



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2011

No. 114

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 27, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KENNY MARCHANT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN 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.

### DISPROVING REPUBLICAN ORTHODOXY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, this week we have just disproven two items of Republican orthodoxy, and that is corporations don't pay taxes, only individuals pay taxes; and tax cuts create jobs.

What am I talking about? Well, last Friday the authorization for the Federal Aviation Administration expired. So the government is not collecting \$200 million a week in security fees and

other fees that pay for the aviation system. It is partially funded by the users of that system with ticket taxes and such. That is \$200 million a week.

Now, what's happened since? Well, three airlines, three honest airlines—Frontier Airlines, Alaska, and Virgin America—lowered ticket prices because the government isn't collecting the taxes. But the other airlines, not so much. They actually raised their ticket prices to match the taxes, and they're collecting the windfall.

At the same time, their association, the Air Transport Association, is complaining about ticket taxes: But a big chunk of your ticket is going to Washington. Well, you can now X out Washington, and you can put in United Airlines, Continental Airlines, U.S. Airways, Southwest Airlines, and Jet Blue, because they're taking the money.

And guess what? In addition to the consumers getting ripped off here, \$200 million a week, we have another problem, the second one, tax cuts create jobs. Well, we've cut taxes, \$200 million a week. That's a lot. And guess what? So far, 4,000 government jobs.

Now, Republicans don't care about government jobs even if they're doing some pretty critical stuff. But also, tens of thousands of private sector jobs are down the tube because not collecting the taxes means all of the airport improvement projects across America funded by these fees are grinding to a halt. Critical projects, projects that will save lives from runway incursions, control towers, security improvements in our airports to defeat terrorist attacks.

And in the case of my little regional airport on the coast in Oregon, their project to install a runway lighting system for instrument landing before winter has stopped. We just got jet service in there. The airlines say, Look, if we're going to come in here in the wintertime, you've got some bad

weather. We need that system. Well, if this impasse continues, we will not have that system by next winter.

Now, who is that helping? Who are you guys helping over there with these stupid stunts you're pulling here? \$200 million a week that the government isn't collecting that would pay for these critical projects, put tens of thousands of people to work, and now it's a windfall to a bunch of airlines.

But don't worry, the Air Transport Association says, these short-term increases, that is by the airlines increasing their ticket prices to make up for the taxes going away, these short-term increases benefit all stakeholders because it enables the airlines to invest in their product and service. Huh? What?

Let's see. The money used to go for safety and security and other essentials; now it's going to the airlines, and they're going to use it to improve their product and service. Maybe they'll start serving peanuts and soda again on some of these flights. I don't know.

But this is outrageous. So much for the Republican mantra. You know, corporations do pay taxes. And, in this case, now they are getting a windfall because the taxes went away. And no, tax cuts don't create jobs. Wrong twice.

### COMMUNITIES OF COLOR TEEN PREGNANCY PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Communities of Color Teen Pregnancy Prevention Act of 2011. My bill addresses the sobering fact that the United States has the highest teenage pregnancy rate of any developed nation.

□ 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.

H5583

With nearly 750,000 pregnancies a year, teen pregnancy is a critical public health issue that costs our country \$10.9 billion annually. Contributing to the seriousness of this issue is that 82 percent of these pregnancies are unplanned.

While it is true our Nation has made progress in reducing the rate of teen pregnancy, the fact remains that many minority communities still have disproportionately high rates. For example, among all Latina and African American girls, over half will get pregnant at least once before age 20, compared to 19 percent of Caucasian non-Hispanic girls.

Giving birth during these teenage years increases the risk of infant mortality, premature birth, complications, and low birth weight. Also of great concern is the fact that teen pregnancies can lead to significant social, educational, and financial burdens to families and to our country.

Research tells us that girls who become pregnant during adolescence are less likely to finish school, have higher rates of unemployment, and a greater dependence on public assistance. In addition to these tragic consequences, many young girls in physically abusive relationships are three times more likely to become pregnant than non-abused girls.

While there is no simple solution to address teen sexual behavior, it is possible to reduce teen pregnancy with a strategy of sexual health education that takes into account cultural and linguistic differences.

My bill is designed to do just that.

The Communities of Color Teen Pregnancy Prevention Act will help reduce the disturbing rates of teen pregnancy in minority communities by supporting new and existing teen pregnancy prevention program interventions with a focus on strengthening community-based organizations, by reinforcing our multimedia campaigns to provide public health education, by increasing awareness about teen pregnancy prevention and healthy relationships, by enhancing research in communities of color that examine factors contributing to disproportionate high rates of teenage and unintended pregnancy, and by examining the role violence and abuse play in the decisions young people make about relationships, sex, pregnancy and childbearing.

Mr. Speaker, our daughters deserve equal opportunities to build a bright future. By preventing teen pregnancies and promoting healthy relationships, we can pave the way for our teenage girls to blossom into women and mothers who have realized their full potential.

I strongly urge my colleagues to co-sponsor and help pass the Communities of Color Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Act of 2011.

□ 1010

#### THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. RANGEL. I think I share the embarrassment of all of the Members of this great legislative body when it appears as though in our hands we have the ability to tell people, our creditors all over the country and the world, that for the first time in our Republic's history we are prepared to say we are not going to pay our debts.

We're not doing this because of some pledges that we've signed or because of some commitment that some Members have made that they will never, never, never do anything in support of our President. They would never talk about raising revenue; that they will never vote for a bill, whether it's a health bill, Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare, education. If the President supports it, they just don't want it.

I don't know how many Americans are really waking up this morning wondering exactly what would happen if we hold our country and our President hostage in order to reach just short political gain by people who have been recently elected and believe that compromise is unpatriotic instead of the legislative objective. But more important than the jobs that we would lose, the money that we would lose, the fact that government would have to be expanded and larger than it's ever been, what I'm really afraid of is that we lose the American Dream and create a scenario where that dream becomes a nightmare.

I don't know what it is that made America so great. I can't imagine what kind of dream that someone could have in Europe or a foreign country and just believe that making it to America would be better than staying in their own country with their own language and with their own race of people. Yet these tens of thousands of people were prepared, in many cases to risk their lives, to come to participate in that American Dream. I can't imagine how people who have been snatched from Africa and brought in chains in the bottom of vessels and were actually sold as property, and yet, instead of saying that they want to go back to Africa, they adopted our Bible, they adopted American customs. But most importantly, with all of the obstacles that they had to overcome, they adopted the American Dream.

What makes America so different is that we're one of the few countries that no matter what you look like or what your last name is, you can become an American. It's absolutely amazing the attractiveness that this dream has. Does it mean that a part of that dream is getting rich inheriting or getting property, having yachts and cars? No. It's having hope and dreams that you would be able to do better for yourself, your family, your kids, your grandkids, your community, and yes,

our great country. It means that you're willing to make sacrifices to help others because even though you never fulfill that dream, the dream never, never stops. There's always the ability to say that even though I didn't make it, my kid is going to go to school. Even though I didn't make it, there's going to be the possibility that I'll be living in a better world—a world of peace, a world of harmony, a world that makes no difference where you came from, that you have a dream that can be fulfilled in this country.

In other countries, you can't dream. How you're born is how you die. That's going to be your legacy. But in America, all of this is going to be placed in jeopardy because we don't have the guts to call out these people that obviously would rather have this dream shattered, not just for those people that are here but for people all over the world that watch us, and maybe they don't have the ability to come here and become a part of that American Dream still. Throughout the Middle East you see other people saying, I too can dream. I can be somebody.

Don't let that dream become a nightmare. Support our President, support our fiscal system, and support that dream.

#### IN MEMORY OF ED BELL

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to remember a great friend of mine who passed away last Tuesday. Thomaston City Councilman Ed Bell was a huge presence in Georgia and a devoted cheerleader for both Upson County, the city of Thomaston, and me.

Ed's life of tireless service started when he entered the U.S. Navy as an aviation ordnance man for 4 years during the Korean conflict. He continued with a sense of duty as an agent with State Farm Insurance, where he worked for 33 years and became a mentor for every State Farm agent under his direction. He was an agent's agent. The people that he insured knew that Ed was their agent and that he was there to protect their interest.

Ed was serving his fourth term on the Thomaston City Council and was truly dedicated to improving the lives of those in his community. If I ever found myself within 25 miles of Thomaston and made the mistake of not calling Ed, you can bet that he would somehow find out, and I would get an earful over the phone for not coming by to see him. And when you came to visit, you had to be sure to set enough time for Ed to introduce you to everyone in town, even though he had already done it many times before.

Even in the years later, Ed could wear a much younger man out with his enthusiasm for showing visitors around his beloved city, taking them through

the courthouse and around the city square. Ed really was "Mr. Thomaston." He was serving on my district's Small Business Committee as well as serving on the Thomaston-Upson Arts Council, the Upson County School Board, the Lions Club, and as a deacon at First Baptist Church of Thomaston. In recognition of all of Ed's work, he was rewarded the well-deserved Lifetime Achievement Award in 2009 from the Thomaston Chamber of Commerce. There is a laundry list of groups impacted by Ed's energy, and his involvement could never be replaced or forgotten by anyone.

The dedication Ed showed to his community pales in comparison to his dedication to family. My thoughts and prayers continue to be with Patricia, Ed's wife of 55 years; his three children, Dick, Debbie, and Nancy; and his six grandchildren, one of whom, William, is currently serving as an intern in my Newnan office. I cannot adequately express, Mr. Speaker, how grateful I am to Ed and his family for all that he has done for Georgia and for me.

So, Ed, until we meet again, we all miss you.

#### RATING THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members often come to the floor to talk about inspector general reports about agencies. And they are almost always critical of reports—reports that document shortcomings.

I'm very proud today to come to the floor to present excerpts from a joint report from the inspectors general of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury, in which they give a perfect set of marks to the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Those two agencies looked into this agency. This is an agency that is being set up, under fire, unfortunately, in a somewhat unusual situation. And what the inspectors general reported is that they've done everything right; that "they identified and documented mission-critical activities and legislative mandates"; that the CFPB has developed and is implementing appropriate plans.

□ 1020

They found that they are implementing appropriate plans that support ongoing operations as well as the transfer of employees and functions. They created several agency-wide documents that identified and tracked priorities. "We found that the agency has completed elements of its implementation plans and is making progress on others."

It is a joint report from two inspectors general that says they've done everything right; so I want to put that forward.

I want to put it forward, in part, because the individual most singularly

responsible for its great success, as she was for the idea and the creation of this agency, is Elizabeth Warren. Elizabeth Warren is one of the most able and dedicated individuals that I've ever encountered, who has dedicated herself to public service.

I regret very much that uninformed political opposition denied her the appointment to be the head of the agency, because she was not only the creator of this idea and a great partner for those of us on the Financial Services Committee—I see my colleague from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) who was an important part of this on the floor as we set this up in the face of significant opposition from vested interests and from ideologues—but in having had the idea, she then presided as the appointee of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the President to set this agency up in an extraordinary way. It is now, on the date when it takes off, ready to function. So she was not simply the creator of the idea and a great advocate, but she has shown herself to be a great administrator; and I regret the fact that she is not getting the appointment.

Although I have great confidence in the appointment of Mr. Cordray, whom the President appointed—he was an outstanding Attorney General, and he will be an outstanding Director—I want to reflect for just a minute on why we had such unwarranted opposition to a woman of great sense and of moderation, a woman who understands the market and was ready to help it function.

Part of it, I have to say, was gender bias. Along with Sheila Bair, recently departed as head of the FDIC, Ms. Warren encountered from some people—maybe unconsciously on their part—the notion that a very strong-willed woman with strong opinions might have a place but not in the financial sector; and I regret the loss of both of them. Yet there was also on the part of my most conservative Republican colleagues a recognition that she was a threat. I disagree with the position not to appoint her, but I give credit to President Obama and Secretary Geithner because they helped us get this agency created, and they did put her in the position and gave her their full backing to get it this far.

We would have ideologues here who would have people believe that government is always a bad thing, that less government is always better. We've seen it in this notion that we should cap government at X percent or Y percent—but I don't regard more fire-fighting as a bad thing; I don't think research into Alzheimer's and cancer is something we need to limit; I am not opposed to fixing bridges and highways. So this notion that government is always bad is mindless. There is a particular problem—and the private sector is a place that will create wealth, and I want us to do what we can to create the right conditions for the private sector, but there will be times when we need the government to protect people

from the private sector. That was the rationale of the Consumer Bureau.

The Consumer Bureau was set up—and it's a very popular entity—to protect individual citizens from abuses in the private sector. It's working well. It was well-designed, I must say. It was well set up, as the inspectors general have said. So I believe my most right-wing colleagues are terrified. It is their false notion that the government is always the source of the problem and the private sector is always the source of the good. Sometimes the government does create problems, and much of the time the private sector does create wealth, but there are times when the public sector has to protect people from the private sector. The Consumer Bureau was set up for that.

Now, the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, Mr. BACHUS, said the other day, We don't worry about the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation of the Federal Reserve. What we worry about is an agency that exists solely to protect consumers. He is also the one who said that he thought the bank regulators were there to protect the banks, but we want to have a regulator there to protect the consumers.

So I salute Elizabeth Warren. I regret that she will not be able to continue the excellent work she has done, but it will live on as a tribute to both the idea she had, the political work she did with us to get it created, and the extraordinarily good administrative work she did in setting it up. I believe Mr. Cordray and the others will do a very good job and that we will soon have proof that the public sector can, in some cases, protect citizens from private sector abuses.

#### RESULTS OF THE JOINT REVIEW

##### CFPB IDENTIFIED AND DOCUMENTED MISSION-CRITICAL ACTIVITIES AND LEGISLATIVE MANDATES

Based on CFPB planning documents and interviews of agency officials, we found that CFPB identified and documented implementation activities critical to standing up the agency's functions and necessary to address certain Dodd-Frank Act requirements. In addition to activities necessary to establish the primary mission areas identified by the Dodd-Frank Act, such as supervision and enforcement, CFPB designed its organizational structure to account for other mandated functional units as well, including offices for financial education, fair lending, and service member affairs, among others. Moreover, CFPB identified the activities necessary to complete the transfer of employees and data from the transferring agencies in a timely manner. CFPB identified in its plans the need to establish a pay and classification system, information security processes, and financial management capabilities—areas required by the Dodd-Frank Act.

In addition, CFPB prepared documentation addressing critical activities vital to establishing a new agency. For example, CFPB's plans identified core business activities—such as securing office space, establishing procurement capabilities, building payroll and benefits functions, and designing an information technology infrastructure, among others.

CFPB DEVELOPED AND IS IMPLEMENTING  
APPROPRIATE PLANS

We found that CFPB developed and is implementing appropriate plans that support ongoing operations as well as the transfer of employees and functions that will occur on July 21, 2011. CFPB planned for mission-critical standup activities and certain Dodd-Frank Act requirements. In July 2010, Treasury officials created a document that, according to a CFPB official, served as a roadmap for implementation. Overall, CFPB's approach was to create detailed planning documents at the division level to provide input for the agency-wide strategic plan. Most CFPB divisions maintained a draft strategic plan, organizational chart, and "dashboards" that tracked implementation progress and potential risks. The division-level strategic plans generally included division-level missions, goals, deliverables, and coordination activities. We also noted that these plans included multiple phases that span beyond the designated transfer date.

CFPB also created several agency-wide documents that identified and tracked priorities and milestones for implementation. For example, one priority for CFPB was the transfer of employees from other agencies. To implement this priority, CFPB maintained a detailed recruitment schedule, developed coordination agreements with other agencies, and allocated resources from the various divisions to timely complete the employee transfer process.

In reviewing the agency's planning documents and discussing the standup status with CFPB officials, we found that the agency has completed elements of its implementation plans and is making progress on others, including its overall strategic plan. Nevertheless, CFPB's operational success will depend, in part, on its ability to effectively execute its plans.

LIBERIA CELEBRATES ITS 164TH  
INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Liberian people on 164 years of independence.

Liberia, which translates to "land of the free," shares a unique history with the United States. Founded by African Americans and emancipated slaves in the early 1820s, this small nation of close to 3.8 million people is striving to build a lasting democracy—an incredible feat in such a war-torn region.

Mr. Speaker, more than 25,000 Liberian Americans call Minnesota home, and I am proud to call them my neighbors, friends and colleagues. Liberian Americans in our communities are entrepreneurs, small business people, teachers, lawyers, and nurses. They contribute to the very fabric of our Nation and to who we are as a people.

So let us today recognize the Liberian people and the long road they have traveled as a nation, and let us always remember the bond between the United States and the Republic of Liberia.

## FAMINE IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today we are witnessing a tragic humanitarian crisis in Somalia and the Horn of Africa, which is currently experiencing its worst drought in over 60 years. According to USAID, crops have failed; livestock has died, and prices in the local markets are too high for most people to buy what they need to feed their families.

On July 20, 2011, the United Nations announced that famine exists in two regions of Somalia. This crisis is affecting over 11 million people throughout the region, and USAID estimates that over 3.2 million people are in life-threatening situations and are in dire need of food, water and medical attention. Additionally, over 80 percent of those fleeing Somalia are believed to be women and children.

At Kenyan and Ethiopian refugee camps, Somali children under the age of 5 are dying at an alarming rate. I visited a camp in Kenya 2 years ago, the Dadaab camp, where many of the refugees from Somalia are going. There are five times as many people in that camp as the camp can handle. It was overcrowded 2 years ago, and with the drought, it is just becoming almost impossible to sustain life.

An alarming 60 percent of the people at risk are still in al-Shabaab-held territory. Al-Shabaab is supported by al Qaeda. They initially said there was no drought—a denial. Yet, in the part of the country of which they are in charge, the drought is very serious, especially in southern Sudan. Then they did agree that the drought was occurring and said they would allow humanitarian organizations to go to that area to distribute food and medicine. However, just last week, they changed their position again.

As we saw in the nineties with Aidid and Ali Mahdi in the original drought during which the United States became involved in Somalia, we cannot have the political warlords and that situation happen again. The World Food Programme and the United Nations are desperately trying to get the food, water and medical assistance into that area, and we are going to continue to ask the al-Shabaab people to allow the food to come in.

During a similar drought in Ethiopia during the early eighties, the international community was slow to respond, resulting in more than 1 million deaths. Then world leaders said, Never again. Now we are facing a worsening humanitarian disaster that threatens to take even more lives. We must act and support those in need.

I have to commend USAID and the work that they're doing. Yesterday, at a hearing we had on this situation, Ms. Cromer, from the USAID, talked about the fact that they had an early warning system and that they had pre-positioned food, which shows that planning has resulted in less loss of life than there would have been had it not been pre-positioned, but we still have a serious problem.

□ 1030

Last week I introduced H. Res. 361, calling attention to this crisis, and we have already over 50 cosponsors.

Indeed, Congress is taking notice. My colleagues, JIM MCGOVERN, JO ANN EMERSON, members of the Hunger Caucus, along with myself and BARBARA LEE and MAXINE WATERS and GWEN MOORE and others have been very vocal on this issue. Ms. McCOLLUM also has added her voice, from Minnesota.

The crisis is worsening, though. The Famine Early Warning Systems Network believes that within the next 1 or 2 months, the famine will spread throughout all of southern Somalia. As the situation has grown more dire, over 600,000 Somalis have fled to neighboring countries, some walking hundreds of miles to refugee camps. The roads to these camps in northern Kenya and eastern Ethiopia have been described by The Washington Post just yesterday and others as "roads of death." Thousands of women, children, and elderly are left on the side of the road weak from malnutrition, unable to continue. They are resting on those who have already died.

So I ask all of you to respond to this very serious situation.

BALANCED BUDGET  
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, March 2, 1995, was a pivotal day in the history of our country. On that day, the United States Senate failed by one vote to send a balanced budget amendment to the States for ratification. The amendment had passed the House by the required two-thirds majority previously, and the Senate vote was the last legislative hurdle before ratification by the States.

If that amendment had passed, then we would not be dealing with the fiscal crisis we now face. If that amendment had passed, then balancing the budget would have been the norm rather than the exception over the past decade and we would have nothing like the annual deficits and skyrocketing debt that we must address today.

The good news is that, like 1995, this Congress is again standing at a crossroads at this very moment. The decisions we make this week could steer the direction of the country for many years to come. We have an opportunity now to take action to ensure that our children will face a much brighter fiscal picture. We must not allow ourselves to miss this opportunity.

And while, yes, we definitely need to deal with the debt limit squarely in front of us and take the opportunity to make significant cuts in government spending, we also must have a long-term solution to this problem. And that long-term solution is a balanced

budget amendment to the United States Constitution. We will, I hope, have the opportunity to vote on such an amendment this week.

Experience has proven time and again that Congress cannot, for any significant length of time, rein in excessive spending. The annual deficits and the resulting debt continue to grow due to political pressures and dependency on government programs. In order for Congress to be able to consistently make the very tough decisions necessary to sustain fiscal responsibility over the long term, Congress must have an external pressure to force it to do so. The most realistic chance we have today to enact this type of institutional reform is through a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution.

Many Members of Congress have introduced balanced budget amendments in this Congress. I introduced two versions on the first day of the 112th Congress. H.J. Res. 2 is the exact text that passed the House in 1995 and failed in the Senate by one vote. This amendment requires that total annual outlays not exceed total annual receipts. It also requires a three-fifths majority to raise the debt limit, and, in addition, this legislation has limited exceptions for times of war.

H.J. Res. 1, which I also introduced, goes much further. In addition to the provisions of H.J. Res. 2, it requires a two-thirds majority to raise taxes and imposes an annual spending cap that prohibits spending from exceeding 18 percent of GDP.

In the United States Senate, 47 Republican Senators have cosponsored a balanced budget amendment, which is a strong sign that the Senate is ready to engage in debate on this subject.

Our extraordinary fiscal crisis demands an extraordinary solution. So we simply cannot afford to succumb to political posturing on this issue at a point in time so critical to our Nation's future. We must rise above that and move forward with a strategy that includes legislation that will get at least 290 bipartisan votes on the House floor.

So as we consider a balanced budget amendment, I encourage the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle to devote our effort to passing this strongest balanced budget amendment that can garner two-thirds of the House of Representatives.

We are at a crossroads in America. We can make the tough choices and control spending paving the way for a return to surpluses and ultimately paying down the national debt, or we can allow big spenders to lead us further down the road of chronic deficits and leave our children and grandchildren saddled with debt that is not our own.

The choice is ours. The stakes are high. Failure is not an option.

#### FAMINE IN AFRICA

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I had breakfast this morning. I had granola and yogurt, a little fruit, an egg and bacon sandwich, and I'm feeling irritable because I didn't have my coffee. I'm looking forward to a delicious lunch that I've planned at about noon-time.

But in the meantime, on the Horn of Africa, 11 million people are facing starvation. And not because they're lazy people or unworthy people, but because they're suffering from the biggest drought that they have seen in 60 years, because they're experiencing flooding, because there are people who have stepped away from the loving care that we usually extend to others of our brothers and sisters, others who are human beings on this planet. Tens of thousands of people will die.

There is an official famine that has been called by the United Nations. And for those of you who know what a famine is, it's not when you don't have a particular thing like me—I didn't have my coffee this morning. Famine exists when at least 20 percent of the population has extremely limited access to basic food requirements, global acute malnutrition exceeds 30 percent, and the death rate exceeds 2 out of 10,000 per day for the entire population.

An example that was in the news recently is of a 7-month-old Somali boy who weighed the same amount as any one of our newborns—weighed 7 pounds. A 7-month-old boy weighed 7 pounds. That is an example of what happens in a drought.

And what are we doing here in the United States of America, the world's largest humanitarian donor, when the United Nations has called for, on July 20, has asked for more than \$1.6 billion to support the humanitarian response in the next 12 months urgently, desperately needed to address and avert this burgeoning humanitarian crisis that is unfolding? We are in the midst of cutting funding of our foreign aid and peace food budget.

The fiscal year 2012 Agricultural appropriations budget bill that passed a few weeks ago, over my opposition, cut this program by \$200 million. It was heartbreaking to see amendment after amendment after amendment come forward to cut it further, and even amendments to eliminate it completely.

□ 1040

The United States, as the world's largest humanitarian donor, we need to do more. We talk about balanced budgets here; and there are people in this world, our brothers and sisters, who don't even have a balanced meal on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we not become numb to the conditions of peoples around the world. Less than 1 percent of our budget goes toward foreign aid, and that includes operations of the

State Department and everything, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking that in these discussions of debt and deficits that we do not turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to those people who are starving.

In closing, I just want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that of course we know who suffers disproportionately among the poor, the usual suspects. Women and children are disproportionately represented among those who are food insecure, those who are starving, and those who die.

I thank my colleague for yielding and for his continued leadership to make sure that we do not forget or overlook this tragedy that is currently occurring in the Horn of Africa. I know that as chairman, and now, ranking member of the Africa Subcommittee, he has been a true leader in working to empower the people and nations of Africa.

The United Nations has declared a famine in parts of Somalia and an emergency humanitarian crisis throughout the Horn of Africa—including Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Somalia.

In Somalia alone, tens of thousands of people have died in the past three months because they cannot get enough food to keep themselves alive.

Tens of thousands will surely die in the coming months if the international community, led by the U.S., does not respond quickly and comprehensively. Famine exists when at least 20 percent of the population has extremely limited access to basic food requirements, global acute malnutrition exceeds 30 percent, and the death rate exceeds 2 out of 10,000 per day for the entire population.

The lives of over 11 million people in East Africa are at risk. That is twice the population of my state of Wisconsin. And as usual, those most vulnerable women and children are suffering disproportionately. One in every three children in southern Somalia is malnourished (some 550,000 total). UNICEF estimates that 2.3 million children are suffering from acute malnutrition in the region.

