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9436-8] (RIN: 2060-AP50) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2470. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Bracketville, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 09-219 RM-11581] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2471. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with the United Kingdom Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2472. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Takes of Marine Mam-

mals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Space Vehicle and Missile Launch Operations at Kodiak Launch Complex, Alaska [Docket No.: 100806326-1088-02] (RIN: 0648-AY99) received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2473. 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.: 30786; Amdt. No. 3429] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2474. 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.: 30785; Amdt. No. 3428] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2475. 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.: 30748; Amdt. No. 3427] received June 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2476. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Livermore, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1264; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-23] received June 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2477. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Poplar, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0016; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-1] received June 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2478. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Kenbridge, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0160; Airspace Docket No. 11-AEA-05] received June 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2479. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Brunswick Malcolm-McKinnon Airport, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0949; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-34] received June 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2480. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Palmdale, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1241; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-22] received June 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2481. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report as required by Sections 402(a) and 409(a) ("the Jackson Vanik Amendment") of the 1974 Trade Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2482. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Extension of Time for Filing Returns [TD 9531] (RIN: 1545-BH88) received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2483. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—this notice provides interim guidance under section 1012 of the Internal Revenue Code on issues relating to the basis of stock [NOTICE 2011-56] received June 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2484. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Applicable Federal Rates—July 2011 (Rev. Rul. 2011-14) received June 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2485. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting transmitting unanimously approved Recommendation 2011-1, Safety Culture at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce 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:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on the Budget. First Semiannual Activities and Summary Report of the Committee on the Budget for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112-147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### 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. HANNA (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CAPU-ANO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, Mr. HARPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of

New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. REED, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WU, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HURT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WELCH, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COBLE, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. BASS of California, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. CHU, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RIVERA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WEST, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BARTLETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WATT, Mr. BERG, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. RUNDYAN, Ms. BUERKLE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. COLE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DENT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DICKS, Ms.

HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DREIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HECK, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 2527. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the National Baseball Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2528. A bill to rescind the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to develop a return-free tax system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POSEY, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 2529. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 2530. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for increased flexibility in establishing rates for reimbursement of State homes by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for nursing home care provided to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2531. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to repeal the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2532. A bill to permit certain members of the United States Secret Service and certain members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division who were appointed in 1984, 1985, or 1986 to elect to be covered under the District of Columbia Police and Firefighter Retirement and Disability System in the same manner as members appointed prior to 1984; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2533. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to proper venue for cases filed by corporations under chapter 11 of title 11 of such Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOWDY (for himself and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 2534. A bill to provide that the public debt limit shall not affect timely payment of certain Social Security, public debt, defense, veterans, and Medicare obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2535. A bill to require financial literacy and economic education counseling for student borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2536. A bill to provide, develop, and support 21st century readiness initiatives that assist students in acquiring the skills necessary to think critically and solve problems, be an effective communicator, collaborate with others, and learn to create and innovate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 2537. A bill to provide grants to cities with high unemployment rates to provide job training, public works, and economic development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 2538. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to authorize assignment to States of Federal agency environmental review responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2539. A bill to establish a competitive grant program for youth summer job placement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2540. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish and operate a toll-free nationwide telephone hotline through which individuals may obtain information on voting in elections for Federal office and report information on problems encountered in voting in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MICHAUD,

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 2541. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. SIRE):

H.R. 2542. A bill to withhold twenty percent of United States assessed and voluntary contributions to the Organization of American States (OAS) for every permanent council meeting that takes place where Article 20 of the Inter-American Charter is not invoked with regard to Venezuela's recent constitutional reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 2543. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 2544. A bill to increase the statutory limit on the public debt, increase job creation, and reduce projected medium and long-term Federal budget deficits and debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Ms. FOX):

H.R. 2545. A bill to clarify the application of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act to the Internal Revenue Service, to require the Service to convene a regulatory review panel for certain rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. PALLONE:

H.R. 2546. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate regulations on the management of medical waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SABLON, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2547. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding environmental education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WALSH of Illinois,

Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H.R. 2548. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the "Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 2549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business credit for donations for vocational educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution welcoming the independence of the Republic of South Sudan, congratulating the people of South Sudan for freely and peacefully expressing their will through an internationally accepted referendum, and calling on the Governments and people of Sudan and South Sudan to peacefully resolve outstanding issues including the final status of Abyei; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 350. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H. Res. 351. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a semipostal stamp to support medical research relating to Alzheimer's disease; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on 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.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

93. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Resolution No. 1654 memorializing the Congress that colleges and universities named in this memorial are authorized to operate educational programs beyond the secondary level; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

94. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Resolution 218 urging Congress to dedicate penalties collected from parties responsible for the Deepwater Horizon oil disaster to repairing the environmental and economic damage caused by the disaster; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## 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. HANNA:

H.R. 2527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 states: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures."