These numbers don't include those who are dying on literal "roads of death" as they attempt to flee famine in Somalia to neighboring countries (Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea) that are struggling with drought themselves.

There was a news report recently about a 7-month old Somali boy who weighed the same as a newborn, some 7 pounds. At this stage in his life, he should weight three times as much. A nurse at the refugee camp his family made it to recently puts the little boy's odds of survival at 50–50, a flip of a coin.

The U.N. has asked for some \$1.6 billion to support the humanitarian response in the next 12 months.

Yet, as the humanitarian crisis unfolds, this Congress is in the midst of cutting funding our foreign food aid budget. The FY 2012 Agricultural Appropriations bill that passed a few weeks ago over my opposition, would cut Food for Peace programs by some \$200 million. During that debate, some of my colleagues offered amendments to even make deeper cuts and even eliminate funding for that program all together. It's as if we are telling the men, women, and children desperately searching for food, to "keep warm and well fed."

I hope that my colleagues on the House Foreign Operations Committee will not make that same mistake and will in fact boost funding for our global humanitarian aid programs which will be needed as this crisis unfolds.

The U.S., as the world's largest humanitarian donor, must do more if a humanitarian catastrophe is to be averted.

Tens of thousands of lives can be saved, but the window of opportunity to do so is extremely limited and is closing even as we speak.

#### DEBT NEGOTIATION

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

Mr. HERGER. Six days, Mr. Speaker. Six days until we exceed the debt limit, and we still haven't seen a plan from the White House. However, we have the first 2½ years of his administration as an example of the future he wants for America. The President's policies display his commitment to unchecked government spending. The President supports massive tax hikes on a Nation already enduring the worst jobless recovery since the Great Depression.

The President is content to ignore our entitlement crisis. His actions over the last 2½ years have put this country in significantly worse shape than when he took office. We have seen a total failure of leadership from the White House. He threatened to veto the commonsense solutions of Cut, Cap, and Balance. The reason? By his own words, he wants a debt limit increase to carry him through the next election.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have had enough. We need action, and we need it now. No more speeches, no more rhetoric. The American people deserve to know what the President's plan is. It's time for President Obama to come to the negotiating table and work with us. We're running a \$1.6 trillion deficit, borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend. Without action, we will guarantee our children and grandchildren a future far less bright than the one our parents left us.

Republicans are here, ready to make the tough decisions, cut spending, and reform the way business is done in Washington. We're ready with solutions that will turn around our debt crisis and begin getting America back to work. But these solutions will remain a fantasy as long as the President's focus remains on politics and reelection rather than the good of the American people. We have 6 days left. It's time to act.

#### REMEMBERING JAMES T. MOLLOY

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the memory of James T. Molloy. Many in Washington knew Jim as the former, and last, doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. Western New Yorkers know Jim as a proud third-generation Irish American and career public servant.

Jim was born on June 3, 1936. He was raised in South Buffalo and paid his way through Canisius College. He de-

veloped his strong work ethic in the grain elevators on the waterfront and as a member of the city's fire department. He also worked as a schoolteacher for the city of Buffalo and the city of Lackawanna.

Jim came to Washington, D.C., in 1968 at the invitation of Congressman John Rooney. He managed the House Finance Office until 1974 when he was elected doorkeeper of the House. He held this position until it was eliminated in 1995. As the last doorkeeper of the House, Jim was a member of an elite group. Only 34 people have served in this position in our 215-year history. He oversaw more than 400 employees and administered a budget of \$6.8 million. He introduced Presidents and heads of State and coordinated 71 Joint Sessions of Congress.

Regrettably, I did not have the honor of serving in the House of Representatives during Jim's tenure, but he was a friend and an endless source of help and advice. I have long been inspired in my own service by his strong commitment to this institution. In fact, numerous western New Yorkers were inspired to consider political careers thanks to Jim Molloy. It was well known that Jim had a particular affection for helping western New Yorkers visiting the Capitol and young Buffalonians looking for work in our Nation's Capitol as well.

Jim was recognized on numerous occasions for his service. He received the Outstanding Citizen Award from the New York State AFL-CIO, the President's Award from the New York State Federation of Police, and the United States Senate Youth Alumni Association Outstanding Service Award. He received an honorary Doctor of Law degree from Canisius College and was named Congressional Staffer of the Year by Roll Call. In 2005, I was a proud sponsor of legislation that was signed into law naming a post office on South Park Avenue in our shared neighborhood of South Buffalo after James T. Molloy.

The loss of Jim Molloy will be felt for many years to come by all who knew him. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence in honor of a servant of this institution, James T. Molloy.

#### THE DEFAULT CRISIS AND ITS EFFECT ON AMERICAN JOBS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Progressive Caucus to draw attention to the devastating effects that could be caused if the United States were to default on its debt. First, let's be clear that raising the debt ceiling will have no effect whatsoever on any new spending that the Congress might do. It's simply giving the government authority to pay its bills, to pay its bills for

obligations that the Congress has already authorized.

Second, while Republicans have attempted time and time again to pin the current deficit on President Obama, the facts cannot be denied: It was the policies of the Bush years that got us here. It was just a decade ago that President Clinton left office not with just a balanced budget but a surplus, and the Congressional Budget Office declared in 2001, "The outlook for the Federal budget over the next decade continues to be bright." That quote, of course, came before the 2001 Bush tax cuts were signed into law; two wars that weren't paid for, put on the credit card; two tax cuts that weren't paid for and that mainly benefited the wealthy; and a devastating recession that may have been prevented, had government regulators not turned a blind eye to Wall Street greed. The Bush policies ran up the bills. Those are the bills that our country is committed to pay, and those are the bills that need to be paid if the full faith and credit of the United States is to be protected.

So now this Republican-manufactured crisis could be solved in 5 minutes if we simply passed a clean debt ceiling increase, like we did seven, eight times during the Bush administration, 18 times under Ronald Reagan, and then turned our attention immediately to ways to put our fiscal house in order, focusing on the real crisis, which is the jobs crisis. Instead, Republicans are choosing to hold our Nation's financial standing hostage, with potentially devastating consequences.

Allowing a default on the debt would essentially be a tax on every American family. Interest rates on everything, from mortgages and auto loans to credit cards and small business loans, would immediately soar. A conservative estimate suggests that the effect of an increase in interest rates could cost a homeowner with a 30-year mortgage of \$172,000 an additional \$19,100 more over the life of the loan. A drop in the stock market would hit the savings and retirement accounts of middle class Americans, less available credit for small businesses and consumers, and lower economic growth that could cost hundreds of thousands of jobs.

□ 1050

In addition, if the country can't pay its bills, an unthinkable scenario becomes a reality, having to choose between what aspects of the government to fund and what bills to pay.

Seventy million checks are due to go out next Wednesday. Those include Social Security and veterans and our military families, and these checks are threatened. That is the threat the Republicans are willing to make, holding the full faith and credit of the United States hostage in order to push for extreme policies that would gut Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid and devastate the economy and the middle class in order to protect hedge fund managers and corporations that

ship our jobs overseas. That is what the Republicans are advocating, but they are not willing to ask for one penny more for millionaires and billionaires.

We need to deal with our fiscal challenges, and I have offered proposals for how to do that in a way that protects the social safety net and what is now the disappearing middle class.

First, we need to create jobs. Putting people back to work will raise revenues and bring down the deficit as a proportion of the economy.

Second, we need to eliminate spending we don't need, such as billions of dollars in waste spent by the Pentagon. But we need to protect spending on vital programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

And finally, we need to raise revenues in a fair way.

I've introduced the Fairness in Taxation Act, H.R. 1124, which would create new tax brackets beginning at 45 percent for income over \$1 million a year and rising to 49 percent for income at \$1 billion a year; and yes, there are Americans who make that. And according to an estimate by Citizens for Tax Justice, my legislation could raise as much as \$800 billion over the next 10 years. Those are the types of proposals that should be considered so that we can achieve fiscal responsibility in a way that protects seniors and children and the middle class and all those who aspire to it.

Right now the American Dream itself is at stake. It is slipping through the hands of people that used to be middle class. We cannot tolerate that. We need to raise the debt ceiling.

#### FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, it's a difficult time to talk because Ms. SCHAKOWSKY has said just about everything that I was planning to say. She said it extremely well and synopsized the issue.

It basically comes down to fairness and justice for the American people. And the President, who has been burdened with problems caused by the Republican Congress and the Bush years, wars in Iraq, wars in Afghanistan not paid for, prescription drug bill not paid for, and Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans which have caused most of the deficit and the problem with the debt ceiling, and now we're not calling on them to make some sacrifice and to pay for it.

Most everybody in America knows about dieting. Most of us are a little overweight. Michelle Obama will tell you that any day. We need to watch our weight. But when you go to diet, you've got to reduce your calories and you've got to exercise some more. Spend some calories, reduce some calories. That's the way you diet. It's the same thing with the budget.

If you had a problem at home with your budget, kind of having a problem, well, maybe you think, I won't take that vacation and go to Miami Beach and stay in that three-star hotel. I'll go to Fort Walton and stay in a two-star hotel. And maybe I'll get another job or work some more overtime. You increase your income, you decrease your spending, and you get it together.

This Congress, though, has got the problem because of dealing with this, and the debt ceiling's independent of all of it. Many Members of Congress on the Republican side have pledged not to raise revenue. Well, you've got to do both. You've got to cut some things, and you cut some things that don't decrease your ability to increase jobs later on or increase jobs now, and you increase revenue at the same time. You have to do both.

Some of the Republicans have pledged never to do revenue. Well, that means they've got one arm tied behind their backs—never increase revenue.

You come to the table and you try to get a bargain. You negotiate in politics. You've got to have both hands at the table, one give and one take. Both sides have to come, open palms, friendship, no guns. Here we are.

But they've got one hand tied behind their backs. That's the problem we've got. So we're not being able to negotiate because one side comes ill-equipped, unprepared, incapable.

Last week we had a new Member here from California (Ms. HAHN), and the Speaker read to her and she repeated the oath of office: I pledge to support, I swear I will support, the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

We've got a domestic enemy right now, and it's the idea that we're not going to pay our debts: The full faith and credit of the United States goes by, interest rates go up, jobs go down, credit card rates go up, home mortgage rates go up, 401(k)s go down, stock market drops 10 percent. Yet we're not doing it. We're considering a pledge to some third-party person that said, No new revenue, arm behind my back, instead of, I will support the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

So that's the problem we've got.

I had a town hall last night on the telephone. My constituents can't understand why we have the problem. I tried to explain it to them. They're concerned about their Social Security checks coming or their veterans check coming. They could be cut off if we don't get this done and we don't have money to pay our debts.

People living simply on Social Security are endangered, and yet millionaires and billionaires go on. Hedge fund guys, they earn billions of dollars—millions at least, billions for some—pay 15 percent, something called carried interest on their income, 15 percent. But the average person out there is paying 25, 26, 34 at the most; 15 percent for the richest guys in New York spending

money outrageously and the ones that almost brought this economy down.

Somebody asked me, Is this thing going to pass?

I don't know. But I'll tell you this: In my life, and I hope nobody out here listening has had that situation, Mr. Speaker, I've had kidney stones. They're easier to pass than this.

Mr. Speaker, I've got a pain in my side.

#### CHANGING OUR FISCAL DIRECTION

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult time in the life of the people of this country. Families are hurting. Our economy is struggling. The economic policies of this administration have failed to turn around this Great Recession, as it has come to be known. And I believe that runaway Federal spending, deficits, and debt are a barrier to our economic recovery, a barrier to putting Americans back to work.

We have to change the fiscal direction of this government for this generation, for jobs for Americans today, and for future generations who are facing a mountain range of debt—a \$14 trillion national debt; \$1.65 trillion deficit this year alone.

As most of my colleagues know, I've fought against runaway spending on a bipartisan basis. I opposed Big Government plans when they were offered by Republican Presidents and in Republican Congresses, and I fought with equal vigor against the borrowing, the spending, the bailouts, and the takeovers of the recent Democratic Congress and this administration.

But now we come to another debt ceiling vote, and as the late Russell Kirk wrote, "Politics is the art of the possible." The American people are looking in and they know, if you owe debts, pay debts. We have to find a way to pay the Nation's bills. But the American people also know we have to find a way to set our Nation on a course of living within our means once again.

Now, I am still studying Speaker BOEHNER's proposal, but there is much that recommends it. I have long said that there should be no increase in the debt ceiling without real and meaningful spending cuts and reforms in the short term and in the long term.

□ 1100

In many respects, the deal negotiated with Senate leaders by Speaker BOEHNER meets that standard. There are no tax increases in the bill. After adjustments to the bill today, there will for certain, according to CBO, be dollar-for-dollar cuts for any increase in the debt ceiling. Also, there are spending caps, a commission, and the possibility of long-term entitlement reform. All of this commends the Boehner plan as an important first step toward fiscal discipline and reform.

There is also a call at some point to vote for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and it's my belief in the importance of that last element that brings me to the floor today. I rise to urge all of my colleagues to keep an open mind on the Boehner plan, but also to keep an open mind about bringing a balanced budget amendment to the floor that could enjoy broad bipartisan support.

Look, Washington, D.C., is not only broke; it's broken. The American people have seen both political parties run up deficits and debt, both political parties live outside the means of the American people, and they know in their heart of hearts that something is missing. I believe that's a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I've authored the spending limit amendment to the Constitution. I support the stout version of a balanced budget amendment that Republicans marked up and referenced in the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill, a spending limit cap, a supermajority on tax increases. But I don't think it takes any great insight to know that that bill will likely not get the 290 votes that we need to send it to the Senate and send it to the States.

So in addition to voting on that bill, with spending constraints and others, I believe the time has come to bring the historic balanced budget amendment back to the floor of the Congress. I believe there should be no increase in the debt ceiling unless this Congress does everything in its power to send a balanced budget amendment to the Senate and to the States for ratification. And I believe we have that moment.

I've talked to some of the most prominent Members of the Democrat minority in this Congress today, and they've expressed support for this amendment. The American people overwhelmingly support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

So I urge my colleagues to keep an open mind, keep an open mind to the Boehner plan. I'm continuing to study it and seeing if we can embrace it as an important first step on fiscal discipline and reform, finding a way to pay the Nation's bills, but change our fiscal direction. But I also encourage my colleagues to consider at some point in the near future, let us bring to this floor a balanced budget amendment that could enjoy broad bipartisan support, to know that we cannot only make progress for fiscal discipline and reform, but we can make history by restoring to the national charter or placing in the national charter those restraints on spending that this Nation's Capitol, under both parties, desperately needs.

#### THE DEFAULT CRISIS AND HOW IT IMPACTS JOBS

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in American history we are at the brink of compromising the full faith and credit of the United States Government—the pledge that America has made to be the strongest, most trustworthy economy in the world, the promise that we will always keep our word and pay back the money we have already spent.

And why are we on the brink of a default crisis? Is it because of a natural disaster that has devastated our Nation? Is it because of a catastrophic national security threat? Is it because of another meltdown of our financial system like the one we saw in 2008? No.

The default crisis is for none of these reasons. Instead, it is a crisis wholly manufactured by my Republican colleagues, who are holding our economy hostage to pursue a radical agenda. This is an agenda that seeks to continue the Bush policies of wars and tax cuts paid for by undoing the New Deal, shrinking the social safety net, and pulling the rug out from under millions of Americans who are still struggling to recover from a financial crisis that was created by Wall Street.

Mr. Speaker, the debt ceiling is being used as political leverage to pursue this agenda. Remember, the debt ceiling was raised 18 times under President Reagan and seven times under President George Bush. Instead of this phony crisis, we should be debating the real crisis facing this Nation, the crisis that is consistently named as the number one concern of American taxpayers, that is, the jobs crisis.

Today, about 14 million people are unemployed, wages are declining, and home values are still plummeting. The unsurprising result is consumers aren't buying, businesses don't need to hire as many workers. And the cycle continues. In minority communities, these problems are even worse, with over 16 percent of African Americans and 11 percent of Hispanics out of work. In fact, just yesterday, the Pew Research Center reported that while all households lost wealth during the recession, minority families experienced disproportionate losses, and the wealth gap between minority and white households is actually growing. The median wealth of U.S. households in 2009 was \$13,000, compared to just over \$6,000 for Hispanics and \$5,600 for African Americans.

But to hear my Republican colleagues, it's as if these unemployed Americans are living in the shadows instead of the communities we represent. Because instead of pursuing a jobs agenda, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have proposed a continuation of failed Bush policies, this time on steroids. First under the Ryan budget, and now under these debt ceiling hostage negotiations, my Republican colleagues are pushing to cut Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, and job-creating domestic programs no matter the cost. Mr. Speaker, now is the time to invest in our communities, not retreat.

We need jobs to get people employed and get them back paying taxes to pay down our deficit. In fact, the Congressional Progressive Caucus is happy to provide for you, Mr. Speaker, a long list of ways to create jobs. We can create a new civilian conservation corps; we can close tax loopholes and bring jobs back from overseas; we can encourage investments in the new green economy; and we can provide incentives for businesses to train and hire the long-term unemployed. And guess what? We can do this while balancing the budget. In fact, the people's budget, offered by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, can balance our books at least 10 years before the Ryan budget.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to stand opposed to Republican efforts to perpetuate this default crisis and balance our budget on the backs of seniors and the middle class. It will amount to an unmitigated and unprecedented disaster to not only America's reputation, but to our capital markets, our job-creating businesses, and our economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I held two town hall meetings this past weekend on Saturday, one in the city of Inglewood and one in the area of Westchester. They made it very, very clear that they want us to increase this debt limit, they want us to get about the business of creating jobs, and they want to close tax loopholes for the richest corporations in America that receive tax breaks under the Bush administration. They are sick of us playing with this issue. They want us to do the people's business and look out for the interests of the least of these.

---

#### 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 o'clock and 8 minutes 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 Rick Postell, Christian Renewal Church, Brunswick, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come to You in Jesus' name on behalf of this great Nation. We ask for Your forgiveness of our transgressions and to thank You for Your blessings and favor upon America. Keep us mindful of Your word that "righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

Grant these Representatives wisdom to make decisions to strengthen our Nation, motivated more by Your hand

than by bipartisan concern. Grant them grace to listen to one another with open hearts and minds. May the clarity and charity of their words reflect respect for their colleagues. May their decisions of today not become future apologies, but may they be a statement of this Congress' character, their firm resolve, and a hope for a better America.

All this we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, Your Son, and our Savior.

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 New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SIREs 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.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 846. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse.

S. 1406. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 510 19th Street, Bakersfield, California, as the Myron Donovan Crocker United States Courthouse.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the request of the House that the Senate return to the House the bill (H.R. 1309) "An Act to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes."

#### WELCOMING PASTOR RICK POSTELL

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, our guest chaplain today is Mr. Rick Postell from Brunswick, Georgia. Rick is a native of Gastonia, North Carolina, and received his BS in business man-

agement from Troy State University and later a master's degree in theology from Beacon University in Columbus, Georgia. He currently lives in Brunswick, Georgia, with his wife, Amy, and their three children.

After graduating from school, Rick served in the United States Air Force base at Moody Air Force from 1981 to 1986. He traveled extensively well in the Air Force and worked on the aircraft maintenance unit while at Moody facilitating F-4 Phantom aircraft.

After his service in the Air Force, Rick served in the United States Post Office from 1986 to 2000. And then he joined the staff of Christian Renewal Church in Brunswick. He currently teaches religious studies at Heritage Christian Academy in Brunswick and has served as guest chaplain not only with us here today but in the Georgia State legislature on the Senate and on the House side.

He travels extensively and has been to Mexico many times on mission trips. His wife, Amy, is with him today along with 18-year-old Sam and 16-year-old Charlie and 14-year-old Hayley.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome with me Pastor Rick Postell.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### ANOTHER GLITCH

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Hill newspaper recently reported that there's another prominent glitch in last year's health care law. Millions of families could struggle to purchase insurance because of the sloppy manner in which the bill was written.

The law mandates that every individual pay insurance. If the insurance offered by an employer is deemed affordable by the government, then an employee must purchase it. However, the Federal Government will only look at the individual plans offered by companies—not the family plans. While the plan for an individual may be affordable, the family plan could be significantly more expensive.

Correcting this mistake in the law would mean at least \$50 billion more per year in government subsidies. The President told the American people that the new health care law would not increase the deficit. Now we find yet another example of how this bill will cost both American families and the Federal Government far more than what was claimed.

Clearly, we need full repeal before this law full of glitches and mandates is fully implemented, bankrupting families and the government.

#### GOP ADULT MOMENT IS LONG OVERDUE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, members of the House leadership have walked away from the negotiating table three times and continue to push their plan to cut Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid benefits, protect the top 2 percent of Americans at the expense of 98 percent of our families, pass a short-term deal that would lead to credit downgrade, higher interest rates, and a tax hike on every American and repeat this crisis next year.

Let me read you some emails that I've received:

"I'm a disabled 57-year-old gentleman who is restricted in a wheelchair. I thank God I live in a country where I am able to receive disability income like millions of other disabled Americans and Social Security recipients. I'm afraid if the Republican leadership gets their way, I'll soon be living on the street.

"I'm very concerned that the default would cause even more dire straits for the average homeowner/worker than even currently exists. That does not even count the repercussions that would result from higher interest rates, falling dollar in the global economy, and lower earnings on annuities and other investments, such as decreasing principles."

What we need is not a Republican plan or a Democratic plan; we need an American plan to deal with our debt that will take care of it so we don't have all of these dire consequences next Tuesday.

#### SPENDING CUTS SAVED CANADA—NOT HIGHER TAXES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in *The Wall Street Journal*, Fred Barnes documented on July 21 that in 1993 Canada faced a fiscal disaster similar to the one we're facing today. Government spending was on the rise, huge deficits were setting peacetime records, the economy was stagnant, an unemployment rate that was around 9 percent with interest payments on debt using 35 cents of every tax dollar.

The newly elected Prime Minister in 1993 listened to the voters by stating, "Canadians have told us they want the deficit brought down by reducing government spending, not by raising taxes, and we agree."

By cutting spending, the Canadian economy roared back from 1995 to 1998 and turned a \$36.6 billion deficit into a \$3 billion surplus. The Prime Minister was able to put aside partisan politics

and listen to the wishes of the Canadian people.

By leading in a manner that cut spending instead of raising taxes, the Prime Minister put Canada first. Our President should change from his failed policies and stop tax increases and destroying jobs.

#### REID VERSUS BOEHNER

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, we have less than 1 week to prevent our Nation from defaulting on its loans. Rather than focusing on a compromise, the majority has come up with yet another irresponsible plan to raise the debt ceiling and slash funding from programs that matter most to seniors and the middle class.

First, their budget tried to end Medicare and gut Medicaid, all the while protecting tax breaks for Big Oil and corporations that send jobs overseas. Then it was the so-called Cut, Cap, and Balance to achieve the same objectives.

Now the Speaker has put forward another plan that seeks the same goals so they can impose cuts on Medicare and Medicaid as well as set their sights on Social Security. This plan will keep the crisis going with a temporary increase in the debt ceiling, leaving the cloud of uncertainty over our economy.

We need to instead focus on the compromise plan that Majority Leader REID has presented to extend the debt ceiling through 2012 to provide certainty to the markets without hurting the economic recovery, as well as protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security from cuts.

Mr. Speaker, we must accept the compromise plan to raise the debt ceiling in order to prevent another recession and save jobs in America.

□ 1210

#### EPA GREEN MONEY GOES TO CHINA. HUH?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the past 10 years, the EPA has sent almost \$100 million in taxpayer money to fund green projects in foreign countries. In 2010 alone, the EPA gave 18 grants to our good friends, the Chinese. Why does the EPA do that? We owe the Chinese over \$1 trillion. Why are we adding to our debt in misguided hopes that they can clean up the smoggy skies in China with American grant money? There is more. Why is the Breathe Easy, Jakarta program in Indonesia the responsibility of the taxpayers in Houston, Texas? Well, it's not. I don't breathe easier knowing green money from the U.S. is financing green development in Indonesia.

At a time when we are facing "something" of a financial problem, we can't

afford to be trying to green the rest of the world too. I'm for protecting our environment, but we do not have the money to spend in hopes of controlling pollution in other countries. Let's green America first, not China.

And that's just the way it is.

#### JOBS

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, in the over 200 days since the majority has controlled this House, they have yet to bring a bill to the floor that would create jobs or help working families, not one. Not one bill to create jobs and build a stronger economy for the future. Not one bill to invest in education, innovation, or infrastructure. Instead, we have a partisan agenda to unfairly burden the middle class with deep cuts while preserving tax cuts for the wealthy and loopholes for Big Oil and corporations that ship jobs overseas. And to make things worse, the majority is threatening to force an unprecedented default on our Nation's debt.

A default would destroy close to 700,000 jobs, spike interest rates on credit cards and mortgages, and cause untold damage to our struggling economy. This is not what the markets are looking for, and it's certainly not what the American people want. They want us to help create jobs and reduce the deficit. They want us to compromise on a fair and balanced approach that doesn't just kick the can down the road. The American people are asking us today to put aside our differences for the good of this country. I support this responsible approach and urge my colleagues to do the same.

#### THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, America stands on the brink of our Nation's first default in history. Our economy is struggling. The Federal Government borrows \$188 million every hour of every day.

For too long, both parties have turned a blind eye to our government's budgetary mess. Washington needs to show the American people that we can deal with these challenges today and in the future. So far, it has failed to do so.

Congress and the President need to quit the partisan games and do what's in the best interest of America. The time to act is now. The American people demand nothing less.

#### BOEHNER DEBT LIMIT PROPOSAL

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I recently heard from a long-term care facility in my district that is set to build an additional location, creating over 100 construction jobs and increasing the number of seniors able to receive quality care. The financing was in place. But when my constituent met with his bank this week about moving forward, the bank put the deal on hold. With the threat of a U.S. default unresolved, the bank was concerned that the facility's payments from Medicare and Medicaid would stop, leaving them unable to repay their loan.

A 6-month extension, like the one being proposed, won't help my constituent reassure his bank or create the kind of long-term certainty needed in this still-fragile economy. I urge my colleagues to reject short-term proposals that push us to the brink of default again and again and call on the House to pass a plan that reduces the deficit while providing real long-term economic certainty to our financial markets, to our small businesses, and to the American people who need the jobs these businesses create.

#### DON'T FALL FOR THESE ACCOUNTING TRICKS

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the talk about raising the debt ceiling, I don't hear anyone talking about the most important factor in this equation, our unsustainable National debt. Everyone is focused on raising the debt ceiling, but if we truly want to get our economy back on its feet, we need to begin paying off the debt that President Obama and his predecessors have created.

It's obvious that our Democrat leaders in the White House and the Senate care more about making campaign speeches than about the livelihoods of the American people. Liberals want to raise taxes, but of course not until after the elections. And they want to sham us with talks about future cuts that we will never see materialize. It's like one big Ponzi scheme, and they're trying to get the American people to buy into it.

We need spending cuts now, and we need to pay down our outrageous debt. I urge both my colleagues and the American people not to fall for these accounting tricks.

#### WE CAN REVIVE THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it's been 29 weeks since Republicans took control of the House, and yet they have failed to bring a single jobs bill to the floor. In fact, I just learned that their proposals are estimated to cost another

2 million lost jobs. Instead, they're wasting time pushing bills that will never become law but do make their position clear. Republicans are willing to hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage in order to push for extreme policies that will gut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and devastate the economy and the middle class while doing everything they can to protect millionaires and billionaires and companies that ship American jobs overseas.

We need to raise the debt ceiling and then turn our attention to the real crisis, the jobs crisis. We can revive the American Dream. We must.

#### ROADBLOCKS TO THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the 14.1 million Americans who are unable to find jobs.

This administration's reckless spending policies, massive bailouts, and excessive regulations have driven the unemployment rate to an astounding 9.2 percent. Democrats have shown again and again that they care more about the bureaucrats that prevent jobs than the businesses that create them. Every year, unelected bureaucrats issue more than 3,000 final rules. That's close to 10 rules a day. Make no mistake, federally imposed rules consume precious time and resources. Businesses are less likely to invest and hire new employees. This is a recipe for failure.

Americans have always been a forward-thinking and innovative people. We're constantly looking ahead to the next breakthrough. Unfortunately, businesses now look over their shoulders instead of aiming for the horizon. The American Dream is still alive, Mr. Speaker; just ask the men and women who are pounding the pavement, polishing their resumes, and looking for paychecks. Americans are ready. We need to make Washington tear down the roadblocks.

#### THE DEBT CEILING

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican debt ceiling plan that will be considered later this week.

My Republican colleagues have brought a bill to the floor that would introduce statutory spending caps for the next 10 years with mandatory automatic cuts across the board to all programs if the cap is breached. Disguised as a solution, this cap would quickly become one of the most serious budgetary problems this country has ever faced. While a spending cap might sound responsible, in reality, caps don't balance budgets; caps trigger

massive unsustainable cuts. We tried this in California. The Republican spending cap jeopardizes our ability to improve our schools, rebuild the Nation's crumbling infrastructure, and invest in R&D.

A global spending cap is not a silver bullet for our budgetary woes. Far from being a budgetary cure-all, a drastic ceiling on spending would undermine our recovery when the economy gets better. So I urge my colleagues to abandon this hostage-taking on raising the debt ceiling and work with the President to lead us forward with a responsible debt reduction plan.

Besides forcing significant cuts to important programs, a cap would make it nearly impossible to restore services cut over the recession as our economy recovers or step in to respond to current or future economic challenges. This is not the time to be talking about capping spending at unsustainable levels that can never be raised again.

□ 1220

#### LET'S GET THE JOB DONE

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, the American people are depending on the Congress and the President to find a solution to the Nation's skyrocketing debt. Now is not the time for partisan rhetoric. Rather, now is the time for both sides to come together and work on finding a bold bipartisan plan to address the Nation's debt and debt ceiling.

One thing we can all agree on is default is not an option. We will and must pay our obligations. Small business owners who have worked their entire lives for sterling credit ratings would receive a devastating blow if Washington can't set aside their differences and come together on this important debate.

At a time when unemployment is at 9.2 percent, default is not an answer. We need to encourage the job creators of our country to invest and to hire, not paralyze them with even more economic uncertainty.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work on a bold plan. There's no reason that we cannot come together and work to cut spending and put our Nation back on the path to fiscal sanity. Americans across our country are depending on us to get the job done.

#### "COMPROMISE" IS A DIRTY WORD

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, when did the idea of "compromise" get to be a dirty word? When did the idea that "my way or the highway" is the only

way to go forward become the order of the day? We are at a stalemate because we cannot come to some basic ideas about how to move forward.

Here's the fact, absolute fact, irrefutable: We do not need to link and tie deficit reduction to raising the debt ceiling. They are independent necessities. They are two different things, and one does not have to be tied to the other. And when you link the two together, you are holding the full faith and credit of the United States hostage to a set of budgetary cuts.

This is a mistake. It is not statespersonship. It is not what we are elected to do.

Yes, we have to do deficit reduction, but it doesn't need to be linked to raising the debt ceiling. We should raise the debt ceiling now and then work on debt reduction.

How do we do that? We need more people paying taxes to reduce the deficit. That means jobs; that means infrastructure.

Let's get it done now. Raise the debt ceiling and pass a good infrastructure bill at the same time.

#### FIGHTING FOR LANDOWNERS IN THE SAN JOAQUIN DELTA

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to stand shoulder to shoulder with the landowners from the San Joaquin Delta who are fighting against the peripheral canal. Without permission, the State is sending its employees into private farmland to conduct surveys that the State needs to conduct studies to build a canal. Delta farmers are not standing for it. Delta farmers have taken the case to the courts, and I urge them to keep fighting for their property rights and the health of the delta.

A peripheral canal or tunnel that takes large amounts of fresh water from the delta would devastate our families, our farmers, and our businesses in our community. A canal will cause saltwater intrusion, destroy thousands of acres of farmland, and devastate our water quality.

It's time for our State and Federal agencies to respect the delta and its people. We won't tolerate anything less.

#### RECOGNIZING YOUTH INTERNATIONAL DAY AND THE CELEBRATION OF INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize International Youth Day and to honor youth leaders in Rhode Island as we celebrate the culmination of the International Youth Year.

Since 1999, when the U.N. designated August 12 as a day to recognize the integral role youth have played in sustainable progress, we have commemorated the importance of young people getting involved in our global, regional, and national development.

In celebrating the many milestones of the youth of today, we also honor the lives and work of those who led them, and Rhode Island has so many fantastic youth leaders. One such example is my friend, Franklin Rodriguez, the Minister of Youth Affairs in the Dominican Republic and the president of the Ibero-American Organization of Youth, who has joined us here today in the gallery.

Under Franklin's leadership, the Ministry of Youth has worked to engage and empower Dominican American youth in Rhode Island by collaborating with the Community College of Rhode Island to provide training opportunities and honoring outstanding young civic and educational leaders in the community with their Youth Excellence Award.

Many of Rhode Island's Dominican residents are young people who have contributed to the cultural, economic, and social development of our State in so many ways. For this reason, I'm honored to recognize International Youth Day, the leaders of the youth movement, and the culmination of International Youth Year.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

#### ONGOING VIOLENCE IN SYRIA

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly condemn the Syrian regime's recent hostility towards both the United States and the Syrian people. The courageous visit by U.S. Ambassador Robert Ford to Hama, the site of massive antiregime protests, demonstrates that the United States stands by those who advocate for democracy and freedom.

Days after Ford's visit, the American Embassy in Damascus endured several violent pro-regime demonstrations, resulting in considerable damage. Had the Syrian security forces acknowledged their international obligations, these rioters in support of President Assad would not have been able to approach the embassy. By responding poorly, Assad has conveyed disrespect towards the United States.

I applaud Secretary of State Clinton's recent tough stance toward Assad, declaring that his regime "has lost legitimacy."

Time and time again, Assad, like his father before him, has turned to arresting, torturing, and killing anyone who

would stand in the way of his tyranny. Therefore, with the best interests of the Syrian people in mind, I call on President Assad to resign as President.

#### COMMEMORATING NATIONAL YOUTH SPORTS WEEK

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate National Youth Sports Week and to welcome several exceptional student athletes joining us in the gallery. The Baltimore SquashWise program and their leader, a local lacrosse star, are here to help us celebrate.

Moments ago I was joined by Hockey Hall of Famer Pat LaFontaine, former Redskin Ken Harvey, youth sports leaders and coaches to unveil the "F.A.N.S. for Youth Sports" legislative agenda to address fitness, access, nutrition, and safety.

Student athletes make better grades, get in less trouble, and are less likely to be obese. Sports shape the character of each child who walks onto the field.

I'm especially pleased that some of our Nation's top sports programs, including the NFL, the NHL, the PGA, and the U.S. Tennis Association, among others, are supporting this agenda. This agenda represents a renewed commitment to our Nation's youth.

Children are the best investment we can make in our future. We should never be too busy to help a child. Let's celebrate together National Youth Sports Week.

#### EXTEND FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FUNDING

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Saturday morning at midnight, following 20 previous clean extensions, funding for the Federal Aviation Administration was allowed to expire.

Why did this happen? Simple. Just like the Republican Party's lack of leadership over the debt ceiling debate, they absolutely refuse to compromise to extend funding for the FAA. For them, this debate is theoretical. Yet for the 4,000 Americans throughout the Nation who are paid out of the FAA trust fund that will not be paid, and tens of thousands who are affected by the cancellation of the airport construction projects, this situation is real. For the State of Florida, that includes over 3,000 airport construction jobs lost and 27 FAA employee jobs, 19 of them in the Orlando International Airport.

Let me just be clear. The reason that the FAA extension was not renewed is because the House Transportation Committee chair, Mr. MICA, inserted

language into the FAA extension bill that would end the program that provides subsidies to rural airports.

Shame, shame, shame on the Republican leadership in this House.

#### REBUILDING THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I am from Colorado, and in Colorado, just like all across the country, Americans believe that if they work hard, if they play by the rules, if they're responsible in how they conduct their lives, they're going to get ahead.

Well, it's been very tough here recently. We've had a downturn. We have all this uncertainty because of, I believe, Republican brinksmanship to either shut down the government or maybe shut down the economy.

People want to get ahead. They want to know that this country will continue to innovate, educate, and rebuild itself so that we have good, long-lasting jobs that provide for our families. That's what Democrats stand for. We don't stand for all this brinksmanship every day.

Are we going to have a government or are we not? Are we going to have an economy or are we not? That's got to change. We have got to get back to rebuilding the American Dream.

□ 1230

#### SANTIAGO CANYON COLLEGE

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to extend well-deserved congratulations to Santiago Canyon College's Imagine Cup team.

Earlier this month, Team Syntax Errors accomplished what many thought they would never do. First of all, we're talking about a community college. And especially with the cuts happening in California to these wonderful colleges we have, they went and they competed against 430 of the best universities in the world. In addition to that competition, this community college is a gem for our community.

Santiago Canyon's Team Syntax Errors proved that hard work and determination can make impossible dreams come true. They placed within the top 15 universities in the world. I am very proud of these students, and I admire their ambition. They are true role models for all of our young students striving to succeed in an ever-changing, ever-global world.

It is my honor to recognize Hayden Donze, Bill Vetter, Gary Kelley, and Dale Laizure for their remarkable accomplishments. Congratulations.

HAPPY 350TH BIRTHDAY TO  
SCHENECTADY, NY

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and celebrate the city of Schenectady on the occasion of its 350th birthday.

Originally inhabited by the Mohawk tribe and then the Dutch, Schenectady's rich history has often served as an inspiration and genesis for many of America's accomplishments.

In the late 1800s, Thomas Edison moved Edison Machine Works to Schenectady, where advances led to new products, including the manufactured light bulb. Later becoming the headquarters of General Electric, Schenectady also played host to the former home of ALCO, the American Locomotive Company. These two developments prompted the community to be dubbed "the city that lights and hauls the world" and the "electric city."

Today, Schenectady is an important part of New York's Tech Valley, a nationwide leading region committed to green technology. From steam turbines to advanced batteries, Schenectady continues to lead the country with a focus on ingenuity and innovation, proving we can "Make it in America."

I am pleased to applaud the city of Schenectady on the rich history and numerous achievements it has accrued as we celebrate the wonderful 350th birthday of this community. I look forward to many bright and booming days to come.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

ESTABLISHING SPECIAL ENVOY  
FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN  
THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH  
CENTRAL ASIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 440) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 440

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

**SECTION 1. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) Seven Baha'i leaders in Iran have been wrongfully imprisoned since 2008.

(2) In May 2010, suspected terrorists attacked two mosques in Pakistan belonging to the Ahmaddiya minority Muslim sect, killing at least 80 people. Ahmadis consider themselves Muslim, but Pakistani law does not recognize them as such.

(3) Said Musa, an Afghan Christian convert, was arrested in May 2010 on charges of apostasy, a crime which can carry the death sentence, and was released in February 2011 only after sustained international pressure.

(4) On October 31, 2010, gunmen laid siege on Our Lady of Salvation Church in Baghdad, Iraq killing at least 52 police and worshippers, including two priests, making it the worst massacre of Iraqi Christians since 2003.

(5) Iraq's ancient and once vibrant Christian population that numbered an estimated 1,500,000 out of a total population in Iraq of 30,000,000 in 2003 has been reduced by at least one half, due in significant part to Christians fleeing the violence.

(6) In November 2010, a Pakistani court sentenced Aasia Bibi, a Christian mother of five, to death under the country's blasphemy law for insulting the Prophet Muhammad.

(7) On New Year's Eve 2010, 23 people were killed when a suicide bomber attacked a Coptic Christian church in Alexandria, Egypt.

(8) On March 2, 2011, Pakistani Federal Minorities Minister Shahbaz Bhatti, the only Christian member of the Cabinet, who was outspoken in his opposition to Pakistan's blasphemy laws was assassinated by extremists.

(9) The Department of State's 2010 International Religious Freedom Report stated that many religious minority groups in Uzbekistan "faced heavy fines and/or short jail terms for violations of restrictive religion laws".

(10) The Special Envoy for Anti-Semitism, Hannah Rosenthal, has noted that Holocaust glorification "is especially virulent in the Middle East media".

(11) A number of countries in the Middle East have recently undergone popular revolutions which in some countries have left security vacuums making religious minorities especially vulnerable to violent attacks, such as—

(A) in March 2011, the Shahedin Church in Helwan province, Egypt, was torched, leading to protests which spurred sectarian clashes in the streets of Cairo;

(B) on March 20, 2011, a group of Salafists in Upper Egypt cut off a Christian man's ear and burned his home and car; and

(C) news reports from April 2011 indicate that Salafi organizations in Egypt have been implicated in the destruction of Sufi shrines across the country fueling violent conflict.

(12) Many of these ancient faith communities are being forced to flee the lands which they have inhabited for centuries.

(13) The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom has recommended that Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan be designated by the Department of State as Countries of Particular Concern in accordance with the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998.

(14) The situation on the ground in the region continues to develop rapidly and the United States Government needs an individual who can respond in kind and focus on the critical situation of religious minorities in these countries.

**SEC. 2. SPECIAL ENVOY TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA.**

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President shall appoint a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia (in this Act referred to as the "Special Envoy") within the Department of State.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Special Envoy should be a person of recognized distinction in the field of human rights and religious freedom and with expertise in the Near East and South Central Asia regions. The Special Envoy shall have the rank of ambassador and shall hold the office at the pleasure of the President.

(c) PROHIBITION.—The person appointed as Special Envoy may not hold any other position of Federal employment for the period of time during which the person holds the position of Special Envoy.

**SEC. 3. DUTIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Special Envoy shall carry out the following duties:

(1) Promote the right of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia, denounce the violation of such right, and recommend appropriate responses by the United States Government when such right is violated.

(2) Monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(3) Work to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia are addressed, including the economic and security needs of such communities to the extent that such needs are directly tied to religious-based discrimination and persecution.

(4) Work with foreign governments of the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia to address laws that are inherently discriminatory toward religious minority communities in such countries.

(5) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(6) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by section 102(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the duties under subsection (a), the Special Envoy shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration of the Department of State, the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and other relevant Federal agencies and officials.

**SEC. 4. DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION.**

Subject to the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, the Special Envoy is authorized to represent the United States in matters and cases relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia in—

(1) contacts with foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations, and specialized agencies of the United Nations, the

Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(2) multilateral conferences and meetings relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

**SEC. 5. PRIORITY COUNTRIES AND CONSULTATION.**

(a) **PRIORITY COUNTRIES.**—In carrying out this Act, the Special Envoy shall give priority to programs, projects, and activities for Egypt, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—The Special Envoy shall consult with domestic and international nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations and institutions, as the Special Envoy considers appropriate to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

**SEC. 6. FUNDING.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the amounts made available for “Diplomatic and Consular Programs” for fiscal years 2011 through 2015, \$1,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for each such fiscal year for the hiring of staff, for the conduct of investigations, and for necessary travel to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) **FUNDING OFFSET.**—To offset the costs to be incurred by the Department of State for the hiring of staff, for the conduct of investigations, and for necessary travel to carry out the provisions of this Act for fiscal years 2011 through 2015, the Secretary of State shall eliminate such positions within the Department of State, unless otherwise authorized or required by law, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to fully offset such costs.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for “Diplomatic and Consular Programs” to carry out this Act.

**SEC. 7. SUNSET.**

This Act shall cease to be effective beginning on October 1, 2015.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. **SMITH**) and the gentleman from California (Mr. **BERMAN**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. **SMITH** of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 440, a bill to establish a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

The bill is authored by my very good friend and colleague, Congressman **FRANK WOLF**, who was also the author of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1988 and other religious freedom legislation. He has taken the lead in Congress time and time again to advance the cause of those who are persecuted because of their faith. I wish to thank him for his years of service on this issue—his legislation and his tireless advocacy on behalf of religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this bill establishes the special envoy position for religious minorities in 31 Middle Eastern and South Central Asian countries, almost all of which have had bad or very bad records of persecuting or disadvantaging religious minorities. The special envoy

will represent the United States in contacts with foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations, U.N. agencies, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and in contacts with international organizations and multilateral conferences. He or she will also meet with victims and try to take their story to offending governments to try to end the abuse.

We know from experience, Mr. Speaker, that special envoys, including and especially for Sudan and Northern Ireland, have achieved unparalleled successes over the years in mitigating explosive situations and literally saving lives all while pursuing positive and durable solutions to what appear to be intractable and unresolvable problems.

But not all special envoys have been equally effective. Almost everything depends on whom the President appoints to the position. So I would appeal to the President: When this bill becomes law, appoint someone with the passion, energy, and experience to get this job done and to stand up as never before for these persecuted minorities.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will speak about different religious minorities in the Middle East, but I am particularly concerned about the Coptic minority in Egypt. They have been called the bellwether of the rights for religious minorities in the Middle East. As the largest and one of the oldest minorities, they are suffering, and their escalating agony portends suffering throughout the region.

And make no mistake, they are suffering. On Friday of last week, I chaired a hearing specifically to hear of the needs and experiences of the Copts during this time during transition. What I heard and what my colleagues heard on the Helsinki Commission worried us deeply. Coptic women and girls, some as young as 14, are being systematically lured from their families or kidnapped off the street corners and forced to change their religion and forced to marry outside of their community. These young girls frequently suffer physical and psychological abuse, including rape, beatings, forced isolation, and lack of personal freedom both before and after their so-called “marriage/conversion.” The drugging of victims appears to be commonplace.

One story that emerged at the hearing detailed the situation of a married woman who was forced to leave her Coptic community and marry a Muslim. Her family was present at the official inquiry—which are no longer conducted, I might point out—and said that she showed signs of being drugged. She was out of it. Over and over she repeated, “I had to do it for the children. I had to do it for the children.”

Dr. Michele Clark, an internationally recognized anti-trafficking expert—she was one of those who led the Protection Project at Johns Hopkins and was director of the OSCE trafficking efforts for years—she authored a report called

“The Disappearance, Forced Conversions, and Forced Marriages of Coptic Christian Women in Egypt.” She testified that this happens to thousands of Coptic women and girls each and every year. She said this on Friday. Others also concurred in that analysis.

Dr. Clark further testified that the mounting evidence shows that the term “alleged”—which has been used in the U.S. State Department Reports on Human Rights Practices, as well as in the TIP report—needs to be replaced. It’s no longer even close to being accurate. It’s not an allegation; it’s a fact that she herself, as a human rights investigator, has helped to establish by doing extensive investigation and inquiries on the ground in Egypt.

She pointed out that the criminality of alleged forced marriages and conversions is generally dismissed by authorities here and everywhere else, especially in Egypt. The coverup must end. Young women are presumed to be willing participants, they are not. The abduction and the disappearance of Coptic women and girls follow, as she puts it, consistent patterns and constitutes human trafficking—modern day slavery.

Dr. Clark testified that men and women and peers are used to build trust and dispel resistance in young women targeted for conversion in marriage. Most cases documented in the report begin with a trusting relationship that ultimately leads to the disappearance or abduction, marriage to a Muslim man, and conversion to Islam. These supposed new friends exploit the vulnerability and naivete of a young Coptic woman.

Once trust has been established, girls are lured to an isolated place, drugged and kidnapped. Often they are raped. Following the rape, the Coptic women experience shame and fear of how their families will respond. They become more willing to stay with the Muslim friends. They feel that they have been so abused. And then they often marry their rapist because they feel they have nowhere else to go. This outrageous abuse must be exposed and stopped—and these young women rescued.

□ 1240

Let me just point out to my colleagues, what is going on in Egypt and the abuses being experienced by Christians and people of the Baha’i faith in Iran and elsewhere, we need to do much more than we have done to combat this, to speak out, to do effective chronicling, but also, once you get the information, to ensure that it is actionable and that you take it to those governments. Sadly, we have not done that. A special envoy would be uniquely equipped and empowered to take the cause of the beleaguered, suffering religious minorities in the Middle East and to fight, and to fight every day of the week for those people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **BERMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I yield

myself as much time as I may consume.

This bipartisan legislation creates a special envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. Housed at the State Department, the special envoy would be responsible for monitoring and combating acts of religious intolerance, engaging with foreign governments to address laws that discriminate against religious minorities, and working to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities are being addressed.

This bill is important because religious minority communities all around the world, but particularly in the Near East and South Central Asia, are facing increased attacks and increased persecution. For example, Iraq used to have a significant number of religious minorities, including Christians, Yazidis, Sabean Mandaeans, Baha'is, Shabaks, Kaka'is, and a small number of Jews. These groups have been subject to escalating violence, persecution, and discrimination for their religious beliefs, and today they comprise only about 3 percent of Iraq's population. By some estimates, half of Iraq's Christian population has fled since 2003.

In November of 2010, a Pakistani court sentenced Aasia Bibi, a Christian and mother of five, to death under the country's blasphemy law. And what was her offense? In June 2009, she was asked to get water for herself and a group of women working in the fields with her. The other laborers objected to a non-Muslim touching the water bowl and an argument ensued. That group of women later falsely accused Aasia of speaking ill of the prophet Mohammed in order to settle a personal score against her. Aasia remains in prison awaiting review of her death sentence.

When Punjab's Governor Salman Taseer had the courage to demand that Aasia be pardoned, one of his own bodyguards killed him. Two months later, when Pakistan's Minister for Minorities, Shahbaz Bhatti, condemned the blasphemy law, militants executed him in broad daylight.

In Egypt, as the gentleman from New Jersey has stated, 23 men, women, and children were killed in a bombing at an Alexandria church in Egypt on New Year's Eve. Just last May, extremists attacked Christians at St. Mina Church in Cairo, leaving 12 dead and hundreds wounded.

I wish these were isolated cases, but I could provide countless other examples, from Afghanistan, to India, to Saudi Arabia. We're fortunate to live in a country that was founded by religious refugees on principles of tolerance, but it is important that we do everything we can to ensure that religious minorities elsewhere in the world enjoy the freedoms and protections they deserve, the freedoms and protections enjoyed by all Americans. Appointing this special envoy will be an

important step in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce-Justice-Science for the Appropriations Committee, the author of H.R. 440, the gentleman from Virginia, FRANK WOLF.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank Chairman ROSLEHTINEN for her support, Mr. BERMAN for his support, and Mr. SMITH for his help. I also want to thank some key staff members whose hard work and efforts on the bill have not gone unnoticed: Elyse Anderson, Kalinda Stephenson, Yleem Poblete, Steve Stombres, and also Kyle Nevins with the majority leader's office. They have been very, very helpful, and I am grateful for their help.

This past January, in the wake of increasing violence, targeted attacks, and heightened discrimination against Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq and Egypt, and persistent concerns in Afghanistan and Pakistan, among other nations, I introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 440, which would require the administration to appoint a special envoy to advocate for religious minorities in the Middle East and South Central Asia in order to make this issue a foreign policy priority.

Since introduction, this legislation has garnered widespread bipartisan support with nearly 80 cosponsors. I want to thank ANNA ESHOO, the lead Democrat in the House, for her work on this. Also, companion legislation has been introduced now by Senators ROY BLUNT and CARL LEVIN. The legislation has also been championed by a host of faith-based organizations and diaspora communities, who recognize the importance of ensuring that the vulnerable communities have an advocate within the U.S. Government and around the world.