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2530.

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. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 (the Bankruptcy Clause); Article III, Section 1 (the power of Congress to establish inferior federal courts)

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 2534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution enumerates the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 2535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 2536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the "General Welfare Clause." This provision grants Congress the broad power "to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 2538.

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, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fifteenth Amendment, Sections 1 and 2

Section. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 2541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 2543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 2544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2545.

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 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1 and 18.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, 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 Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 2548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58: Mr. HALL.  
 H.R. 136: Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 210: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SIRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 333: Mr. MARINO.  
 H.R. 361: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
 H.R. 389: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.  
 H.R. 412: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 420: Mr. HALL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 452: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. KINGSTON.  
 H.R. 494: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 595: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
 H.R. 615: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. HUNTER.  
 H.R. 645: Mr. HALL and Mr. WOODALL.  
 H.R. 687: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. HEINRICH.  
 H.R. 721: Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 733: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.  
 H.R. 777: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 860: Mr. PETERS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 885: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 912: Mr. SCHRADER.  
 H.R. 942: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 1041: Mr. WEST.  
 H.R. 1072: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. PALAZZO.  
 H.R. 1089: Ms. HANABUSA.  
 H.R. 1112: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
 H.R. 1172: Mr. MICHAUD.  
 H.R. 1174: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 1193: Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 1204: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 1259: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mrs. HARTZLER.  
 H.R. 1269: Mr. PETERS and Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 1280: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. CHABOT.  
 H.R. 1283: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.  
 H.R. 1288: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
 H.R. 1297: Mr. OWENS.  
 H.R. 1300: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 1397: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 1426: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.  
 H.R. 1443: Mr. HUNTER.  
 H.R. 1459: Mrs. ELLMERS.  
 H.R. 1464: Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 1465: Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 1466: Ms. HANABUSA.  
 H.R. 1489: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1505: Mr. HALL.  
 H.R. 1506: Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 1513: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 1565: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 1612: Mr. BARROW.  
 H.R. 1633: Mr. CARTER.  
 H.R. 1639: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.  
 H.R. 1653: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. GERLACH.  
 H.R. 1697: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.  
 H.R. 1714: Mr. GRIMM.  
 H.R. 1736: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DENT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1744: Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 1772: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1803: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1821: Mr. FILNER and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1856: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1905: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1941: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1951: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1958: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1968: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1984: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2042: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2059: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 2064: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 2088: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 2107: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2108: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 2117: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 2123: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

H.R. 2128: Mr. PAUL and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2140: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2159: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 2164: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2194: Mr. WU.

H.R. 2218: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2227: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 2230: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2233: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2238: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2257: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2271: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2313: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2333: Mr. NADLER and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2402: Mr. MICA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 2409: Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2431: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2433: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEST, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2444: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2488: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2492: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 2496: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2497: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 2514: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2521: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.J. Res. 5: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. BARROW, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 64: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 134: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 207: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H. Res. 231: Mr. CAPUANO and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 290: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 295: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 298: Mr. BROWN of Florida.  
H. Res. 304: Ms. TSONGAS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT No. 82: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT No. 83: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 84: Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science" may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 85: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be expended to administer or enforce the requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 or title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act), except with respect to a contract that exceeds \$20,000,000.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. LUETKEMEYER

AMENDMENT No. 86: 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 continue the study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT No. 87: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

H.R. 2434

OFFERED BY: MR. WESTMORELAND

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 3, line 20, strike "\$200,000,000" and insert "\$0".

Page 4, line 3, strike "\$200,000,000" and insert "\$0".

H.R. 2434

OFFERED BY: MS. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT No. 5: Strike section 901.

H.R. 2434

OFFERED BY: MR. GOODLATTE

AMENDMENT No. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for construction of the Richard H. Poff Federal Building in Roanoke, Virginia.