Shortly before introducing this legislation, I chaired a hearing at the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission on the recent spate of attacks and the ongoing persecution of Christians in Iraq and Egypt. Commission members heard testimony about the increasing sectarian tensions in the two countries and the need for greater U.S. attention to the plight of religious minorities. The hearing was held prior to recent events in the Middle East which have, in some cases, created a political vacuum that have left religious minorities particularly vulnerable. I heard this fear expressed time and again during a recent trip to Egypt.

Religious minorities throughout the region, including those who are Jewish, Ahmadis, Baha'is, are under increasing pressure. In fact, many of these ancient faith communities have been forced to flee the lands that they have inhabited for centuries.

Consider some of the following:

Last October, at least 70 people were killed during a siege on Our Lady of Salvation Church in Baghdad, making it the worst massacre of Iraqi Christians since 2003.

Iraq's once vibrant Christian community population has been reduced by at least half since 2003. This would be tragic under any circumstances, but it is especially so given the rich ancestral heritage of this indigenous community.

Apart from Israel, the lands and peoples of modern-day Iraq are mentioned with greater frequency in the Bible than any other country. Abraham, Jonah, Nineveh, Esther, and Daniel all hail from Iraq. The Christians of Iraq today still speak Aramaic, the language that Jesus spoke.

In Afghanistan and Pakistan, countries where the United States has invested its treasure and the lives of countless brave American soldiers, persecution of Christians runs rampant.

On November 7 last year, a Pakistani court sentenced Aasia Bibi, a Christian mother of five, to death for the crime of blasphemy. Only after intervention by the international community was her execution delayed. Her fate still remains, at this moment, unclear.

Pakistan's blasphemy laws are often used to victimize both religious minorities and Muslims. Earlier this year, Punjab's influential Governor, Salman Taseer, was shot and killed by his own bodyguard, who reportedly told police that he, quote, killed Mr. Taseer because of the Governor's opposition to Pakistan's blasphemy law.

In April, Pakistan's Federal Minister for Minority Affairs, Shahbaz Bhatti, a heroic man of faith whose courageous and outspoken leadership against his nation's draconian blasphemy law made him a prime target of extremist Islamist elements in his country, was assassinated. Bhatti was the only Christian member of the Pakistani Cabinet.

□ 1250

In an interview with The Washington Post's Fred Hiatt, Shahbaz Bhatti "urged Americans not to forsake or forget" Pakistan's suffering religious minority community.

Members of the Jewish faith continue to experience discrimination and persecution throughout the region. The Special Envoy for Anti-Semitism, Hannah Rosenthal, has noted that Holocaust glorification "is especially virulent in the Middle East media."

If the international community fails to speak out, the prospects for religious pluralism and tolerance in the region are bleak. I urge my colleagues' support for this bill, and again thank the leadership on both sides for making this legislation a priority. I am hopeful that this bill will overwhelmingly pass the House and send a clear and unequivocal message to both the persecutors and the persecuted that the United States of America stands with those whose most basic freedom—the right to

worship according to the dictates of conscience—is under assault.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), who brought this bill to my attention and has worked with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) to put it together and bring it to this point. She is deeply committed on this issue and a very great Member of Congress.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank Mr. BERMAN, our distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for not only yielding me this time but for his conscience, because that indeed is what this is about, and his unflinching leadership on so many issues. Your endorsement and strong support of this bill I think bolsters it enormously, and says to the entire House that a person that is steeped in the background of the issues of the entire world is for this.

I want to pay tribute to Mr. WOLF for his incredible advocacy on this issue relative to religious minorities for so long. It is an honor to have worked with you to bring this to a realization of not only legislation but to bring it to the floor. I salute you. You are a gentleman; and you, too, are a man of great conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I think today we are here on something that really distinguishes the United States of America. From the founding of our Nation, religious freedom has been a pillar of our democracy, and it remains one of the most critical exports of our great Nation. I think having said that really establishes the foundation of why we are here in strong support of H.R. 440. This bill, as my colleagues have said, will create a special envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and South Asia. The legislation responds to the very urgent needs of Christians and other religious minorities who are under siege. When I say that, I underscore it. They are under siege in the Middle East. Again, I commend everyone, especially Mr. WOLF, who has been part of this effort. And as a cochair of the Religious Minorities Caucus and all of the members of it, I thank them as well.

In January of this year, Representative WOLF chaired a hearing to review the violence and the hardships faced by Middle Eastern religious minorities. I was privileged to testify that day about the plight of many people, but most especially the Assyrians. I am of both Assyrian and Armenian descent, and the language Mr. WOLF spoke of, Aramaic, I speak fluently and understand very well. It is the language, as he said, that Jesus spoke. These are the world's oldest Christians, and they are quickly disappearing from Iraq. During this hearing, we also learned of Egypt's Coptic Christian population and the renewed threats they face and unacceptable violence in that uncertain political situation.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. At the conclusion of the hearing, we agreed to press forward with this legislation to create a special envoy at the State Department, someone at the ambassador level to elevate this issue for the attention it deserves. We need a high-level official dedicated to religious freedom in the region, committed to addressing the concerns of the minority communities.

I am very, very pleased that this legislation has attracted very solid bipartisan support. We have 78 cosponsors, an even split between Republicans and Democrats, all calling for the State Department to elevate religious freedom in the Middle East as a diplomatic priority. There is a history for this. Senator John Danforth served our Nation as special envoy to Sudan, and Senator George Mitchell as special envoy to Northern Ireland, so there is precedent for this.

I want to speak of a meeting I had in my office last week. Three Dominican nuns, sisters who traveled from Iraq, and they once again relayed their story of what is happening to them. They have been dispersed across Iraq. They teach everyone regardless of their background, Muslims, Christians, no matter what the background is. And in their hospitals, they care for whomever is sick and wounded. And yet their convents have been burned, the statue of the Blessed Mother's hands chopped off and placed at their door. So these threats are very real. They are very real. That is just one example of it.

So this history of violence must and should be dealt with. As I said, our great Nation, our great Nation treasures its religious freedoms, and it is part of the core of our democracy. So that's why I urge all of my colleagues to join us, not just me but all of us, in supporting this important legislation. The message that will go forward from this Chamber, with all of the other issues that are swirling around us, is that we stand with great dignity for one of the great principles of our great Nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who both here and abroad fights against persecution and discrimination against religious minorities.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 440, a bill to provide for the establishment of a special envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman FRANK WOLF and Congresswoman ESHOO, for introducing this legislation and for their tireless leadership on this critical issue.

Ethno-religious minorities continue to face a crisis in Iraq, where attacks

and violence against Christians continue. My district is home to a large and vibrant Assyrian population, and they regularly share with me the devastating stories of their friends and family members still living in Iraq who are facing threats because of their faith. In November 2010, over 1,500 protesters demonstrated in Chicago, sending a powerful message about the need to protect Iraqi minorities.

By creating a special envoy specifically focused on the rights of religious minorities in the region, this legislation is an important step toward ending the cycle of violence.

To date, the U.S. Government and the international community unfortunately have failed to provide security for Iraqi ethno-religious minorities. Iraqi Christians continue to fear for their physical safety, as well as for the survival of their communities and culture. Of a population that numbered 1.4 million people before the American-led invasion, there are now less than 500,000 Iraqi Christians in the country.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 440 is a critical step toward addressing the threat against Iraqi ethno-religious minorities. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

□ 1300

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Since 1947, 49 million Hindus in Bangladesh have gone missing, according to Professor Sachi Dastidar. A recent Hindu American Foundation report concluded that the "Hindus of Bangladesh continue to be victims of daily acts of murder, rape, kidnapping, temple destruction, and physical intimidation."

Dr. Richard Benkin, an authority on human rights abuses in Bangladesh, has described to me on several occasions the atrocities and human rights abuses suffered by Bangladeshi Hindus that he personally has verified. Other groups, like the Christian Assyrians in Iraq's Nineveh province, the suffering of the Baha'i prisoners in Iran, and millions of others who seek to practice their religion in peace, look to the United States as a beacon of hope. I believe this bill helps us answer that important call. H.R. 440 will create a powerful diplomatic tool for the promotion of religious freedom and human rights in the volatile regions of the Near East and South Central Asia.

I thank the gentleman for his bill, and I urge support for this meaningful legislation.

Mr. BERMAN. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to rise in support of H.R. 440, a bill to establish a special envoy to promote religious freedom of religious minorities in the Near East and

South Central Asia. As a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation and as a member of the Religious Minorities of the Middle East Caucus, I strongly support its passage.

While many parts of the Near East and Southeast Asia are predominantly Muslim, historically these areas have been home to a diverse group of ethnic and religious minorities. Whether it is Chaldeans, Syrians, and Assyrians in Iraq, Baha'i in Iran, Copts in Egypt, or the Hindus in Pakistan, religious minorities have for centuries lived and worshipped alongside their Muslim countrymen and women.

Unfortunately, instability in the Middle East has had a disproportionately negative impact on religious minorities. The most striking example of this has been in Iraq, where more than half of the Iraqi Christian population has been forced to flee the country since the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Those who have stayed have been specifically targeted in gruesome and random acts of violence, such as murder, rape, and abduction.

This includes religious and community leaders like Archbishop Rahho, who was kidnapped and murdered. Religious minorities have also suffered attacks in their places of worship, such as the October 2010 massacre at Our Lady of Salvation Church in Baghdad, in which 58 worshipers were killed by militants and extremists.

While the end of the Mubarak regime in Egypt has brought about the promise for democratic reform, it has also given rise to instability and acts of violence against religious minorities. Coptic Christians have lived peacefully in this part of the world for centuries. Sadly, in recent months, Coptic churches and protesters have also been targeted for violence.

Freedom of religion is something we take for granted here in the United States. Our citizens are free to worship however they please, without fear that they will be targeted for violence because of their religious beliefs. I'm honored to represent Michigan's Ninth Congressional District, which is home to an amazingly diverse population. We have Jewish synagogues, Islamic mosques, Hindu temples, and Christian churches of almost every kind imaginable. This diversity is a source of strength in our community, and something my constituents are very proud of. Many of my constituents have relatives in Near East or South Central Asia and they wish that they, too, had the same freedom to worship that so many of us take for granted. They are desperate to see the United States take more leadership in promoting religious tolerance overseas.

That is why the legislation we're debating today is so important. It creates a permanent special envoy that will work on behalf of the President and the Secretary of State to advance the cause of religious minorities abroad. This individual will be able to ensure that the United States is fully engaged

to fight to protect religious minorities in other countries and to help hold our own government accountable when that should be done.

I would like to thank Representative WOLF, who is not only the author of this legislation but also the cochair of the Religious Minorities of the Middle East, a tireless champion on behalf of vulnerable populations. I would also like to thank my friend, Representative ESHOO, who is also a cochair of the caucus and a true champion for religious minorities in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that the United States will be vigilant in promoting religious tolerance and freedom around the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I simply ask the House to pass what is I think an important bill because we only have to read what is going on recently to understand this is a rapidly increasing and severe problem that affects those countries deeply in terms of the conflict's intentions. I think much good can come from having someone focused on these issues in that region.

I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. I rise to urge this Chamber to support H.R. 440, a bill that requires the President to appoint a special envoy at the State Department to advocate for religious minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this matter.

I have personally met with oppressed people from all over the globe, but predominantly ones from the Near East and South Asia. The region has long been a hot-bed of religious discrimination, and little has been done by our government to aid these innocent practitioners of faith. Revolutions striving for democracy and greater expression in the region have been matched by a wake of religious intolerance and extremism. As we cherish our right to the free expression of religion here at home, our State Department needs to reflect our dedication to protecting this right in our diplomatic engagements abroad.

Religious minorities in Egypt, Iraq, Iran, and countless other countries are left without an advocate in the political process of their respective governments. H.R. 440 would provide an envoy that can advocate for these religious minorities and focus solely on their plight while being able to avoid bureaucratic red tape. As basic human rights are increasingly under assault in this region, our government needs to rapidly respond to the new challenges rapidly emerging. It is in our strategic interest to pass this legislation. I ask the Members to join me in supporting it.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 440.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a bipartisan bill, which I support. I would just note—and I know the gentleman's long history with mine of advocating for human rights and religious freedom in Vietnam. I hope that we can follow up this great effort with a similar effort really specifically oriented toward the religious oppression that's going on in Vietnam against the Buddhists, against the Cao Dai, against the Catholics and many others. I commend the gentleman for this bill. I just wanted to raise that issue in the hopes that it can be addressed at a later date.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of religious freedom for minorities in the Middle East and South Central Asia must be of the highest priority. For far too long, religious minorities and the persecution and marginalization they endure has been overlooked, even trivialized. Their rights and even their very lives must now be assiduously protected in this time of political upheaval, especially in the Middle East.

Mr. WOLF had the foresight to draft this bill before the so-called Arab Spring. It was needed in January. It's even more needed now, especially in light of the spate of church bombings and escalated persecution against believers, especially with kidnappings of thousands each and every year of Coptic Christian teenage girls, who are then forced to convert to Islam and forced to "marry" a Muslim man.

□ 1310

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. The Middle East is at a critical juncture. We are witnessing the systematic extinction of centuries-old religious communities. South and Central Asia are also systematically failing their religious minorities.

The late Shahbaz Bhatti, Federal Minister for Minorities in Pakistan, gave his life to fight the injustices and atrocities suffered by the religious minorities in Pakistan. The Government of Pakistan has since abolished the Ministry for Minorities, perhaps under the false impression that it does not matter in relations with the United States.

A Special Envoy for religious minorities sends the right message at the right time, and empowers a diplomat with access to the President and to, hopefully, all the leaders throughout

the region and to all those who are disenfranchised. The rights of religious minorities matter, and we will not look askance during this perilous time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of H.R. 440, a bill to establish a Special Envoy to promote religious freedom for minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, because no one should be made to feel that the practice of their religion is a crime or a source of shame.

Around the world, people are persecuted in the name of one religion against another. Such persecution not only violates their inalienable right to worship as they choose; it also creates instability in many places around the world. Many conflicts are rooted in sectarian differences and rivalries. To the extent the United States can promote religious tolerance, we advance the cause of human rights, justice and peace around the globe.

This bill creates a special envoy in order to monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities and to work with foreign governments to address laws that are inherently discriminatory toward religious minority communities.

As we speak, there are minorities all over the world who live in fear for their lives merely because they practice a different religion than those around them. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 440.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 440, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1315

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey). Pursuant to

House Resolution 363 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. 2584.

□ 1316

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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 26, 2011, the bill had been read through page 56, line 22.

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. CLARKE of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. DICKS of Washington.

An amendment by Mr. TONKO of New York.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. DOLD of Illinois.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. REED of New York.

An amendment, as modified, by Mr. SCALISE of Louisiana.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 251, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 651]

AYES—173

Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)
Altmire	Blumenauer	Chu
Andrews	Boswell	Cicilline
Baca	Brady (PA)	Clarke (MI)
Baldwin	Brady (IA)	Clarke (NY)
Bass (CA)	Brown (FL)	Clay
Becerra	Butterfield	Cleaver
Benishek	Camp	Clyburn
Berkley	Capps	Cohen
Berman	Capuano	Conyers
Biggert	Carnahan	Costello
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Courtney

Critz	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Ryan (WI)
DeFazio	Levin	Sánchez, Linda T.
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Deutch	Loeb sack	Schakowsky
Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Schrader
Dingell	Lowey	Schwartz
Doyle	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Duffy	Maloney	Scott, David
Edwards	Markey	Sensenbrenner
Ellison	Matsui	Serrano
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Sewell
Eshoo	McDermott	Shuler
Farr	McGovern	Sires
Fattah	Meeks	Slaughter
Filner	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Frank (MA)	Miller (MI)	Speier
Fudge	Miller (NC)	Sutton
Garamendi	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Gibson	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	Murphy (CT)	Thompson
Gutierrez	Nadler	Tonko
Hahn	Napolitano	Towns
Hanabusa	Neal	Tsongas
Hastings (FL)	Oliver	Upton
Higgins	Owens	Van Hollen
Himes	Pallone	Velázquez
Hinojosa	Pascrell	Visclosky
Hirono	Pastor (AZ)	Walberg
Hochul	Paulsen	Walz (MN)
Holt	Payne	Wasserman Schultz
Honda	Pelosi	Waters
Hoyer	Peters	Watt
Huizenga (MI)	Peterson	Waxman
Inslee	Petri	Welch
Israel	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (FL)
Jackson (IL)	Polis	Woolsey
Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)	Wu
Johnson, E. B.	Quigley	Yarmuth
Kaptur	Rangel	
Keating	Reed	
Kildee	Rogers (MI)	
Kind	Rothman (NJ)	

NOES—251

Adams	Culberson	Harper
Aderholt	Cummings	Harris
Akin	Davis (KY)	Hartzler
Alexander	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Amash	Dent	Hayworth
Austria	DesJarlais	Heck
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Heinrich
Barletta	Doggett	Hensarling
Barrow	Dold	Herger
Bartlett	Donnelly (IN)	Herrera Beutler
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Holden
Bass (NH)	Duncan (SC)	Huelskamp
Berg	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Bilbray	Ellmers	Hunter
Bilirakis	Emerson	Hurt
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Issa
Black	Fincher	Jackson Lee
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	(TX)
Bonner	Flake	Jenkins
Bono Mack	Fleischmann	Johnson (IL)
Boren	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Boustany	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Jones
Brooks	Fortenberry	Jordan
Broun (GA)	Foxx	Kelly
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burgess	Gallely	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Calvert	Garrett	Kissell
Campbell	Gerlach	Kline
Canseco	Gibbs	Labrador
Cantor	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Capito	Gohmert	Lance
Cardoza	Gonzalez	Lankford
Carter	Goodlatte	Latham
Cassidy	Gosar	LaTourette
Castor (FL)	Gowdy	Latta
Chabot	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Chandler	Graves (MO)	Long
Coble	Green, Al	Lucas
Coffman (CO)	Green, Gene	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Griffin (AR)	Lujan
Conaway	Griffith (VA)	Lummis
Connolly (VA)	Grimm	Lungren, Daniel E.
Cooper	Guinta	Mack
Cravaack	Guthrie	Manzullo
Crawford	Hall	Marchant
Crenshaw	Hanna	

Marino Pompeo Sessions  
 Matheson Posey Sherman  
 McCarthy (CA) Price (GA) Shimkus  
 McCaul Quayle Shuster  
 McClintock Rahall Simpson  
 McCollum Rehberg Smith (NE)  
 McHenry Reichert Smith (NJ)  
 McIntyre Renacci Smith (TX)  
 McKeon Reyes Southerland  
 McKinley Ribble Stover  
 McMorris Richardson Stivers  
 Rodgers Richmond Stutzman  
 McNeerney Rigell Sullivan  
 Meehan Rivera Terry  
 Mica Roby Thompson (PA)  
 Miller (FL) Roe (TN) Thornberry  
 Miller, Gary Rogers (AL) Tiberi  
 Moran Rogers (KY) Tipton  
 Mulvaney Rohrabacher Turner  
 Murphy (PA) Rokita Walden  
 Myrick Rooney Walsh (IL)  
 Neugebauer Ros-Lehtinen Webster  
 Noem Roskam West  
 Nugent Ross (AR) Westmoreland  
 Nunes Ross (FL) Whitfield  
 Nunnelee Royce Wilson (SC)  
 Olson Runyan Wittman  
 Palazzo Scalise Wolf  
 Paul Schiff Womack  
 Pearce Schilling Woodall  
 Pence Schmidt Yoder  
 Perlmutter Schock Young (AK)  
 Pitts Schweikert Young (FL)  
 Platts Scott (SC) Young (FL)  
 Poe (TX) Scott, Austin Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann Giffords McCotter  
 Buerkle Hinchey Stark  
 Costa Landry

□ 1340

Messrs. CONNOLLY of Virginia, MORAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Messrs. ROHRABACHER, and MCINTYRE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BECERRA, DUFFY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. LEE 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. DICKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) 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 224, noes 202, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 652]

AYES—224

Ackerman Biggert Buchanan  
 Altmire Bilbray Butterfield  
 Andrews Bishop (GA) Capps  
 Baca Bishop (NY) Capuano  
 Baldwin Blackburn Carnahan  
 Barrow Blumenauer Carney  
 Bartlett Boren Carson (IN)  
 Bass (CA) Boswell Castor (FL)  
 Bass (NH) Brady (PA) Chandler  
 Becerra Braley (IA) Chu  
 Berkley Brooks Cicilline  
 Berman Brown (FL) Clarke (MI)

Clarke (NY) Hoyer  
 Clay Inslee  
 Cleaver Israel  
 Clyburn Jackson (IL)  
 Cohen Jackson Lee  
 Connolly (VA) (TX)  
 Conyers Johnson (GA)  
 Cooper Johnson (IL)  
 Costello Johnson, E. B.  
 Courtney Kaptur  
 Critz Keating  
 Crowley Kildee  
 Cuellar Kind  
 Cummings Roybal-Allard  
 Davis (CA) King (NY)  
 Davis (IL) Kissell  
 DeFazio Kucinich  
 DeGette Lance  
 DeLauro Langevin  
 Dent Larsen (CT)  
 Deutch LaTourette  
 Dicks Lee (CA)  
 Dingell Levin  
 Doggett Lewis (GA)  
 Dold Lipinski  
 Donnelly (IN) LoBiondo  
 Doyle Loebsack  
 Edwards Lofgren, Zoe  
 Ellison Lowey  
 Engel Lujan  
 Eshoo Lynch  
 Farr Maloney  
 Fattah Markey  
 Finer Matheson  
 Fitzpatrick Matsui  
 Fortenberry McCarthy (NY)  
 Frank (MA) McCollum  
 Frelinghuysen McDermott  
 Fudge McGovern  
 Garamendi McIntyre  
 Gerlach McNeerney  
 Gibson Meehan  
 Gonzalez Meeke  
 Green, Al Michaud  
 Green, Gene Miller (MI)  
 Grijalva Miller (NC)  
 Grimm Miller, George  
 Gutierrez Moore  
 Hahn Moran  
 Hanabusa Murphy (CT)  
 Hanna Nadler  
 Harris Napolitano  
 Hastings (FL) Neal  
 Hayworth Olver  
 Heinrich Owens  
 Herrera Beutler Pallone  
 Higgins Pascrell  
 Himes Pastor (AZ)  
 Hinojosa Payne  
 Hirono Pelosi  
 Hochul Perlmutter  
 Holden Peters  
 Holt Petri  
 Honda Pingree (ME)

NOES—202

Adams Chaffetz Gohmert  
 Aderholt Coble Goodlatte  
 Akin Coffman (CO) Gosar  
 Alexander Cole Gowdy  
 Amash Conaway Granger  
 Austria Cravaack Graves (GA)  
 Bachus Crawford Graves (MO)  
 Barletta Crenshaw Griffin (AR)  
 Barton (TX) Culberson Griffith (VA)  
 Benishek Davis (KY) Guinta  
 Berg Denham Guthrie  
 Bilirakis DesJarlais Hall  
 Bishop (UT) Diaz-Balart Harper  
 Black Dreier Hartzler  
 Bonner Duffy Hastings (WA)  
 Bono Mack Duncan (SC) Heck  
 Boustany Duncan (TN) Hensarling  
 Brady (TX) Ellmers Heger  
 Broun (GA) Emerson Huelskamp  
 Bucshon Farenthold Huizenga (MI)  
 Buerkle Fincher Hultgren  
 Burgess Flake Hunter  
 Burton (IN) Fleischmann Hurt  
 Calvert Fleming Issa  
 Camp Flores Jenkins  
 Campbell Forbes Johnson (OH)  
 Canseco Foyx Johnson, Sam  
 Cantor Franks (AZ) Jones  
 Capito Gallegly Jordan  
 Cardoza Gardner Kelly  
 Carter Garret King (IA)  
 Cassidy Gibbs Kingston  
 Chabot Gingrey (GA) Kinzinger (IL)

Kline Nunes  
 Labrador Nunnelee  
 Lamborn Olson  
 Landry Palazzo  
 Lankford Paul  
 Latham Paulsen  
 Latta Pearce  
 Lewis (CA) Pence  
 Long Peterson  
 Lucas Pitts  
 Luetkemeyer Poe (TX)  
 Lummis Pompeo  
 Lungren, Daniel Posey  
 E. Price (GA)  
 Mack Quayle  
 Manzullo Reed  
 Marchant Rehberg  
 Marino Renacci  
 McCarthy (CA) Ribble  
 McCaul Rigell  
 McClintock Rivera  
 McHenry Roby  
 McKeon Roe (TN)  
 McKinley Rogers (AL)  
 McMorris Rogers (KY)  
 Rodgers Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher Rogers (WI)  
 Miller (FL) Rokita  
 Miller, Gary Rooney  
 Mulvaney Ros-Lehtinen  
 Murphy (PA) Roskam  
 Myrick Ross (FL)  
 Neugebauer Royce  
 Noem Ryan (WI)  
 Nugent Scalise

NOT VOTING—6

Bachmann Giffords McCotter  
 Costa Hinchey Stark

□ 1345

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) 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 184, noes 238, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 653]

AYES—184

Ackerman Castor (FL) Dicks  
 Alexander Chandler Dingell  
 Altmire Chu Doyle  
 Andrews Cicilline Edwards  
 Austria Clarke (MI) Ellison  
 Baca Clarke (NY) Engel  
 Baldwin Clay Farr  
 Barletta Cleaver Filner  
 Barrow Clyburn Fitzpatrick  
 Bass (CA) Cohen Fleming  
 Becerra Connolly (VA) Frank (MA)  
 Bishop (GA) Conyers Frelinghuysen  
 Bishop (NY) Costello Fudge  
 Blumenauer Courtney Garamendi  
 Boswell Critz Gerlach  
 Boustany Crowley Gibbs  
 Braley (IA) Cuellar Gibson  
 Butterfield Davis (CA) Goodlatte  
 Capps Davis (IL) Green, Al  
 Capuano DeGette Green, Gene  
 Carnahan DeLauro Grijalva  
 Carney Dent Gutierrez  
 Carson (IN) Deutch Hahn

Hanna	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda	Pitts	Ross (AR)	Thompson (CA)	Matheson	Posey	Scott, Austin
Hayworth	Marino	T.	Platts	Ross (FL)	Thompson (MS)	McCarthy (CA)	Price (GA)	Scott, David
Heinrich	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta	Poe (TX)	Royce	Thornberry	McClintock	Quayle	Sensenbrenner
Higgins	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes	Polis	Runyan	Tiberi	McHenry	Rehberg	Sessions
Himes	McCollum	Schakowsky	Pompeo	Ryan (WI)	Tipton	Miller (FL)	Renacci	Smith (NE)
Hinojosa	McDermott	Schiff	Posey	Scalise	Upton	Mulvaney	Ribble	Southerland
Hirono	McGovern	Schilling	Price (GA)	Schmidt	Walden	Murphy (PA)	Roby	Stearns
Hochul	McNerney	Schock	Quayle	Schweikert	Walsh (IL)	Myrick	Roe (TN)	Stivers
Holden	Meehan	Schwartz	Reed	Scott (SC)	Wasserman	Neugebauer	Rogers (MI)	Stutzman
Holt	Meeks	Scott, David	Rehberg	Scott (VA)	Schultz	Nunnelee	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Honda	Michaud	Serrano	Reyes	Scott, Austin	Webster	Olson	Rokita	Walberg
Hoyer	Miller (MI)	Sherman	Ribble	Sensenbrenner	West	Palazzo	Roskam	Walsh (IL)
Israel	Miller (NC)	Shuler	Rigell	Sessions	Westmoreland	Paul	Royce	Webster
Jackson Lee	Moran	Sires	Rivera	Sewell	Whitfield	Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
(TX)	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter	Roby	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)	Pence	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)	Roe (TN)	Shuster	Womack	Petri	Schilling	Wittman
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Speier	Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Woodall	Poe (TX)	Schweikert	Yoder
Jones	Napolitano	Stivers	Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Yoder	Pompeo	Scott (SC)	
Kaptur	Neal	Sutton	Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)				
Kelly	Oliver	Thompson (PA)	Rohrabacher	Southerland	Young (AK)			
Kildee	Owens	Tierney	Rokita	Stearns	Young (FL)			
King (NY)	Palazzo	Tonko	Rooney	Stutzman	Young (IN)			
Kingston	Payne	Towns	Ros-Lehtinen	Sullivan				
Kinzinger (IL)	Pelosi	Tsongas						
Kissell	Peters	Turner						
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Van Hollen						
Lance	Quigley	Velázquez	Bachmann	McCotter	Terry	Ackerman	Dingell	Lewis (CA)
Langevin	Rahall	Visclosky	Crenshaw	Schrader	Waters	Adams	Doggett	Lewis (GA)
Larson (CT)	Rangel	Walberg	Giffords	Smith (WA)		Aderholt	Dold	Loebsack
LaTourette	Reichert	Walz (MN)	Hinchev	Stark		Akin	Donnelly (IN)	Loftgren, Zoe
Lee (CA)	Renacci	Watt				Alexander	Doyle	Lowey
Levin	Richardson	Waxman				Andrews	Dreier	Lucas
Lewis (GA)	Richmond	Welch				Austria	Edwards	Lujan
Lipinski	Roskam	Wilson (FL)				Baca	Ellison	Lummis
LoBiondo	Rothman (NJ)	Wittman				Bachus	Ellmers	Lungren, Daniel
Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard	Wolf				Baldwin	Emerson	E.
Lowey	Ruppersberger	Woolsey				Barlow	Engel	Lynch
Lujan	Rush	Wu				Bartlett	Eshoo	Maloney
Lynch	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth				Barton (TX)	Farr	Markey
						Bass (CA)	Fattah	Matsui
						Bass (NH)	Filner	McCarthy (NY)
						Berkley	Fitzpatrick	McCaul
						Berman	Fleischmann	McCollum
						Biggert	Fleming	McDermott
						Bilirakis	Forbes	McGovern
						Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	McIntyre
						Black	Frank (MA)	McKeon
						Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	McKinley
						Blumenaue	Fudge	McMorris
						Bonner	Gallegly	Rodgers
						Boren	Garamendi	McNerney
						Boswell	Gerlach	Meehan
						Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	Meeks
						Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Mica
						Bralley (IA)	Granger	Michaud
						Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Miller (MI)
						Buchanan	Green, Gene	Miller (NC)
						Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	Miller, Gary
						Butterfield	Grijalva	Miller, George
						Calvert	Grimm	Moore
						Camp	Guinta	Moran
						Cantor	Guthrie	Murphy (CT)
						Capito	Gutierrez	Nadler
						Capps	Hahn	Napolitano
						Capuano	Hanabusa	Neal
						Cardoza	Hanna	Noem
						Carnahan	Harper	Nugent
						Carson (IN)	Harris	Nunes
						Carter	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
						Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Owens
						Chandler	Heck	Pallone
						Chu	Herrera Beutler	Pascarell
						Ciilline	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
						Clarke (MI)	Himes	Paulsen
						Clarke (NY)	Hinojosa	Payne
						Clay	Hirono	Pelosi
						Cleaver	Hochul	Perlmutter
						Clyburn	Holden	Peters
						Coble	Holt	Peterson
						Cohen	Honda	Pingree (ME)
						Cole	Hoyer	Pitts
						Connolly (VA)	Inslee	Platts
						Conyers	Israel	Polis
						Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
						Costa	Jackson Lee	Quigley
						Courtney	(TX)	Rahall
						Cravaack	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
						Crawford	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
						Crenshaw	Jones	Reichert
						Critz	Kaptur	Reyes
						Crowley	Keating	Richardson
						Cuellar	Kildee	Richmond
						Culberson	Kind	Rigell
						Cummings	King (NY)	Rivera
						Davis (CA)	Kissell	Rogers (AL)
						Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Rogers (KY)
						Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Rooney
						DeFazio	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
						DeGette	Langevin	Ross (AR)
						DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ross (FL)
						Dent	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
						DesJarlais	Latham	Roybal-Allard
						Deutch	LaTourette	Ryunan
						Diaz-Balart	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger
						Dicks	Levin	Rush

## NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann  
Crenshaw  
Giffords  
Hinchev  
McCotter  
Schrader  
Smith (WA)  
Stark  
Terry  
Waters

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

□ 1349

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.  
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 294, answered “present” 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 654]

AYES—131

Altmire	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Bartlett	Farenthold	Hunter
Benishkek	Fincher	Hurt
Berg	Flake	Issa
Bilbray	Flores	Jenkins
Bishop (NY)	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Bono Mack	Gardner	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Kelly
Brooks	Gibbs	King (IA)
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Kingston
Buerkle	Gohmert	Kinzingler (IL)
Burgess	Goodlatte	Kline
Burton (IN)	Gosar	Labrador
Campbell	Gowdy	Landry
Canseco	Graves (GA)	Lankford
Cantor	Hultgren	Latta
Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Lipinski
Cardoza	Pascarell	LoBiondo
Carter	Pastor (AZ)	Long
Cassidy	Paul	Luetkemeyer
Chabot	Paulsen	Mack
Chaffetz	Pearce	Manzullo
Coble	Pence	Marchant
Coffman (CO)	Perlmutter	Marino
Cole	Peters	
Conaway	Peterson	
Cooper	Petri	
Costa	Pingree (ME)	
Cravaack		
Crawford		
Culberson		
Cummings		
Davis (KY)		
DeFazio		
Denham		
DesJarlais		
Diaz-Balart		
Doggett		

## NOES—294

Ackerman	Dingell	Lewis (CA)
Adams	Doggett	Lewis (GA)
Aderholt	Dold	Loebsack
Akin	Donnelly (IN)	Loftgren, Zoe
Alexander	Doyle	Lowey
Andrews	Dreier	Lucas
Austria	Edwards	Lujan
Baca	Ellison	Lummis
Bachus	Ellmers	Lungren, Daniel
Baldwin	Emerson	E.
Barlow	Engel	Lynch
Bartlett	Eshoo	Maloney
Barton (TX)	Farr	Markey
Bass (CA)	Fattah	Matsui
Bass (NH)	Filner	McCarthy (NY)
Berkley	Fitzpatrick	McCaul
Berman	Fleischmann	McCollum
Biggert	Fleming	McDermott
Bilirakis	Forbes	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	McIntyre
Black	Frank (MA)	McKeon
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	McKinley
Blumenaue	Fudge	McMorris
Bonner	Gallegly	Rodgers
Boren	Garamendi	McNerney
Boswell	Gerlach	Meehan
Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	Meeks
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Mica
Bralley (IA)	Granger	Michaud
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Miller (MI)
Buchanan	Green, Gene	Miller (NC)
Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	Miller, Gary
Butterfield	Grijalva	Miller, George
Calvert	Grimm	Moore
Camp	Guinta	Moran
Cantor	Guthrie	Murphy (CT)
Capito	Gutierrez	Nadler
Capps	Hahn	Napolitano
Capuano	Hanabusa	Neal
Cardoza	Hanna	Noem
Carnahan	Harper	Nugent
Carson (IN)	Harris	Nunes
Carter	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Owens
Chandler	Heck	Pallone
Chu	Herrera Beutler	Pascarell
Ciilline	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Clarke (MI)	Himes	Paulsen
Clarke (NY)	Hinojosa	Payne
Clay	Hirono	Pelosi
Cleaver	Hochul	Perlmutter
Clyburn	Holden	Peters
Coble	Holt	Peterson
Cohen	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Cole	Hoyer	Pitts
Connolly (VA)	Inslee	Platts
Conyers	Israel	Polis
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Costa	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Courtney	(TX)	Rahall
Cravaack	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Crawford	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Crenshaw	Jones	Reichert
Critz	Kaptur	Reyes
Crowley	Keating	Richardson
Cuellar	Kildee	Richmond
Culberson	Kind	Rigell
Cummings	King (NY)	Rivera
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Rogers (AL)
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Rogers (KY)
Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Rooney
DeFazio	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
DeGette	Langevin	Ross (AR)
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ross (FL)
Dent	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
DesJarlais	Latham	Roybal-Allard
Deutch	LaTourette	Ryunan
Diaz-Balart	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Levin	Rush

Ryan (OH) Smith (NJ) Walden Owens Rush Tonko  
 Sanchez, Linda Smith (TX) Walz (MN) Paulsen Ryan (OH) Towns  
 T. Smith (WA) Wasserman Peters Ryan (WI) Turner  
 Sanchez, Loretta Speier Schultz Peterson Sarbanes Upton  
 Sarbanes Sullivan Waters Schakowsky Velázquez  
 Schakowsky Sutton Watt Schilling Visclosky  
 Schiff Terry Waxman Schock Walberg  
 Schmidt Thompson (CA) Welch Schrader Walsh (IL)  
 Schock Thompson (MS) West Scott (VA) Walz (MN)  
 Schrader Thompson (PA) Whitfield Sensenbrenner Wasserman  
 Schwartz Tiberi Quigley Serrano Schultz  
 Scott (VA) Tierney Rangel Shimkus Waters  
 Serrano Tipton Wolf Shuster Welch  
 Sewell Tonko Womack Renacci Wilson (FL)  
 Sherman Towns Woodall Ribble  
 Shimkus Tsongas Woolsey Rogers (MI)  
 Shuler Shuler Wu Rooney  
 Shuster Upton Yarmuth Roskam  
 Simpson Van Hollen Young (AK)  
 Sires Velázquez Young (FL)  
 Slaughter Visclosky Young (IN)

Adams Diaz-Balart Lee (CA)  
 Aderholt Dicks Lewis (CA)  
 Akin Doyle Lewis (GA)  
 Alexander Duncan (SC) Lofgren, Zoe  
 Amash Duncan (TN) Long  
 Andrews Edwards Lowey  
 Austria Ellison Lucas  
 Baca Ellmers Luetkemeyer  
 Bachus Emerson Lujan  
 Barletta Eshoo Lummis  
 Barrow Farenthold Lungren, Daniel  
 Bartlett Fattah E.  
 Barton (TX) Filner Lynch  
 Bass (CA) Fincher Mack  
 Becerra Fitzpatrick Maloney  
 Berg Flake Marchant  
 Berkley Fleischmann Markey  
 Berman Fleming Matheson  
 Bilbray Flores Matsui  
 Bilirakis Forbes McCaul  
 Bishop (GA) Portenberry McClintock  
 Bishop (UT) Foeux McCollum  
 Black Frank (MA) McDermott  
 Blackburn Franks (AZ) McGovern  
 Blumenauer Frelinghuysen McHenry  
 Bonner Fudge McIntyre  
 Bono Mack Gallegly McKeon  
 Boren Garamendi McKinley  
 Boustany Gardner McMorris  
 Brooks Gohmert Rodgers  
 Broun (GA) Goodlatte McNERNEY  
 Brown (FL) Gosar Meehan  
 Buchanan Gowdy Meeks  
 Bucshon Granger Mica  
 Buerkle Graves (GA) Miller (FL)  
 Burgess Graves (MO) Miller (NC)  
 Burton (IN) Green, Al Miller, Gary  
 Butterfield Green, Gene Miller, George  
 Calvert Grijalva Moran  
 Camp Guinta Mulvaney  
 Campbell Guthrie Murphy (CT)  
 Canseco Gutierrez Myrick  
 Cantor Hall Napolitano  
 Capito Hanabusa Neal  
 Capps Harper Neugebauer  
 Capuano Harris Noem  
 Cardoza Hartzler Nugent  
 Carnahan Hastings (FL) Nunnelee  
 Carney Hastings (WA) Olson  
 Carson (IN) Hayworth  
 Carter Heck Palazzo  
 Cassidy Hensarling Pallone  
 Castor (FL) Herger Pascarell  
 Chaffetz Herrera Beutler Pastor (AZ)  
 Chandler Himes Paul  
 Chu Hinojosa Payne  
 Clarke (NY) Hirono Pearce  
 Clay Holden Pelosi  
 Cleaver Holt Pence  
 Clyburn Hoyer Perlmutter  
 Coffman (CO) Huelskamp Pitts  
 Cohen Hurt Poe (TX)  
 Cole Insee Pompeo  
 Conaway Issa Posey  
 Connolly (VA) Jackson Lee Price (NC)  
 Costa (TX) Rahall  
 Courtney Jenkins Reed  
 Cravaack Johnson, E. B. Rehberg  
 Crawford Johnson, Sam Reyes  
 Crenshaw King (IA) Richardson  
 Cuellar Kingston Richmond  
 Culberson Kissell Rigell  
 Davis (CA) Labrador Rivera  
 Davis (KY) Lamborn Roby  
 DeFazio Langaney Roe (TN)  
 DeGette Lankford Rogers (AL)  
 DeLauro Larsen (WA) Rogers (KY)  
 DesJarlais Larson (CT) Rohrabacher  
 Deutch Latham Rokita

Ros-Lehtinen Sewell Tipton  
 Ross (AR) Sherman Tsongas  
 Ross (FL) Shuler Van Hollen  
 Rothman (NJ) Simpson Walden  
 Roybal-Allard Sires Watt  
 Royce Smith (NE) Waxman  
 Runyan Smith (NJ) Webster  
 Ruppertsberger Smith (WA) West  
 Sánchez, Linda Southerland Westmoreland  
 T. Speier  
 Sanchez, Loretta Stark Whitfield  
 Scalise Stearns Wilson (SC)  
 Schiff Stutzman Wittman  
 Schmidt Sullivan Wolf  
 Schwartz Terry Womack  
 Schweikert Thompson (CA) Woodall  
 Scott (SC) Thompson (MS) Woolsey  
 Scott, Austin Thompson (PA) Young (FL)  
 Scott, David Thornberry Young (IN)  
 Sessions Tierney

NOES—291

NOT VOTING—4

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—6

Bachmann Giffords McCotter  
 Becerra Hinchey Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1353

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) 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 137, noes 291, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 655]

AYES—137

Ackerman Dreier Jordan  
 Altmire Duffy Kaptur  
 Baldwin Engel Keating  
 Bass (NH) Farr Kelly  
 Benishek Garrett Kildee  
 Biggert Gerlach Kind  
 Bishop (NY) Gibbs King (NY)  
 Boswell Gibson Kinzinger (IL)  
 Brady (PA) Gingrey (GA) Kline  
 Brady (TX) Gonzalez Kucinich  
 Braley (IA) Griffin (AR) Lance  
 Chabot Griffith (VA) Landry  
 Cicilline Grimm LaTourette  
 Clarke (MI) Hahn Latta  
 Coble Hanna Levin  
 Conyers Heinrich Lipinski  
 Cooper Higgins LoBiondo  
 Costello Hochul Loeb sack  
 Critz Honda Manzullo  
 Crowley Huizenga (MI) Marino  
 Cummings Hultgren McCarthy (CA)  
 Davis (IL) Hunter McCarthy (NY)  
 Denham Israel Michaud  
 Dent Jackson (IL) Miller (MI)  
 Dingell Johnson (GA) Moore  
 Doggett Johnson (IL) Murphy (PA)  
 Dold Johnson (OH) Nadler  
 Donnelly (IN) Jones Nunes

Adams Diaz-Balart Lee (CA)  
 Aderholt Dicks Lewis (CA)  
 Akin Doyle Lewis (GA)  
 Alexander Duncan (SC) Lofgren, Zoe  
 Amash Duncan (TN) Long  
 Andrews Edwards Lowey  
 Austria Ellison Lucas  
 Baca Ellmers Luetkemeyer  
 Bachus Emerson Lujan  
 Barletta Eshoo Lummis  
 Barrow Farenthold Lungren, Daniel  
 Bartlett Fattah E.  
 Barton (TX) Filner Lynch  
 Bass (CA) Fincher Mack  
 Becerra Fitzpatrick Maloney  
 Berg Flake Marchant  
 Berkley Fleischmann Markey  
 Berman Fleming Matheson  
 Bilbray Flores Matsui  
 Bilirakis Forbes McCaul  
 Bishop (GA) Portenberry McClintock  
 Bishop (UT) Foeux McCollum  
 Black Frank (MA) McDermott  
 Blackburn Franks (AZ) McGovern  
 Blumenauer Frelinghuysen McHenry  
 Bonner Fudge McIntyre  
 Bono Mack Gallegly McKeon  
 Boren Garamendi McKinley  
 Boustany Gardner McMorris  
 Brooks Gohmert Rodgers  
 Broun (GA) Goodlatte McNERNEY  
 Brown (FL) Gosar Meehan  
 Buchanan Gowdy Meeks  
 Bucshon Granger Mica  
 Buerkle Graves (GA) Miller (FL)  
 Burgess Graves (MO) Miller (NC)  
 Burton (IN) Green, Al Miller, Gary  
 Butterfield Green, Gene Miller, George  
 Calvert Grijalva Moran  
 Camp Guinta Mulvaney  
 Campbell Guthrie Murphy (CT)  
 Canseco Gutierrez Myrick  
 Cantor Hall Napolitano  
 Capito Hanabusa Neal  
 Capps Harper Neugebauer  
 Capuano Harris Noem  
 Cardoza Hartzler Nugent  
 Carnahan Hastings (FL) Nunnelee  
 Carney Hastings (WA) Olson  
 Carson (IN) Hayworth  
 Carter Heck Palazzo  
 Cassidy Hensarling Pallone  
 Castor (FL) Herger Pascarell  
 Chaffetz Herrera Beutler Pastor (AZ)  
 Chandler Himes Paul  
 Chu Hinojosa Payne  
 Clarke (NY) Hirono Pearce  
 Clay Holden Pelosi  
 Cleaver Holt Pence  
 Clyburn Hoyer Perlmutter  
 Coffman (CO) Huelskamp Pitts  
 Cohen Hurt Poe (TX)  
 Cole Insee Pompeo  
 Conaway Issa Posey  
 Connolly (VA) Jackson Lee Price (NC)  
 Costa (TX) Rahall  
 Courtney Jenkins Reed  
 Cravaack Johnson, E. B. Rehberg  
 Crawford Johnson, Sam Reyes  
 Crenshaw King (IA) Richardson  
 Cuellar Kingston Richmond  
 Culberson Kissell Rigell  
 Davis (CA) Labrador Rivera  
 Davis (KY) Lamborn Roby  
 DeFazio Langaney Roe (TN)  
 DeGette Lankford Rogers (AL)  
 DeLauro Larsen (WA) Rogers (KY)  
 DesJarlais Larson (CT) Rohrabacher  
 Deutch Latham Rokita

Bachmann Giffords

Hinchey McCotter

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

□ 1356

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 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 237, noes 189, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 656]

AYES—237

Ackerman Camp Fitzpatrick  
 Adams Canseco Flake  
 Aderholt Cardoza Fleming  
 Akin Carnahan Flores  
 Altmire Carney Forbes  
 Baldwin Carson (IN) Fortenberry  
 Barrow Chabot Gallegly  
 Barton (TX) Chaffetz Gardner  
 Bass (NH) Chandler Garrett  
 Benishek Coble Gerlach  
 Berg Cohen Gibbs  
 Berkley Cooper Gibson  
 Biggert Costa Gingrey (GA)  
 Bilbray Cravaack Gohmert  
 Bishop (GA) Crawford Goodlatte  
 Bishop (NY) Critz Gosar  
 Bishop (UT) Crowley Graves (GA)  
 Bonner Cuellar Griffin (AR)  
 Bono Mack DeFazio Griffith (VA)  
 Boren Denham Grimm  
 Boswell Guinta Dent  
 Brady (PA) DesJarlais Guthrie  
 Brady (TX) Diaz-Balart Hahn  
 Braley (IA) Dold Hanna  
 Brooks Donnelly (IN) Harris  
 Buchanan Dreier Hartzler  
 Bucshon Duffy Hastings (FL)  
 Buerkle Duncan (TN) Hayworth  
 Burton (IN) Engel Heinrich  
 Calvert Fincher Hensarling



Rangel	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Reyes	Scott, David	Towns
Ribble	Serrano	Tsongas
Richardson	Sewell	Van Hollen
Rogers (KY)	Sherman	Velázquez
Ross (AR)	Shuler	Visclosky
Rothman (NJ)	Simpson	Walz (MN)
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Wasserman
Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Schultz
Rush	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Watt
Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Waxman
T.	Stark	Welch
Sanchez, Loretta	Sutton	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Wolfe
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Schiff	Thompson (PA)	Wu
Schrader	Tierney	Yarmuth
Schwartz	Tipton	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Bachmann	Hinchev
Giffords	McCotter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1406

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

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THORN-BERRY). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

YUKON-CHARLEY NATIONAL PRESERVE

SEC. 116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement or enforce regulations concerning boating and other activities on or relating to waters located within Yukon-Charley National Preserve, including waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, pursuant to section 3(h) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-2(h)) or any other authority. This section does not affect the authority of the Coast Guard to regulate the use of waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States within the Yukon-Charley National Preserve.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, beginning on line 23, strike section 116.

□ 1410

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 116 would prohibit the National Park Service from carrying out boat inspection or safety checks on the Yukon River within the Yukon-Charley National Preserve in Alaska. This provision was put in at the request of Mr. YOUNG from Alaska who is upset with the National Park Service law enforcement at the preserve.

Last summer, two park rangers arrested a 70-year-old following an altercation during a boat safety inspection. This case is still before the courts, but it has stirred considerable local anger, especially when it was learned that the

rangers had handcuffed but later released another local resident who refused to speak to rangers when approached.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska is a long-time friend of mine, and I am very hesitant to offer this amendment to strike his provision, but I think he has already won the case. The people there, the two rangers, have been reassigned to another duty, and the Park Service does have jurisdiction. I have discussed this with Chairman YOUNG, and the Park Service always has jurisdiction within the national park.

Now, the gentleman from Alaska suggested that the Coast Guard had jurisdiction or the State had jurisdiction, but we have checked this carefully. The Park Service has jurisdiction within the national preserve to look at safety on the river. I think it is wrong to prohibit a safety inspection for people whose lives are at risk up there.

I have been to Alaska many times. These rivers can be very dangerous, and to make sure that the people who are being conveyed—this is a commercial endeavor—the people who are being moved around in these boats are safe, the people who own the boats are safe, whether it is commercial or not.

So I would like to yield to the ranking member and discuss this amendment and the importance of it.

Mr. MORAN. Well, first of all, I would like to ask my good friend: Why is this not an earmark? Why is this not an earmark for one particular national preserve?

While we are considering that, perhaps Mr. YOUNG can come up with an explanation. And I share the ranking member's great affection for Mr. YOUNG. He is a good friend. But this also creates a precedent. Any time something happens on a national preserve or park land, they could come to the Congress and say, all right, no more inspections, and we could get a proliferation of these kinds of things specific to individual national reserves or parks.

The fact is that if the Park Service has jurisdiction, then they have responsibility. And I'll bet you anything that if we were to say there were to be no boat inspections, something's going to happen and some serious accident is going to occur, and then people are going to ask why in gosh name wasn't the Park Service there to do inspections? And it's going to go back to this, where we set a precedent of not allowing any boat inspection or safety check.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, the thing is this has happened before. I can remember one of our colleagues putting in a provision in one of these bills, I think it was the Merchant Marine and Fisheries bill years ago, about one of the boats that was going up to Alaska to fish in these very dangerous waters. This wasn't in the river; it was in the ocean. And that boat went down, and there were many questions raised about why that Member had prohibited

boat and safety inspections of that boat.

Now, I think the gentleman is completely right. This is a bad precedent. The gentleman from Alaska has already won. He has already gotten his view across with the Park Service. They have taken these rangers away. It's time to leave this. We're doing this amendment in the best interests of Mr. YOUNG. And if Mr. YOUNG would like to get up and explain this, I would like to hear his explanation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, Members of the body, with all due respect, this is about the State's rights. This bill does not preclude the State of Alaska, the Coast Guard, or any other entity from enforcement on the Yukon River. The Park Service can still move on the river. But it does not allow them to enforce inspections of boats on the river that are private. Not in business, but private.

And I have to tell you a little story about this. This is the reason I'm very adamant about it. The Park Service is for the people; it's not for the Park Service. The Park Service in Alaska has become, very frankly, I'd say, like an occupying army of a free territory. To give you an example, this man that was arrested was 70 years old with his wife, who happened to be from Germany—I'm going to bring that up a little later—and a couple. So 70 years old, 69 years old, 68 years old, on a cruise on the Yukon River in a very seaworthy boat, Coast Guard inspected. And there was another boat on the river and there was a distress signal given by the Park Service. Being a good Samaritan, they went over to help them out. As they approached the boat, they flashed their badges and said: We're the Park Service. We're going to board your vessel and inspect you for safety and registration.

Think about this. A distress signal, and then: We're going to board your boat.

And maritime law says you will not board a boat on a moving river. You have to put it to shore.

And the guy said: Up yours; I'm going to go to shore. And that's what he did.

And he gets to shore, he gets out of the boat. The rangers have already got a shotgun on a 70-year-old man, and carrying a pistol out of the holster. And as the guy walked toward them, they started to say something. He turned around and walked back. They tackled him and rolled him in the mud, a 70-year-old man. These are two young bucks—cowboys—and handcuffed this man, this 70-year-old man, and made him sit on the shore. And they took him a great distance down the river to a village and flew him to Fairbanks—drove him to Fairbanks—handcuffed.

This is your Park Service? This is not my Park Service.

Well, it did go to trial and the judge hasn't rendered his decision yet. In the first place, the State never gave them the authority to do any inspection. In the second place, they never gave them the authority—by the way, the Coast Guard did not give them authority. And they do not have jurisdiction over that water; that's State water. In every State in this Union, it's the State's water. To have the Park Service act like that is dead wrong.

So I'm asking you not to support this amendment. This is an amendment that shouldn't be adopted because we have agencies today who are acting, very frankly, like occupiers. The lady I brought up was from Germany. And during the trial they asked her, the prosecution: Did you ever have a gun pointed at you? And she said: Yes, by the SS troops.

Now, that gives you an idea. A 70-year-old lady and have them point a shotgun. Now, that's wrong.

You say it sets a precedent; yes, it sets a precedent because it's State's waters. This amendment should not be accepted. We should leave it in the bill as it is. It's the right thing to do.

I say vote down the amendment. Think about the little people. Quit thinking about these agencies. These agencies aren't God. Think about the little people. People are abused by agencies, and you're paying for them.

And by the way, the one ranger, the one ranger, had a record longer than my arms, and they hired him to enforce the so-called park regulations.

So I'm asking you to think about this a moment. It's the wrong amendment. This is the right thing to do. It's time we start telling these agencies: Think of the people, not the parks themselves.

□ 1420

This is about parks and partners. And they're certainly not partners in Alaska. They say: We're going to educate Alaskans about Alaska. Now, this is a 70-year-old man that had been living there all his life. And to have that happen is dead wrong.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, in response to my very good friend, it appears that the conduct—it appears—the conduct of these park rangers was wrong. So they have been reassigned. And I'm sure that whoever has responsibility now in that jurisdiction has been told you don't do this.

Now, these kinds of things happen all over the country, if not all over the world, clearly. Some people in authority abuse their power. It happens with local police departments. It happens with State police. It happens with other people with a badge. And so they get disciplined. Sometimes they get taken to court. But normally we don't

change national policy to deal with misconduct, if that's what it was, on the part of certain individuals. We don't change national policy. And that's what you're trying to do.

Let me put into this discussion and deliberation the fact that they had to go through national park land to get to that State water. They do. And the National Park Service runs the concessions. So the National Park Service does have responsibility for some of the vehicles on this water. They don't know if there's contraband stuff coming. They don't know what's on the vessel.

My guess is—I don't know for sure—my guess is it's very seldom that they're going to stop and board any boat. They would probably have to have some reason. I'm sure now, after this incident, they have to have very substantial reason. But it's entirely conceivable that at some point in the future they're going to have very substantial reason to stop and board a boat. And we have precluded their ability to carry out their responsibility.

So that's why we're concerned about the precedent. We're not concerned about the fact that if there was misconduct, that these folks have been reassigned. We're sure that the instructions that have been given by superiors have changed now to ensure that this incident is never repeated. But we really don't think that the solution is to change national policy, which would have repercussions for other national preserves around the country, and it might have very serious ramifications on this particular one in the future. We can't tell right now.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Again, I plead with my friend from Alaska. You have made your case. You have gotten the relief for your constituents. The rangers have been reassigned. Accept victory and don't give us an amendment that would undermine boat safety inspections. That's what this amendment does.

Let me read this amendment: No other funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement or enforce regulations concerning boating and other activities on or relating to waters located within Yukon Charlie National Preserve, including waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Pursuant to section 3(h) of public law, or any other authority.

Mr. MORAN. Reclaiming my time, it's clear that's not just the waterway. That includes all of the land. The entire park on this national preserve, they can't carry out their responsibilities. We're not just talking about the water.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It is not their responsibility. This is the State waters.

Mr. DICKS. It's within a national park.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor. Members will yield time appropriately to each other.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. I yield to my very good friend from Alaska to try to clarify what seems to be inextricable.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Again, this is Yukon Charlie, the Yukon River that was used by the Gold Rush people, has been used by Alaskans all these years without the Park Service. The State has authority over the waters. The Coast Guard has the authority for inspection. The State has the authority for registration, not the Park Service. This is navigable water that is our water. Now, the land is there on one side. But this is our water.

I have not won because I may have won a temporary battle, but there can be another park ranger—rangers. There can be another park superintendent that does not listen to anyone. Then where are we?

Mr. MORAN. Reclaiming my time, the language is clear it applies to all waters, not just navigable waters.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The only navigable water is the Yukon.

Mr. MORAN. It's possible if the language was more specific, we wouldn't have quite the trouble with it.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. Again, relating to waters located within Yukon Charlie National Preserve, including waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

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

(On request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate my friend from Washington reading the section, but he left out the last sentence of that section.

I think this is a pertinent part and this is the point that the gentleman from Alaska is making, and it regards safety inspection.

I will quote the last sentence: "This section does not affect the authority of the Coast Guard to regulate the use of waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States within the Yukon Charlie Preserve."

I would interpret that as saying the safety part of that is taken care of. But the gentleman from Alaska certainly is right on the part that these are State waters.

I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORAN. I was happy to yield.

Reclaiming my time, I would respond to the gentleman, the Coast Guard really doesn't spend much time on rivers. It's normally coastal waters. It may have responsibility, but the fact is the Coast Guard normally doesn't apply much in the way of resources.

I would like to know how large is this national preserve, because I suspect it's a very expansive national preserve that we're talking about. Do we know?

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. If the Park Service doesn't have jurisdiction, how does the Coast Guard have jurisdiction? That's another Federal agency. The gentleman changed his story and told me it was the State that had authority. I wonder who in the hell has authority.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman from Washington yield?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Again, the Chair requests that Members use proper yielding to each other for time. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Chair.

I think a number of very good questions have been raised by the ranking member of the full committee—Appropriations Committee—and we are concerned about this precedent. We're also concerned about the safety of people who use this national preserve. We can understand Mr. YOUNG's angst, but nevertheless we have a responsibility not to establish precedent that may come back to haunt us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to point out that the staff clearly researched the language here and applicable laws that relate to these waters. That's what we do when we put this language in here.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. To answer the gentleman, the Coast Guard has all the authority for enforcement on all waters, including all rivers. In fact, sometimes the Coast Guard is too active on the river, as far as I'm concerned. I have been on that river. Like I say, I'm a tugboat captain, a licensed mariner, and my biggest challenge to this is excessive use of the Park Service.

Now, you say I won that battle. Like I said before, that doesn't keep them from trying to enforce this again over the State's objection. The State didn't give them the right to register the boats or check registrations. The Coast Guard didn't give them the right to inspect the boat.

And remember this now: Here are two guys giving a distress signal and a

good citizen tried to help them and they flash a badge. This sounds like you know what to me. That's not a good thing. I get very frustrated. Leave this in the bill. Let the Park Service know they no longer can trod over the people of Alaska because they are part of the Federal Government. They are the Park Service—You better listen to us—when this man was breaking no laws. This is wrong.

Now, you say I have won the battle. Maybe I have. But it took a lot of effort to do it. But I haven't won the war. And they will come back. So I'm suggesting this stay in the bill as it is. It's very, very important.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. I rise in support of the amendment.

We understand that this is a huge 2.5 million-acre park and that what we're talking about here is a 158-mile-long river in the middle of this park, so we're talking about a huge area.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The river is 2,800 miles long. This is one little tiny section. This is a river that's 5 miles wide and 2,800 miles long. It's the third largest river in the United States of America that carries transportation.

Mr. MARKEY. I reclaim my time to say that the 158-mile area is a portion of the inside of the park, of the 2.5 million-acre park. So it seems to me what the gentleman is suggesting is that he believes—and I understand—that the National Park Service or that an individual officer made a mistake here, that they abused their authority, and I understand that.

When I was a boy, my favorite television show when I was 9, 10, 11 was "Sergeant Preston of the Yukon." He had his faithful horse, Rex, and his dog, Yukon King. Each week at 5 o'clock on Friday, he would come out to patrol the Yukon. He worked for the Canadian Royal Mounties. I would like to think that, if he ever made a mistake—if he ever overstepped his boundaries, if he ever improperly treated anyone he was in the process of arresting—that the punishment wouldn't be that the Mounties could never again, any of them, go into the Yukon, because that would seem to me to kind of result in a less fully implemented set of law enforcement principles in that area.

What we're learning here is that the punishment to the National Park Service for potentially something that one or two officers engaged in is that none of them can continue their policing, which the Coast Guard says they need. In fact, this is, in many ways, such a

remote part of the Yukon that the Coast Guard right now relies upon the Park Service police to police these areas.

The answer which we're getting from the gentleman of Alaska—and I understand the example that he's trying to make of this one particular incident—is that you're using this as something that, I think, is illustrative—okay?—and perhaps just the highlight, but I don't think you really want the result to be a reduction in the overall enforcement of the laws inside of the park, because that's what would result here. The partnership between the Coast Guard and the Park Service on this river and all that abuts the river is something that is seamless and has worked for generations, and it is something that everyone seems to support.

Perhaps you could target this a little bit more narrowly but not punish the entire Park Service and every officer in the Park Service. It's like every person who works there is now going to suffer as a result of this amendment, and I don't think that's what you intend.

So I will support the amendment of the gentleman from Washington State. It will, I think, make it possible for us to come back to maybe take another look at but not in a way that undermines this partnership that has existed up there for a generation, which has worked. By the way, if there is an exception in any police department, the action of that person who did something wrong should not lead to that entire police department never again being able to enforce the laws. That would be an indictment of everyone; okay?

I think, to the extent to which the Dicks amendment seeks to delete the provision which is in the bill, it doesn't mean that you can't come back and talk about something that might be more specific.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. Again, what I worry about here is we're talking about safety. We're talking about inspecting boats that may be unsafe. I think that is an important issue that we should not deal with in an across-the-board way here in this bill.

I think the gentleman from Alaska has made his point. I think he should support our amendment to strike this in order to make sure that the people of Alaska are protected. I know he cares about them.

Mr. MARKEY. Reclaiming my time, the effect of this amendment could be, because the Coast Guard relies upon the Park Service, that we wind up with an entire area without any law enforcement. Because the Coast Guard does not reach that area, the Park Service is there. If you take out the Park Service, it becomes much more of a dangerous place for everyone, and I don't think that's really what the gentleman intends.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. It has been a fascinating debate to listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Virginia tell the gentleman from Alaska how it works in Alaska. I will tell you that he knows more about Alaska than any of you ever thought of knowing. The problem is, you say you're trying to save Mr. YOUNG from himself by offering this amendment. We're trying to save the Park Service from itself and the actions that it has taken.

Now, logically, your argument says if people have problems in their own areas, then you might see other amendments come up like this and we'll be setting a precedent. Exactly. If we can't have oversight about what goes on and about what the Park Service does, why are we even here?

You heard the story, which I won't repeat, of what happened to this gentleman, Mr. Wilde, on the river. We all agree that it's a problem. In fact, when the Park Service stops the gentleman in the middle of the river and tells him to shut down his boat, to shut down his motors—and as they testified in court, they refused to shut down theirs because it was unsafe—who is being protected? That's the point. The safety inspections of these boats will not stop. The statutory authority is given to the Coast Guard. That's who has the statutory authority, not the Park Service. That's the debate that's going on here.

This language is intended to only limit the Park Service's authority to engage in boater safety checks on the Yukon River within the Yukon Charley National Preserve, the only non-ocean navigable waterway within Alaska's national parks. It is important to note that this language will not have any effect on the ability of the Coast Guard to conduct the statutorily granted power of conducting boater safety checks. It is intended to avoid similar incidents between the Park Service and the public.

Yes, when Mr. YOUNG brought this up originally, the manager of the Park Service could have said, "You're right. There is a problem there, and I'll get rid of these people." They didn't do that. It took this to bring about the actions that have finally occurred: that they've been dismissed from that region. We're trying to prevent the Park Service from harming itself.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Just keep in mind that the Coast Guard has its authority. As soon as this happened, I called the Coast Guard because the Park Service said the Coast Guard had granted them that authority. The Coast Guard said, No way. That's our authority.

Secondly, they said, with registration, only the State has the right to register a boat—that's the same thing in your State—not any Federal agency.

Remember, this is the highway of Alaska. The highway of Alaska has been used for hundreds of years, and we've gotten along very well without any Park Service all these years. By the way, I don't think there was a drowning because of a boat accident on that section of the river—in history. So why all of a sudden you're wanting me to protect the Alaskan people who do not like this, I do not understand.

Very frankly, I think you're meddling. You're meddling in something that a State has a great interest in, that has said before, This is our waterway. We have a right to traverse it from Canada through Alaska, all the way down to the Bering Sea. By the way, it had an illegal boat. According to the Coast Guard, the boat they were driving was overpowered. So just leave this in the bill as it should be.

I ask all of my colleagues to think about this very carefully. Do you want an agency that does not respect the rights of individuals because they work with the government or an agency that does not respect the rights of history? I don't think you do.

So I'm asking for the amendment to be defeated, and I'm asking for my colleagues to understand this is a big issue in my State. It is very, very important, not only to me, but to my people—the people of the State of Alaska, who have been using that river for centuries. So let's just leave it in the bill.

□ 1440

So let's just leave it in the bill.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. We have people in the law enforcement area who make mistakes, but we don't get rid of law enforcement. We don't say we're no longer going to protect people, the other people. We go through a process to see what that officer did. I think the gentleman gets the gist.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, we're not getting rid of law enforcement here. The Coast Guard will still do the safety inspections which they are statutorily authorized to do. The Park Service is not statutorily authorized to do that. They say they have been given that authority from the Coast Guard. I don't think that's the case.

So we're not getting rid of anything. What we're doing is clearing up a jurisdictional problem here.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I would hope we could clarify this. There seems to be a misunderstanding here. I hope that we can, if my amendment doesn't prevail, that we could try to work together to clarify this before conference.

Mr. SIMPSON. I'll guarantee there is a misunderstanding here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would again remind all Members that they should direct their comments to the Chair, not to others.

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. There is no doubt, Mr. YOUNG, that you are the renowned expert on Alaska. So I don't rise to counter that. And in fact, I come from the other open, wild State that likes their own self-determination, and they just associated you with the State of Texas.

I remind my colleagues that there is water in Virginia, there's water in Massachusetts, and there's water all along. But I rise to support the gentleman's amendment because frankly, the last time I talked to the very important Coast Guard, they're short on money. Frankly, I want the Coast Guard to be in the port of Houston doing their job as it relates to protecting the coastline of America from terrorists. They are involved in that. They are not, in essence, an agency that can just expand its resources.

I would just raise the question. I think the gentleman from Washington was very engaging and cooperative by saying how can we work this out.

My interpretation is, in opposing the language that's in the bill and supporting Mr. DICKS, is that we have, in essence, a legislative earmark, and that means that all of us can rise up and try to solve our problems in that way.

I would like to get back to regular order.

And I cite for all of you just another example. We've got a legislative earmark when one of our Republican colleagues has decided to shut down the FAA. That's an example.

And lost in the doing of that is \$2.5 billion in construction projects, 87,000 American construction jobs, 3,000 FAA aviation engineers furloughed, safety analysts, career professionals in 35 States and in my own city of Houston. I want to get on the floor and put an amendment on the floor to get that Member out of the business of stopping the FAA from doing its work—\$200 million per week is being lost.

Nobody is saying anything because we're also not doing regular order by fooling around with the debt ceiling. Nobody can come together and act like adults and say, Let's just raise the debt ceiling so the American people can go on with their business.

Now we've got a Member that says "my way or the highway" and shutting down the FAA. You can't run the government like this.

And I think the message of the amendment that is on the floor is not that we don't respect Members' personal knowledge of their States, it's

just that we can't go willy nilly and change laws just for isolated incidences.

And I apologize to Mr. Wild, but you can see I'm pretty agitated about a situation where we're quietly allowing the FAA not to work. And as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, who knows what danger is around because the FAA is not functioning? Who knows what jeopardy we're putting for seniors and students and families and people trying to buy a home because we're fooling around with the debt ceiling?

So I just think we're in a pattern here. Do what you want to do and forget the heck of the American people and forget that we live in a big country and that we should be for all of the people. And if we need safety on our waterways, we need to find a way to work through our issues. I don't like the way individuals were handled. I agree on that issue.

But I certainly don't like the way we're handling our business with the debt ceiling when we are literally putting ourselves under jeopardy. And I encourage the President to do anything he needs to do to save the American people and to be able to move forward so that we don't lose all of our resources and opportunities for the Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security recipients of America. And I hope he stands up and recognizes this is a ridiculous position to be in when the FAA is not even functioning.

And my Bush Intercontinental Airport can't even continue doing its construction work, and the people who need the work are thrown out on the streets because they can't work because one lone Member wants to get up and talk about the FAA and foolishness about not protecting small airports and not allowing our airport employees or our employees such as air traffic controllers and others to be able to confer about the quality of work issues.

So I would just suggest that you might be able to find a solution, Mr. YOUNG. I know you know all of the issues about that. We have a lot of water from where I come from. I think Mr. Dicks has put forth a perfect question and then an answer to the idea of whether or not your amendment or language would have a far-reaching impact beyond Mr. Wild and the unfortunate behavior of two individuals that I understand may not be here.

Let's look at this holistically, as we need to look at this Nation. Let's come together as adults representing the American people.

I thank the gentleman for the time. I ask support for Mr. DICKS' amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the underlying bill H.R. 2584, a bill which irresponsibly slashes funding for many of our Nation's most important environmental and infrastructure programs. If it's passed, the overall legislation would cause grave harm to the health and safety of our communities and in addition removes protections for our wildlife and environment.

I'll take a few issues at hand.

Clean water infrastructure. Ensuring our families have clean water is under attack in this bill. It cuts 55 percent, almost \$1 billion, from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. This program enables the States to invest in much-needed repairs and improvements to aging water infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, an estimated 25 percent of all treated water in the United States of America is lost due to leakage from water systems that are in disrepair—25 percent of the water that's already been treated. What a waste of money in supposedly an austere Congress.

We're facing a \$500 billion funding gap to bring aging water and wastewater infrastructure back to par. Our pipes are literally crumbling beneath our feet, out of sight, out of mind until the next major water main break disrupts our lives and our towns.

This investment in water infrastructure has the potential to generate thousands and thousands of American jobs since every \$1 billion in infrastructure investment supports 28,500 jobs.

Second issue: air quality. The bill that's before us takes us further backwards to an era where polluters poisoned our atmosphere at will by preventing the EPA from implementing two important air quality rules—the power plant air toxics rule and the transport rule, irresponsibly putting the health of our communities at risk. We're going backward instead of forward.

□ 1450

Air pollution disproportionately impacts the urban areas in my district, such as Paterson, New Jersey, where we see much higher incidences of asthma and other respiratory ailments due to the concentrations of harmful pollutants. It is terrible. Go to our hospitals. It is out of control not just in Paterson, New Jersey, but across the United States. These pollutants can be-

come lodged in the tissues of the lungs and interfere with the respiratory system. This needs to be controlled.

And the National Park Service itself, referred to in the last debate, this proposed legislation would cripple the operation of the National Park Service. This service takes care of our parks. We fought for this, all of us, Democrats, Republicans in whatever State it was in this Union. They want to slash this by \$409 million from the President's request. Our national parks are visited by 275 million people each year. They come from all over the world to appreciate our country's natural and historic wonders. In my district, the Park Service is hard at work on the Great Falls National Historic Park right in my home city of Paterson, the only historic park in the entire Nation that has aesthetic value as well as historical importance, as it was the first industrial city of the United States.

The investment we make in our parks pays for itself many times over in economic development in the surrounding areas and the enjoyment and education they provide to Americans of all ages. We must ensure that the Park Service has the resources they require to ensure that parks all over the country are properly operating.

How about the arts and humanities in this legislation? Besides the huge cited cuts to our health, infrastructure, and environment, the bill before us drastically cuts funding to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. As a former teacher, as a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, as many of us are, I have seen firsthand the positive impact that arts and humanities education has on the success of our students. In my district, as a result of the economic crisis, many schools have been forced to cut back on arts programs and to lay off arts teachers. They're the first to go.

In conclusion, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation leaves a lot to be desired. We are seeing our colleagues on the other side of the aisle attempting to legislate through the appropriations process, selectively imposing deep cuts to programs which their special interest constituencies don't approve of. The draconian cuts in this bill are truly unacceptable, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY

SEC. 117. (a) DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY.—During fiscal year 2012 and thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior may appoint, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, other than sections 3303 and 3328 of such title, a qualified candidate described in subsection (b) directly to a position with a land managing agency of the Department of the Interior for which the candidate meets Office of Personnel Management qualification standards.

(b) QUALIFIED CANDIDATES DESCRIBED.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a former resource assistant (as defined in section 203 of the Public Land Corps Act (16 U.S.C. 1722)) who—

(1) completed a rigorous undergraduate or graduate summer internship with a land managing agency, such as the National Park Service Business Plan Internship;

(2) successfully fulfilled the requirements of the internship program; and

(3) subsequently earned an undergraduate or graduate degree from an accredited institution of higher education.

(c) DURATION.—The direct hire authority under this section may not be exercised with respect to a specific qualified candidate after the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the candidate completed the undergraduate or graduate degree, as the case may be.

#### REVIEW PROCESS FOR CERTAIN BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

SEC. 118. (a) EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW REQUIRED.—Hereafter, a person may bring a civil action challenging a proposed action of the Bureau of Land Management concerning grazing on public lands (as defined in section 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702(e))) or an amendment to a land use plan proposed under section 202 of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1712) in a Federal district court only if the person has challenged the action or amendment at the agency level and exhausted the administrative hearings and appeals procedures established by the Department of the Interior.

(b) ISSUE LIMITATION.—An issue may be considered in the judicial review of an action or amendment referred to in subsection (a) only if the issue was raised in the administrative review process described in such subsection.

(c) EXCEPTION.—An exception to the requirement of exhausting the administrative review process before seeking judicial review shall be available if a Federal court finds that the agency failed or was unable to make information timely available during the administrative review process for issues of material fact. For the purposes of this subsection, “timely” means within 120 calendar days from the date that the challenge to the agency action or amendment at issue is received for administrative review.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, beginning on line 13, strike section 118.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in support of my amendment. This would strike section 118, which amends administrative appeals procedures for grazing decisions on public lands to require parties to exhaust all administrative appeals before they may file suit in Federal court.

This is a back-door attempt to curtail the use of court injunctions to stop grazing decisions made by the BLM. Without the ability to seek injunctive relief, opponents of a grazing decision are handicapped because irreparable

damage to a resource may occur while the administrative appeals process is being exhausted.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member, to further discuss this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

We hear from a number of people and organizations around the country who are concerned about this because without the ability to seek injunctive relief from the courts, opponents of a grazing decision are very much handicapped. Meanwhile irreparable damage to a resource may occur while the administrative appeals process is being exhausted. So that's our concern. I know that's the concern of the ranking member of the full committee.

But let me share another concern that I think underlies this whole issue of grazing. Currently—I know the ranking member's aware of this—the Federal Government charges \$1.35 per month, per cow to graze on federally owned lands. In the meantime, States like Idaho charge four times that, \$5.12; Montana, \$6.12. Nebraska can charge up to \$41 per acre to graze on State-owned land. Texas—I know the gentleman is aware of this—Texas will charge \$65 to \$150 per acre per cow. But the Federal Government charges \$1.35.

Now that's the kind of Federal subsidy that we really think we ought to go after. When we're cutting deeply into the bone programs for people who are destitute, programs that are absolutely necessary to protect our environment or needed infrastructure in this country, we're giving this kind of a subsidy, \$1.35 to graze on Federal land versus as much as \$65 to \$150 that the great State of Texas charges to graze on State land. And then private land is oftentimes even more expensive. So that's the kind of subsidy that I don't think passes the test of fairness, if the taxpayer was really aware of the kind of subsidy they're providing some grazers on their federally owned land. It ought to be rectified. But this particular issue simply rubs salt into that wound.

Mr. DICKS. Again, I ask for support for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia's concern about the cost or the subsidies or whatever he wants to call it, but it has absolutely nothing to do with this amendment. It's a whole different issue. Should the Resources Committee be looking at the prices charged for cattle grazing, or mining, other things? Sure, they should be. It's not the purpose of this bill. It's not the purpose of this amendment.

All this amendment says is that in the past, BLM regulations have required that litigants exhaust the administrative review before litigating in

Federal court. That means they have to go through the review process that's been set up administratively before they can go to court.

Recently, numerous lawsuits over grazing have been filed in Federal courts before the administrative review process had been completed. That means they haven't gone through to find out whether they would win or lose on the administrative side. This ties up the BLM field offices because they must respond to both an administrative process on one side and a litigation process on the other side. This provision simply requires litigants to first exhaust the administrative review before litigating grazing issues in Federal court. Litigants could still file for temporary restraining orders, contrary to what you said. They have to show irreparable harm, and they can still file for temporary restraining orders. Nothing in this provision prevents that.

I would hope—and I know the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. DICKS, because we've talked about this before—if we could spend more money actually managing the lands rather than in court, we would all be better off. All this says is, follow the administrative procedures, and exhaust them before you go to court. You still have that option after those administrative procedures have been exhausted. As I said, you can still get a restraining order if there's irreparable harm. This, I think, will cut down on the lawsuits, and I think this is a good provision in the bill.

And I would hope that the gentlemen from Washington and Virginia would recognize how well the underlying bill is written and would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I am told that the ability to offer a temporary restraining order is very narrowly drafted. So irreparable harm, that wouldn't do it.

□ 1500

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MORAN. It's only if a Federal court finds that the agency failed, or was unable to make information timely available during the administrative review, according to this language. So it's probably an unreal situation.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, that's the standard that exists now, as I understand it. We're not changing that.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman again yield?

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

Mr. MORAN. I would like to make two points. One is that this is clearly authorizing language on an appropriations bill. If we're going to change the law, then it ought to be done by the authorizing committee.

But, secondly, I know the gentleman is aware, you can only get an injunction from a Federal judge if you can prove that you are likely to win your case, or if there is imminent harm. So I don't know why the gentleman is so concerned about the existing legal situation.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, to answer your question, the reason I'm concerned is the extraordinary amount of money that we are spending in court instead of on managing public lands. That's the real issue here. And we have a process set up where, if you have problems, you can go through an administrative process. Go through it. At the end if you don't like the outcome, go to court. That's all we're saying.

And is this legislating on an appropriation bill? Well, I guess funding unauthorized programs is legislating on an appropriations bill also, which we've done in several provisions in this bill which you support. I hope my colleagues will vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GRAY WOLVES

SEC. 119. Hereafter, any final rule published by the Department of the Interior that provides that the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) in the State of Wyoming or in any of the States within the range of the Western Great Lakes Distinct Population Segment of the gray wolf (as defined in the rule published on May 5, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 26086 et seq.)) is not an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), including any rule to remove such species in such a State from the list of endangered species or threatened species published under that Act, shall not be subject to judicial review if such State has entered into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior that authorizes the State to manage gray wolves in that State.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, beginning on line 16, strike section 119.

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 119 exempts from judicial review any final rule of the Secretary of the Interior that delists wolves in Wyoming or the Western Great Lakes States, provided the Fish and Wildlife Service has entered into an agreement with the State for it to manage the wolves.

The irony here is that the majority does not trust any action of Secretary Salazar except if it involves the delisting of wolves. The rider undercuts

the public's right to petition a Federal court to review an agency's decision and blocks the court's ability to carry out its customer authority to review executive branch decisions.

Now, I have been a strong proponent of the re-introduction of the gray wolf into Yellowstone and in other areas. This has been one of the most successful operations in restoring a species that had been nearly wiped out in our country. And today we're seeing all of the benefits of this. So I don't think we should undercut the people's right to go to court if they don't think the agency has done this according to the law. And I have great respect for Secretary Salazar, and I'm sure he would agree with me that there should not be a prohibition on judicial review.

And I'd like to yield to the distinguished ranking member for any comments he would have on this.

Mr. MORAN. My only observation is it's ironic that the majority doesn't seem to trust anything that Secretary Salazar does, except if it involves the delisting of wolves. This rider does undercut the public's right to petition a Federal court to review an agency's decision. So, we're establishing a precedent here with regard to wolves. It blocks the court's ability to carry out its customary authority to review executive branch decisions.

That's the way the system's supposed to work. The executive branch makes a determination and, in our system, if there are individuals or organizations that don't agree, they have recourse to the judicial system. This says, no, we're going to suspend that part of the Constitution. No, you don't, you can't go to the courts. The executive branch is inviolate here. They make a decision, that's it. Permanent.

We like Secretary Salazar, and we support Secretary Salazar far more consistently than the majority does, if the majority supports him on anything. But we don't really see why we need to suspend the constitutional process in this particular specific unique circumstance.

So I would support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Again, I ask for support for my amendment. I think it corrects a flaw in this bill. And believe me, there are a lot of flaws.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose my friend's amendment. I hope this isn't a pattern long term, but on this particular bill it seems to be a pattern at any rate.

His amendment would strike the important language in H.R. 2584 that addresses the administration's confusing policies involving Endangered Species Act-listed populations of gray wolves nationwide.

As I mentioned on the House floor during a colloquy with Chairman SIMP-

SON on Monday, the Obama administration has created a confusing and impractical result with its recent announcement to delist the gray wolves in some States, but leave other States, such as Washington, Oregon and Utah with mixed management. H.R. 2584, as written, and as clarified in my colloquy with the chairman, would help remedy this flawed policy.

Problems with the Federal management of gray wolves are nearly as old as the Endangered Species Act itself. Five years after ESA's passage in 1978, the gray wolf was listed as endangered or threatened in all of the lower 48 States. In the mid-1990s, the Clinton administration ordered an experimental introduction of wolves into the Yellowstone area, central Idaho, and the Mexican wolf into Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. It also established a new definition to identify the population of listed species. As a result, wolves multiplied. But, unfortunately, because they can't read maps, they moved into areas where they weren't supposed to go.

In 2003, the Fish and Wildlife Service divided gray wolves into geographical boundaries that made more sense. It included the entire States of Washington, Oregon, Utah and other areas so that States would eventually be able to develop their own State management plans to remove wolves from the endangered species list.

Then, in 2009, the Obama administration reversed course and adopted the theory that wolves should be delisted in Idaho, Montana, and only parts of certain other States, but would leave other areas where wolves likely populate still. This is under ESA.

As a result, in my own Fourth Congressional District in central Washington, and I'll put up a map here, the wolves are delisted on the eastern side of Highways 97, 17, and 395. Highway 97, Highway 17, and 395.

Delisted over here, listed over here. This makes absolutely no sense, and it shows how the ESA is badly in need of updating and how ineffective the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is in managing wolves. And I might add, this is true in Oregon, in parts of Oregon and parts of Utah.

So I oppose this amendment because the colloquy that I had with the chairman is one that sets the stage for properly managing these wolves in the States that I associate with.

I just might add on a personal level, I live very, very close to here. But I live in the listed area.

Now, we do fish marking. I know my friend is very well aware of fish marking, and I'm not opposing the authorizing on this bill, as the gentleman knows—this year, anyway. But there is no listing here for the gray wolf. Now, I have no idea if a wolf crosses down here into my area, if it is, in fact, a listed or a delisted wolf.

□ 1510

But apparently Fish and Wildlife think that they know where Highway

97 ends, where 17 comes down here and connects with Highway 395, because that's what their arbitrary rule says. It doesn't make any sense at all.

And so as a result of this, the colloquy I had with Chairman SIMPSON clarified this, that it includes the whole areas that are within that geographic boundary. And for that reason, I oppose my friend's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I also rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from the State of Washington.

The best way to manage wolves is to let State experts do the job. Now, that's true whether you want to increase the number of wolves in your State, like the gentleman from the State of Washington wants to do, or you want to maintain a recovered population, which is what we want to do in my State of Wyoming.

Now, the truth about current wolf management is that if Washington wants to try to increase the wolf population in western Washington, they cannot do it under the current rules. And in my State of Wyoming, when asked at our committee meeting whether the wolf was fully recovered in the State of Wyoming, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service testified that, yes, the gray wolf is fully recovered in the State of Wyoming, has been for a long time.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate that very much.

I think the problem is that the State of Wyoming, unlike Idaho and Montana, has not come up with a plan where the State would protect the wolf if it were delisted.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Reclaiming my time, I'm coming to that.

The State of Wyoming has a wolf management plan that was approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as adequate. And then subsequently, through litigation upon litigation upon litigation, the courts changed their mind, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service changed its mind, the court changed its mind again, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service changed its mind again. So this is a process that is driven by litigation, not by science, because the science and the numbers both say that the gray wolf is recovered in Wyoming.

Wyoming has a wolf management plan on the books. However, what we are saying here with this amendment is that the State of Wyoming, through its Governor, will negotiate changes to that management plan which, when agreed to with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and submitted to the Wyoming Legislature, will not then be sub-

ject to additional whipsaw litigation—that will be the end of it—returning management of wolves to the State experts that should be doing this job.

Wolf management is frozen, and it need not be. By trying to strip this language, the gentleman from the State of Washington emboldens the people who don't want Washington State—or Oregon or Wisconsin or Michigan or Wyoming or any other State—to make its own decisions using its own wildlife biologists. I believe that State wildlife experts, not D.C. cube dwellers, have the expertise and the knowledge and the passion to manage the wolf anywhere they roam.

It is the intent of this legislation as currently written to make sure that the people who have the science, the background, the knowledge to make sure that the wolf, which has admittedly been recovered—admittedly by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recovered—to be managed in a way that ensures that ongoing recovered status and ensures it at the very level where you're able to do it, where the boots are on the ground of the wildlife biologists and the paws are on the ground of the wolf that is already recovered but that needs to be maintained pursuant to a wolf management plan.

Let's trust our States, their wildlife biologists. Let's trust my Wyoming Game and Fish Department that has been recognized as one of the best wildlife management agencies in the country.

I'm stunned that people in Washington really believe that they can do it better and make decisions for wolves they've never seen, in places they've never been, and don't trust wildlife biologists they've never met. It is much better if the people on the ground are where the wildlife are on the ground, where the interaction is on the ground, where the conditions are understood, where the geography is known, where the life expectancy, where the birthrates, where the survivability of the species can be witnessed and determined.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I'll be brief, Mr. Chairman, or as brief as I can.

I appreciate this discussion on wolves because it is something that is near and dear to the people of Idaho.

I was the speaker of the house in Idaho when the gentleman from Washington supported wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone and Idaho and Montana and Wyoming—something that Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana frankly didn't want but, nevertheless, the Fish and Wildlife Service said that's what we're going to do and that's what they did. Since that time, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming have been doing the right thing in restoring these wolf populations.

In Idaho and Montana, they came up with a wolf management plan that was approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service—it was approved—but then it was taken to court because it didn't include Wyoming. And a judge said—not based on science. We're trying to get back to science. But a judge said, You can't just delist in Idaho and Montana; you have to include Wyoming, and Wyoming didn't have a State management plan approved then. Since that time, I understand that the Fish and Wildlife Service and Wyoming have come up with a plan in principle—and they're still working out the details, but I believe that they will have a plan by the end of this year—to delist in Wyoming.

All we're saying is that when they're delisted by Fish and Wildlife Service, they have an approved plan, then it is not subject to judicial review. Because, frankly, there are people who don't think we ought to have any wolf management plan that would include, guess what? Hunting wolves. I know the gentleman from Washington is astounded by that. Our Governor has indicated that he likes to hunt wolves. The problem is wolves have no natural predator out there except hunger. When they've done away with the food supply, some wolves die; otherwise, they just continue to grow in population.

Anybody that thought we were going to reintroduce wolves into the Rocky Mountains and there wasn't going to be some type of control—a hunt or whatever—were living on a different planet. But those same people now that wanted the wolves reintroduced, that oppose any type of wolf management, go to court to try to stop the delisting.

The gentleman from Washington has explained the problem that exists when you have mixed management of wolves that get confused. They don't know which side of the line they live on, whether they're protected or whether they're not protected, whether they can go out and eat your puppy dog or not. So they're confused wolves. We're trying to clear that up for them.

And in the Great Lakes, the Great Lakes have had a population that is greater than in the Rocky Mountains and have been deserving of delisting for a number of years but have just not gotten it done.

And contrary to what the gentleman from Virginia said, I actually think the Secretary of the Interior is doing a good job. There are many things I agree with him on. Many of my westerners would disagree with that. I happen to think he's doing a good job as Secretary of the Interior. I don't agree with everything he does, but you know what? When I call him up and say we've got some real problems with this, he listens—he might not agree after he listens, but he listens to us. That's all I ask from a gentleman in that position.

So don't believe that we are critical of the Secretary. We do have some differences of opinion, and I realize that he works in an administration that

makes it difficult for him sometimes. He's from Colorado. He knows western issues. But I have enjoyed working with him.

And I trust the Fish and Wildlife Service and the science that they provide to delist wolves better than I do adjudge. That's why this language is here. Wolves will still be protected in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Washington, Oregon, Utah, where they have expanded to, and in the Great Lakes.

□ 1520

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. As I recall, the fact was that Montana and Idaho had plans that would protect the wolves if they were delisted, and then at some point they would take further action if necessary to protect the wolves if too many of them were killed.

The problem with Wyoming was Wyoming's plan didn't have credibility. Now I understand that it does. But what the judge was saying is that you have to protect the wolf throughout the area, which included Wyoming. That's why they couldn't delist it without dealing with Wyoming, and Wyoming wasn't ready. So, I hope that Wyoming will come up with a credible plan at the State level to keep the wolf going.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is right. If wolf populations get below acceptable levels, then they go back on the endangered list. Guess what. Wyoming and Montana and Idaho are not going to let that happen.

I think this is a good way to go for proceeding with the Endangered Species Act and making sure it does what it's intended to do.

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

(On request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SIMPSON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I asked the gentleman to yield because this is precisely the point that this debate and discussion on the Endangered Species Act is having.

If you recall in the CR, the Endangered Species Act was amended to allow Idaho and Montana to delist, because the way ESA was written, unless the whole identified population could have been managed, nobody could manage, and that was the law. And that's what we have been saying—as we had last night and we will probably have later discussions on this—why ESA needs to be looked at in a comprehensive way, because it was clearly a flaw. It was clearly a flaw. I'm glad that the CR amended the Endangered Species Act to take care of this provision.

The colloquy that we had regarding Washington, Oregon, and Utah was simply to recognize these larger populations but recognize States are moving in a direction of managing their populations.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would just say to the gentleman from Washington that was supportive of the reintroduction of wolves in Idaho and Montana and Wyoming that put us in this situation, several wolves—

Mr. DICKS. I want to say to the chairman, if you would yield, I also tried to reintroduce the wolf in western Washington, but the chairman of the Interior Committee in the other body disagreed with me.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, western Washington.

I just want you to know that there have been several wolves that have come to my house, and they presented me with a petition that they would like to visit the Cascades.

Mr. DICKS. We'd like to have them.

Mr. SIMPSON. You're welcome.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield real quickly?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. As a matter of fact, the gray wolves are showing up in the Cascades now, the eastern side of the Cascades. So you'll get them.

Mr. DICKS. The Olympics too.

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TRAILING LIVESTOCK OVER PUBLIC LAND

SEC. 120. During fiscal years 2012 through 2014, the trailing of livestock across public land (as defined by section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)) and the implementation of trailing practices by the Bureau of Land Management shall not be subject to review under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, beginning on line 6, strike section 120.

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 120 provides that for 2012 through 2014, the movement of livestock across public land shall not be subject to NEPA review.

Proponents of this provision will argue that moving cattle from one location to another shouldn't require a NEPA review. However, this movement of cattle can be across wide swaths of public lands and take weeks, not just days. The impact on water, plants and other wildlife species, including big-horn sheep, can be significant.

I would like to yield to the ranking member to further discuss this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Some on the other side may be thinking, well, what's a guy from a heavily residential suburban area in the Washington area and with no cattle in his district know? So I would have thought this would have been a perfectly fine amendment: What do you need to have restrictions for livestock moving from one place to another?

But upon further investigation, what is not immediately apparent becomes very important. As the gentleman has said, we're talking about very wide swaths of land that are covered by these livestock movements, and they don't just take a few hours or a few days to cross. Sometimes they can take weeks. When you've got very large herds of cattle, you can cause quite a bit destruction to the soil, to the brush, to waterways, to any number of environmental resources in the process of major transfers from one area to another of very large herds of cattle. There can be very substantial environmental destruction. That's why those who are involved in this feel there ought to be a NEPA review. The National Environmental Policy Act will review it, it will tell us what the ramifications will be, what are the consequences, and then based upon that information it empowers those who have land or interests that would be adversely affected by large movements of cattle from one place to another. That's why the NEPA review has an appropriate place and role to play in this, and that's why I think the gentleman's amendment makes a lot of sense and I would support it.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Referring my remarks to the Chairman, I've got to get the gentleman from Virginia on a horse out with some cattle.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. "Trailing" is the process of moving a livestock herd from one grazing area to another. It generally doesn't take weeks. It certainly doesn't take weeks in the same location. You're moving from one location to another. Trailing has no significant impact on the environment, so

while in the past it has been generally considered part of the process of grazing on public lands, the BLM has rarely conducted environmental assessments on or issued permits for trailing itself, focusing instead on the impacts of grazing.

Recently—and this is the problem and this is why this amendment is before us—environmental activists that want to get cattle off of public lands, and they have a right to try to do this—I disagree with them—have focused their attention on trailing as a way to shut down grazing on public lands.

Congress, not the courts, has the authority to determine public land policies, and today responsible grazing is an important and legitimate use of public lands. Unfortunately, because activists have tied local BLM offices up in knots with litigation, judges are now determining how public lands can be used in the West.

This provision—and this is the important part—attempts to get ahead of this issue by exempting trailing from NEPA requirements for 2011 through 2014. The Forest Service on their grazing permits require permits on trailing. The Forest Service does. The BLM has not in the past. But, instead, these litigations are tying this up in knots. The BLM is going through a process to include trailing when they issue their grazing permits, so that the NEPA process on trailing will be included. The problem is between now and when they get that completed, we're going to be in court spending all our money in court rather than getting this process moving forward.

We're not opposed to requiring NEPA process on trailing permits just like the Forest Service does, but what this does is exempt this through 2014 while BLM, for lack of a better term, gets their act together. That's all this does.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

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

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I rise to oppose the amendment as well, Mr. Chairman.

There is a gentleman who is a wild-life biologist by the name of Allan Savory, and Allan Savory studied the way that the buffalo grazed on the sweeping landscapes of the American West. Buffalo grazed in a manner that cut wide swaths. Concentrated numbers of buffalo would move through and graze literally everything down to the nubs, both the weeds, the buffalo grass, and all of the very nutritious hard grasses and the grasses of the Sandhills of Nebraska, very different, very nutritious grasses that we call hard grasses. Some short hard grass, and others the tall grass. But they'd take everything out. They would at the same time, through their split hooves knead the soil in a way that allowed those lands to regrow

more healthy, stronger, more filled in than they were prior to this intensive short-term grazing. That's how buffalo grazed the plains of the United States before people were here.

So Allan Savory took those same practices to Rhodesia and studied the manner in which grazing occurred there, and created something called the Savory system. The Savory grazing system is now used in a number of places throughout the West, and it actually emulates the way that buffalo grazed. And that is what happens when you trail cattle and sheep across public lands in a manner which keeps them concentrated for very short periods of time where they do very intensive grazing for very short periods of time, and then get off that land quickly so grass can regenerate so you don't have the type of runoff that happens when you have some charismatic megafauna overgrazing repeatedly day after day after day in the same place.

That's why these grazing practices are appropriate, these trailing practices are appropriate, and actually create a healthier grazing situation that carries a long-term, studier, stronger, healthier grass resource to be used by wildlife and domestic animals.

That is why on a scientific basis there is great rationale for relieving people who trail livestock across public lands from the onerous, expensive obligations of the NEPA process. I appeal to the desire to use sound science in the manner in which we approach these issues and not the type of emotional arguments that are raised by people who are just philosophically opposed to grazing.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 121. The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) log and track the specific reasons for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement returning to an applicant, without approval, any exploration plan, development and production plan, development operations coordination document, or application for permit to drill submitted with respect to any oil and gas lease for the Outer Continental Shelf; and

(2) provide quarterly reports to the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate that include—

(A) the date of original submission of each document referred to in paragraph (1) received by the Bureau in the period covered by a report;

(B) for each such document—

(i) the date the document was returned to the applicant;

(ii) the date the document is treated by the Bureau as submitted; and

(iii) the date of final agency action the document.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, beginning on line 15, strike section 121.

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 121 requires the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement to keep detailed records and provide quarterly reports on any oil and gas permit or plan that was not approved by the agency. They don't ask for the ones that were approved, just the ones that were not approved.

This is the majority's attempt to try to speed up the approval of oil and gas permits and plans, and I have no objection to that. Here we are 16 months after Deepwater Horizon, and the Congress hasn't enacted a single significant safety reform. Despite the serious safety and environmental shortcomings found as a result of the Deepwater Horizon tragedy, the majority wants BOEMRE to return to the good old days of lax reviews and quick approval of oil and gas permits and plans.

I think this provision should be stricken.

I yield to the ranking member for his comments on this provision.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman. Not surprisingly, I fully agree with the gentleman that this language again is inappropriate in here. It's punitive. It requires excessive record-keeping, and ironically, because normally we are getting complaints there is too much record-keeping. Well, now what we do is we're requiring in this bill even more detailed records that are not now required. It is going to expand the bureaucracy. They have to provide quarterly reports on any oil and gas permit or plan that wasn't approved by the agency.

So in other words, the intention is to discourage the agency from not approving anything even if they feel that the oil and gas drilling operation might not be a safe one, that they don't have the requisite rules in place to prevent a Deepwater Horizon tragedy.

It says for each such document that the bureau receives, they have to provide the date the document was returned to the applicant, the date the document is treated by the bureau, and the date of final agency action, and on and on. More and more records that are not necessary.

We know what the intent of this is. It's to tell BOEMRE, the new Bureau of Ocean Energy Management Regulation and Enforcement, it's in your interest to just speed these along. Don't hold up any of these permits because if you do, you're going to have this very burdensome requirement on you. Here it's 16 months after Deepwater Horizon, and the Congress hasn't enacted a single significant safety reform. And the majority wants us to return to the good old days of very lax reviews, quick approvals of every oil and gas permit and

plan. And if you don't, we're going to impose this very burdensome requirement on BOEMRE. That's just not in the interest of safety. It works against our resolve not to let a Deepwater Horizon tragedy occur again.

I'm using this acronym BOEMRE. For those who don't know what it means, it's the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement. It's the new agency that was set up to prevent any future Deepwater Horizon tragedies. So here we're seeing language that is intended to mitigate against BOEMRE being able to do its job. I strongly support the intention of the ranking member of the full committee in striking this burdensome language.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, you know, if a little green man from outer space came and landed and watched this debate, he'd be puzzled. If the gentlemen on the other side were so concerned about the Culberson amendment, I'm puzzled why they didn't request a recorded vote in the committee. This was adopted in the committee, full committee markup, by a voice vote.

But beyond that, nobody wants another Deepwater Horizon. But this language that the gentlemen are objecting to says that this new agency will report quarterly to Congress on the status of permitting and why permits were rejected. Now why would the gentleman not want to have transparency and oversight over an agency to which we appropriate dollars?

Now this wouldn't puzzle me if we just hadn't come off of 4 years of a majority that was preaching to us about transparency and oversight and openness. Why wouldn't you want some report issued by the agency that tells us what they are doing with the money that we appropriate to them and what's the status and why a permit was rejected. That's a reasonable question.

□ 1540

Just to move to a different agency—you may not know this, Mr. MORAN. I've lived in Mr. MORAN's district for a period of time when I'm here in Washington, D.C., and I never saw anybody grazing and I never saw anybody moving livestock. But in my area, I will tell you that we're the nursery capital of the world. We are very much concerned with the guest worker program.

Under this administration, applications for guest worker applications have been denied at an alarming rate. When we ask the Department of Labor how many have been denied and how many have been appealed and how many appeals have been successful, they keep those records. You know why? Because that's a reasonable inquiry by a Member of the Congress, a member of the public, a guy who's

growing arbor vitae in Perry, Ohio. So to describe this as somehow burdensome and crippling and somehow going to lead to another Deepwater Horizon disaster is just ridiculous.

The guys on the other side, Mr. Chairman, are great Members and great advocates for a lot of things, but this argument doesn't even pass the straight face test. And I would respectfully urge that it be defeated.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield to my former Congressman, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you.

You have this deep-seated concern about why we did not ask for a vote; so I can clarify that. The reason is we were overwhelmed with more than 40 amendments and we were trying to look to the welfare of the rest of the committee. There's only so many of these issues that you can call a recorded vote on, so we tried to be reasonable.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Reclaiming my time, I can appreciate the pressure that the gentleman found himself under. There are over 200 amendments. We're approaching 200 amendments on this particular piece of legislation.

I recall sitting in another full committee markup where the gentleman asked for a recorded vote on whether or not we could use Styrofoam containers in the House cafeteria. So clearly, the gentleman has to be as concerned about knowing what it is this new agency is doing relative to permits as he is about Styrofoam containers in the cafeteria.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. This year, I'm sure the gentleman has noticed, we've been trying to reestablish regular order—having a subcommittee markup and a full committee markup and amendments on the floor, which is welcomed by our side. So we have to kind of make a decision: Are we going to ask for a vote on every single issue? We never do that. We try to cooperate. This is comity, something that the gentleman from Ohio understands quite well.

So I would just remind him that we're trying to get through these bills, and that's why we try to not ask for a vote on everything. We wanted to save this one for the floor so the American people would hear about what's going on.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate it. I know the gentleman said "comity," not "comedy." I think it's comedy with a "d" that reigns here. I trust that the gentleman has had his tongue firmly implanted in his cheek as he made that observation.

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

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

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I hail from Louisiana, which of course is a very big part of what this section 121 is about and certainly what the amendment is about. Just bringing everyone back, we had the Deepwater Horizon spill, which was a tragic situation which has hurt Louisiana in several ways, one being, of course, oil in the water. That's obvious. But then, of course, the many jobs that have been lost.

Going back over history, what we found is that in response to this the President brought together 10 experts to determine whether or not drilling should be stopped in deep water off the shores of Louisiana—in the Gulf of Mexico, in fact. This board of experts came together and said, no, that should not happen. We should continue forward. We can solve this problem. We can prevent it from happening. Nonetheless, the President came out and said, no, let's shut down drilling.

Well, when that didn't work, the President and Secretary Salazar slapped a moratorium on drilling. Then there were lawsuits. Then we had a de facto moratorium. Then we had a permitorium after there was a stay placed by a judge. Today, we have what I would call a "slowitorium" on permits and leasing in the Gulf of Mexico.

So it's very clear what's going on is the fact that even though the administration can't get the courts to stop drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, even though the other side can't advance legislation, they're trying to do it administratively by slowing the process down. So all we ask, the people of Louisiana, is some transparency on this issue.

Section 121 does some very simple things. It just says the Secretary of the Interior shall log and track the specific reasons for BOEMRE returning to an applicant without approval any exploration plan, development and production plan, development operations, coordination document, or application, et cetera, et cetera.

We're getting reports continuously from drillers, from contractors who are out there trying to drill, that they put in applications. Weeks, months go by; they hear nothing. Finally, they get it back and an "i" was not dotted, so now they've got to start the process all over again.

So all we're asking is that integrity be brought back into this process, that there be accountability back into this process.

And the gentleman is absolutely right. We do want to get drilling back up in the Gulf of Mexico. We were at a peak of 1.7 million barrels a day before this incident. It has dropped now to 1.59 million barrels a day. And it's going to continue to drop because we have a process in which permits and leasing are still way off track. They're not back to the levels they were. And production is going to net down. As a result of that, we're going to continue to see oil and gas prices going up.

So despite what is coming out of the Secretary of the Interior, drilling and production is not up; it's down. And it's continuing down and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future until we get the permits and the leases back up.

I certainly suggest, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues and I should oppose this amendment. We do need to have transparency and accountability in BOEMRE when it comes to offshore drilling.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman is quite right that there are now 1.6 billion barrels per day being drilled. Today, 67 new shallow water well permits have been issued since the implementation of these new standards. They're averaging six per month. The average before the disaster had been eight. So they're catching up. Just three of these permits are currently pending. Eight have asked for more information, have not been denied.

In terms of deep water, 75 permits have been issued. There are 25 pending. Twenty-two have been asked for additional information. Mostly, that information is with regard to containment, which is exactly what we instructed the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to do: are they sure, can they assure us that they can contain any spill.

So things are not quite as dire as you might believe.

Mr. FLEMING. Reclaiming my time, I would just suggest that we're still well off pace. And accountability is not going to be a factor in that.

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, in the 7 months before the blowout, there were 49 deepwater permits issued. And in the 7 months since the moratorium was allegedly lifted, there's only been seven deepwater permits issued. We in the committee adopted this amendment, which I was proud to offer, simply to shine sunlight on the process. All the language in this bill requires is that the agency report to the American people and report to Congress the reasons why a permit for exploration or for drilling has been slowed down or delayed.

We're all committed to transparency. We all want to know where and how our tax dollars are being spent. And the slowdown in drilling in the Gulf of Mexico has had a catastrophic effect on employment. We've lost 60,000 jobs since 2008 in the Gulf of Mexico area. If we would get back to the levels of drilling, of permitting, both shallow and deepwater, that we were before the blowout, it's estimated that as many as 190,000 jobs could be created in the Gulf of Mexico in about 18 months, with about 400,000 industry-supported

jobs across the United States supplying equipment to the offshore oil industry.

No one has a stronger stake in protecting the environment than we have that live there. These folks that work for these great companies are my friends and my neighbors. I'm proud to represent so many of these companies. Houston, Texas, is to the oil industry what Silicon Valley is to the computer industry.

□ 1550

These are engineers. These are the scientists. These are people who live and work in and around the Gulf of Mexico, who fish there, whose kids play on the beaches. Being a Houstonian and growing up along the gulf, I remember tarballs were common on the beach in Galveston. You just don't see it anymore.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I just wanted to say that the gentleman and I have worked together, and I have great regard for him. I just wanted to mention a couple of facts and that, if we take up time, I'll try to get you extra time.

"To date, 67 new shallow water well permits have been issued since the implementation of new safety and environmental standards on June 8, 2010. Permits have averaged more than six per month over the past 8 months compared to an average of eight permits per month in 2009. Just three of these permits are currently pending, with eight having been returned to the operator for more information." Now, the question I have is:

Why don't we ask them to give, when they're doing the report, not just the ones that they've turned down but the ones that they've approved? I mean, wouldn't the gentleman want to have all that information instead of just the negative side of this?

Mr. CULBERSON. In reclaiming my time, as for the permits that have been approved, of course that's a matter of public record; but as for the permits that have been rejected and that are not yet a matter of public record, we want to see those and know why they've been rejected, why they've been delayed. That's all this language requires is that they shine sunlight on every corner of the process. Many of these permits have been rejected for reasons that are not directly tied to the substance of the application. I've seen permits that are rejected because the typeface wasn't, in the opinion of the permitter, correct. It is clear that there has been a slow-down and that this administration overreacted to the spill. It has deliberately slowed down the permitting process and has made it more difficult for Americans to find American oil and gas.

We are committed to drill here and drill now in a way that is safe and clean, that protects the environment but yet takes advantage of the natural

resources that God has so abundantly blessed this continent with. The Gulf of Mexico demonstrated that it can be done cleanly and safely; and there is no quicker way to generate high-paying jobs than to open up drilling in the continental United States, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico. Those rigs are gone, by the way, Mr. DICKS. Once those rigs leave the Gulf of Mexico, they don't come back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

The reason that this is the greatest deliberative body in the world is that sometimes during the course of a very intelligent discussion the truth and facts come out. Now, both the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Virginia have been able to cite chapter and verse of how many applications have been applied for, where they are, and what has happened to them. So, to suggest that somehow this is going to create some additional burden, you've got to add a line: "We denied it because . . ."

So I trust that, based upon the sunshine that has now been brought forth to the good facts by the distinguished ranking member, perhaps we can get past this amendment, in the interest of comity, without a recorded vote as we did in the committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I urge the House to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield again just briefly?

Mr. CULBERSON. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Now we get to deepwater: Since an applicant first successfully demonstrated containment capabilities in mid-February of this year, BOEMRE has approved 75 permits for 21 unique wells, with 25 permits pending and 22 permits returned to the operator with the request for additional information, particularly information regarding containment.

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

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CULBERSON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. DICKS. Now, we want them to do this safely. We don't want to go through what we went through, which was one of the greatest disasters in the history of the country.

Mr. CULBERSON. Cleanly and safely.

Mr. DICKS. I just hope that we can have reports not only about the ones that are turned down. As you say, it may be that the other ones are part of the public record, but I think the report should come back with both of these if it's going to come to the Congress. You know how this place works. Not everybody sees these public

records. If these reports are going to be used by the committee, we ought to have both sides of the equation.

Mr. CULBERSON. Reclaiming my time, I couldn't agree more. We find ourselves in agreement that sunshine is a healthy thing, and that's the purpose of the language in the bill.

With all due respect, Mr. DICKS, it is important that the House reject this amendment so that we can have sunlight in every corner of the permitting process and so that the public and the Congress can know why these permits have been delayed or denied so that we can open up the Gulf of Mexico to drill here and drill now—cleanly and safely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I feel, I guess, like a lot of Americans in that I just can't act like it's business as usual. I am very upset that the FAA has shut down. Let me just tell everyone that H.R. 2644, by Representative COSTELLO, was filed yesterday. It is a clean reauthorization of the FAA bill.

Saturday morning at midnight, following 20 previous clean extensions, funding for the Federal Aviation Administration was allowed to expire. Why did this happen? Simply because the Republican Party's lack of leadership over the debt ceiling debate is the same as their position with the FAA. Over 4,000 people have been laid off and over 3,000 in Florida—good construction jobs.

Just last night, I spoke with a single mother of two children, a woman from Kansas, who received an eviction notice at her apartment because she is not going to be able to pay her bills because of this impasse. These are real people. I repeat:

The reason the FAA extension has not been renewed is because the House Transportation Committee chairman inserted language in the FAA extension bill that would end a program that provides subsidies to rural airports.

So, yes, this is another example of the Republican Party's, "if you don't do it my way, then we'll just shut it down, shut it down."

Let me be clear. There are people here in the Capitol who flew up. They paid, let's say, \$500 for their tickets. The aviation still charged the \$500, but the money that goes to fix up the airport, that money is going now to the airline industry. In fact, they have raised the ticket price. This is an example that, if we don't do our job, the people get hurt, and that goes back to what everybody is so nervous about as far as what we should do about raising the debt ceiling.

I spoke to the longshoremen on Monday. I asked them: Have you ever heard of it before? Not one person. Do you know I voted for it seven times under President Bush? They didn't know that. Four times under President Clinton and 19 times under Ronald Reagan?

Yet, we've got people who will bring down the United States Government if they don't have their way:

It's our way or not at all.

I was here under President Bush when we had 8 years of what I call "reverse Robin Hood"—robbing from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich. We did the same thing in December. We gave \$70 billion to the millionaires and billionaires, and now people are calling my office, wanting to know whether or not they're going to get their Social Security checks. There is something wrong with that. There is something wrong in the people's House that we are having senior citizens worrying about whether they're going to get their Social Security checks or whether they're going to get their veterans' checks. We can include the billionaires and millionaires, and we've got people over here from Louisiana to whom we've given billions of dollars; yet we want to close the opportunities to help other areas when we have disasters. That's what a budget is about. The budget determines your priorities.

It's a sad day in the people's House when we have people in this House who do not care about the American people; they only care about the next election. I can truly say that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. So the people who have lost their jobs at the FAA because of politics, wake up. The people who think that it's okay to rob Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare—education—wake up.

□ 1600

You know, elections have consequences, and we are going to have another election. And the people in this country are going to wake up, and they're going to realize that we're going to move forward or move behind. And clearly we've got people in charge that are only interested in pushing us behind.

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

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

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

Mr. LANDRY. I find it very amusing that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Washington would use an argument that we are overburdening a Federal agency when it is that side of the aisle that has a tendency to overburden and overregulate and demand reporting from our private sector. They have no problem asking the private sector to report things to the government so that they can discern whether or not the private sector is conducting its business accordingly.

And when this amendment comes up—and we're simply asking for transparency in order to see whether or not my constituents are being disingenuous or whether it is the government that is being disingenuous in the per-

mitting process. That is simply all we're asking here.

This allows us to help separate fact from fiction as to whether or not BOEMRE is rejecting permits for ridiculous reasons or legitimate reasons.

And so, again, it just amazes me that when we have an opportunity to shed a little light on a Federal agency that the party who has claimed that it's all about transparency and open government is now trying to shield that agency.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment should fail.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### LEASE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 122. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") may lease to the Savannah Bar Pilots Association, or a successor organization, no more than 30,000 square feet of land and improvements within Fort Pulaski National Monument (referred to in this section as the "Monument") at the location on Cockspar Island that has been used continuously by the Savannah Bar Pilots Association since 1940.

#### (b) RENTAL FEE AND PROCEEDS.—

(1) RENTAL FEE.—For the lease authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall require a rental fee based on fair market value adjusted, as the Secretary deems appropriate, for amounts to be expended by the lessee for property preservation, maintenance, or repair and related expenses.

(2) PROCEEDS.—Disposition of the proceeds from the rental fee required pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be made in accordance with section 3(k)(5) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-2(k)(5)).

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A lease entered into under this section—

(1) shall be for a term of no more than 10 years and, at the Secretary's discretion, for successive terms of no more than 10 years at a time; and

(2) shall include any terms and conditions the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect the resources of the Monument and the public interest.

(d) EXEMPTION FROM APPLICABLE LAW.—Except as provided in section 2(b)(2) of this Act, the lease authorized by this Act shall not be subject to section 3(k) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-2(k)) or section 321 of Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 1302).

#### SELF-DETERMINATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SEC. 123. The Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall reinstate the Demonstration Project that was in place from 2004 until 2008 for the Indian tribes within the California Tribal Trust Reform Consortium, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, and the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boys Reservation; shall thereby ensure that the participating tribes shall be able to continue operations independent of the Department of the Interior's trust reform and reorganization; and shall not impose its trust management infrastructure upon or alter the existing trust resource management systems of the above referenced tribes having a self-governance compact and operating in accordance with the Tribal Self-Governance Program set forth in title IV of Public Law 93-

638 (25 U.S.C. 458aa-458hh): *Provided*, That the California Trust Reform Consortium and any other participating Indian tribe agree to carry out their responsibilities under the same written and implemented fiduciary standards as those being carried by the Secretary of the Interior, including complying with section 102 of Public Law 103-412 (25 U.S.C. 4011): *Provided further*, That participating Indian tribes shall timely transfer funds and supply sufficient data to enable the Secretary of the Interior to comply with section 102 of Public Law 103-412 (25 U.S.C. 4011) for accounts that are maintained by the Department of the Interior when funds are being collected by the Indian tribes: *Provided further*, That such Indian tribes demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that they have the capability to do so: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall provide funds to the Indian tribes in an amount equal to that required by section 403(g) of Public Law 93-638 (25 U.S.C. 458cc(g)(3)), including funds specifically or functionally related to the provision of trust services to the Indian tribes or their members.

#### WILD LANDS FUNDING PROHIBITION

SEC. 124. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, beginning on line 15, strike section 124.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, as the amendment states, I seek to strike section 124 of this bill because section 124 prohibits expenditures for the Bureau of Land Management to carry out its lawful duties under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Secretary Salazar issued an order appropriately. It was called 3310. It stated the policy that BLM, the Bureau of Land Management, should act consistently with the law. Section 201 of the law, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, requires that the Interior Department maintain a current inventory of land under its jurisdiction and that it identify within that inventory of land the resource values including wildernesses of those lands.

Now, section 101 of the Federal Land Policy Act also says that certain public lands should be maintained in their natural state. Now, that's the law, the law since 1976. Secretary Salazar is simply attempting to implement that law.

Despite what some have claimed, Secretary Salazar's order does not create any de facto wilderness. One of the reasons that I would strike section 124 is that it will then return BLM wilderness policy to the way that it has operated for 27 years until it was unilaterally changed by then-Interior Secretary Gale Norton in 2003 in the Bush administration.

Now, the order that Secretary Salazar has issued directs BLM to develop

recommendations to the Congress regarding wilderness land designations. And it directs public involvement in the development of those recommendations. Now what could be wrong with that—make recommendations to the Congress and have public involvement?

But section 124 of this bill removes the requirement for public involvement. Why are we afraid of public involvement? And it also removes the requirement for the Bureau of Land Management to provide recommendations to the Congress.

Why does this bill want to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from making recommendations to the Congress and for having public involvement?

It's not going to prevent the Congress from designating wilderness. What it does do is to prevent the Congress from being properly informed before we can consider those designations.

The Secretary's order is the kind of good government process that encourages public involvement and forward thinking. As a demonstration of that forward thinking, Secretary Salazar reached out to the Congress in June, just a short while ago, and asked for Members' input into the wilderness characteristics of lands within their districts. Isn't that what we want them to do, reach out to the Congress, ask for our input?

I don't know what more we can ask from the Secretary or from the Bureau of Land Management but an open, public process with congressional input.

But this section that I think should be struck, this section 124, wants to foreclose that process, foreclose that open, public process with recommendations to the Congress.

It was a process that the majority and the committee report applauded.

Let me say further that wildlands do have real benefits. They have economic, they have environmental, and they have aesthetic benefits. It's important that we protect not only public land in its natural state but that we protect our ability to make informed decisions about which areas should or should not be designated as wilderness areas.

I do think we need the secretarial order so that we can be informed so that we can make the right decisions with regard to those designations. Wilderness areas are important, but it's also important that we maintain our responsibility. The Secretary makes recommendations to us for us to make these designations within the context of a public process.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate very kindly the gentleman from Virginia and his explanation of this particular provision that's in the bill. Unfortunately, it's not quite that way.

Your recommendation of this is that in June the Secretary asked for our input as to wilderness, which is indeed exactly what he should do if he wants to obey the law. That is the proper course. Only Congress has the ability to designate wilderness areas.

□ 1610

You said that the provision that's in the bill would foreclose that process. In fact, you're arguing the exact opposite. This provision in the bill does not allow the Secretary to go around that process but insists that he does come and work with Congress to do any kind of land designation as it is written in the law.

Secretary Salazar and Deputy Secretary Hayes and BLM Director Abbey have all assured us that they have no plans to implement this ill-advised policy they established just before Christmas, a Secretarial order that usurped congressional authority and congressional responsibility. I'm going to take them at their word. Unfortunately, though, the order has never been withdrawn officially. It has been superseded.

The Solicitor General's opinion to clarify the legal status of that superseding of the opinion has been promised us. It was promised to the chairman, promised to the chairman of the authorizing committee. Yesterday at a hearing we asked where that was, and we were told once again, well, it's on its way. What was said at that hearing, obviously, is what they will do is nothing contrary to the provision that was placed in the CR. Therefore, if we are going to take their word for it—in the old Reaganesque form, "Trust, but verify"—continue this language in here and make sure that what they claim they will do will be done and there is no legal way of getting around it.

Now, I say that legal process for a purpose. Even if I trust the word of the Secretary—and I do—if this provision is in some way legally in doubt—now, once again, until the Solicitor General's opinion is clear with us, it is in doubt—in a litigation-prone society like we have, any kind of radical activist may ask a renegade judge for political purposes to contravene what the policy states it's supposed to be. That's why I support Congresswoman LUMMIS' inclusion of this language in here. It would oppose any kind of roundabout process of going around Congress and allowing the administration to go around NEPA and around FLPMA, which is actually what the original order did.

It is not that we don't have confidence in this process; it's simply that we want to make sure it is very clean. And if, indeed, we all agree and believe what the Secretary is saying, then this language in here has no impact whatsoever. It should be accepted by all of us. If, though, you want to try to have some kind of dangling aspect out there so that somebody can sue someone

somewhere and maybe change the entire process, then create doubt and actually withdraw language that was in the CR that was approved by the House and the Senate and signed by the President.

What we're asking for is consistency so that what the gentleman from Virginia said will indeed happen, that if wilderness is designated, it will be done by Congress—it is our legal responsibility to do it—and that no one can do these evaluations, which are legal under FLPMA, with only one criterion. That, once again, was admitted by Director Abbey in our committee that that is not the way the law is written, and indeed if you do that, that is abrogation of the law.

Now, once again, you have a process here. If you leave the language in there, it's no harm, no foul. It is consistent with the law, and it is consistent with what the Department of the Interior said their policy will be. You take this language out, and all of a sudden you have created a doubt. Find somebody who has a good attorney, and all of a sudden that doubt creates a major problem for the Department of the Interior, and especially for us in Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. The amendment that's being offered is perfectly appropriate. It's the duty of the Department of the Interior to carry out the law. The law requires the Secretary to review, from time to time, the status of public land.

All too often, I hear my colleagues on the Republican side say that this is government land. No, no, no, this is not government land. This is our land. This is the land of the American people, owned in common for the common good. And the Secretary, carrying out that responsibility, reviews the attributes of the land. Is it good for oil? How about gas development or coal development? Or maybe it's useful as grazing land, or perhaps it should be wild and scenic land and preserved for the purpose of remaining in its most natural state. So my Republican colleagues come up and say, No, you can't look at the land. You can't study the land. We just won't want to know anything about the land, except to allow for the destruction of the land.

This particular amendment doesn't come in a vacuum. This amendment leads to the House floor another bill that is likely to move out of the Resources Committee and soon be on the floor, which would take the previous work done over the last 30 years that would quantify the values of the land, scenic, natural, wilderness, and push all of that aside and say, Open all the land, all the land to what was euphemistically—I hope euphemistically—called mechanized

conservation. Hmm, "mechanized conservation." Sounds to me like bulldozer, drilling rigs, a stampede of cattle and the like over any and all land.

Understand that this particular line in this appropriation bill goes hand in hand with a piece of legislation that went through, that was heard in the Resources Committee just yesterday, that would take all of the land that has been designated as wild and scenic some 30 years ago—some of which is said, no, it's not perfect for a wild and scenic designation—and take all of that land and open it for development. We ought not do that.

Therefore, this amendment that's been brought forward by the ranking member is appropriate in that it allows the Department of the Interior to upgrade some 30-year-old studies, taking into account new scientific information, new information about the land, and making that information available to us in Congress so that we can make an informed decision about whether land should or should not be wild and scenic or whatever designation might be appropriate, including opening some land for development. But I suppose it's best to know nothing.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would love to yield briefly to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I understand the gentleman's comments. And I know the hearing yesterday addresses the issue, which is separate from this. Listen, we should have that debate; we should have that discussion.

This issue is an administrative Secretarial order that, to the credit of Secretary Salazar, they withdrew. It was confirmed, by the way, to be withdrawn because of the CR we passed that takes us through September 30. The Secretary, to his credit, said, I'm going to abide by that. As a result, the order has not been withdrawn.

This debate here is about next year's funding. So until we get clarification on that order or the order is withdrawn, this language is appropriate. And that's simply all we're saying.

Now, we can get into a discussion of whether wild lands is, in fact, a designation or not. And as a matter of fact, wild lands has no definition whatsoever administratively. So there's a question on our side, obviously, if they can even do that because wild lands may be synonymous with wilderness, but wilderness can only be designated by the Congress.

And that is the concern that we have. And that's why I think the language that was put into the appropriation bill takes care of next year. And I say, to the credit of the Secretary—

Mr. GARAMENDI. Reclaiming my time, sir, my apologies for interrupting you.

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

(On request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and by unanimous consent, Mr. GARAMENDI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you for that accommodation.

I think the underlying problem was well described by you, and that is that the language prohibits the Secretary from going forward with the study of the wild lands. I think that's wrong. I think it's appropriate for us to always update our studies, always to understand what has changed and what is appropriate as we go forward.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

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

□ 1620

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman remembers, because he was in a committee hearing, under direct questioning, I think it was Director Abbey said that there is no authority to make any designation under law of wild lands because that was a made-up term. There's no designation.

Can they inventory? Yes. Nobody argues with that. But you can't make up administratively a new designation, and that's what the issue was. And he testified that he had no authority to do that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think you're down to parsing words here. The study that was attempted to be undertaken by the Secretary was to study the lands for their wild land values. He obviously could not designate a wild land that doesn't exist. But that study could give us information that we would need to open land to more drilling or other purposes, or to hold it aside for scenic and other values.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, this debate is always fascinating. I've got to tell you, if rhetoric were fast food, there'd be golden arches over all these doors because I've never heard so much rhetoric in my life. And I hope that the gentleman from California actually read the report. Maybe he did and maybe these pages got stuck together. I don't know.

But if you look at the report—he said that we don't care about the lands and the designations, that we just want to use them up and all that kind of stuff.

Let me read, for the RECORD, what the report says: As mentioned in the introduction of this report, the committee lauds the Department of the Interior for its significant changes in wild lands policy and notes that the Bureau of Land Management has, to this date, been in compliance with the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution prohibiting funds for the use of Secretarial order 3310, which was to designate, and as the gentleman said, he couldn't designate wild lands because

that policy didn't exist, and he can't. And he's in compliance with that.

It continues: While the Department is now rightly requesting the input of Members of Congress, Senators, and the public, the committee is concerned about the internal direction given by the Bureau of Land Management regarding the inventory of lands managed by the Bureau. As the Department has stated, inventories of bureau lands are required under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, FLPMA, and the committee agrees. The committee agrees with this reading of the act.

The committee points out that inventories should, however, cover all land uses, multiple use, not just lands with wilderness character. The values to be assessed include wildlife, fish habitat, nonmotorized and motorized recreation, hunting, fishing, grazing, conventional and renewable energy development, mining, wilderness character, forest management, and aesthetics. All of these values are important, and one value does not supersede the other.

The committee also directs the Bureau to use the definition of wilderness as defined in the 1964 Wilderness Act, as directed by section 603 of FLPMA. The committee will continue its oversight of this issue.

The Secretary has done the right thing by withdrawing his policy of wild lands designation, a designation that he made up. Only Congress can designate a new land designation. That's what Congress does. The Secretary agreed with that, withdrew it.

We have no problem, and encourage them to go on with the inventories for all of the characteristics of public lands. So the gentleman's comments relative to oh, all we care about is mining and flattening the land, or whatever he said, is just rhetoric.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The reality is, if the Secretary carries out what he says he's going to do, this amendment probably isn't necessary. If they decide to reverse course, then it was necessary. If they do what they said they are going to do, it absolutely won't have any effect, as the gentleman from Utah said.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. When I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior, I thought that the Department of the Interior should do what it needed to do. Now that I'm here I would agree with you that they should do what we tell them to do. Just a change in jobs.

However, the point here is that the language that you have put into this bill would preclude the Secretary from moving forward, even to carry out the words that are in the document itself. And I did read the document.

We need to know what is on the land, and we need to know its potential uses.

As I understand the amendment that you have put forward that is in this bill, it would deny the funding for those purposes to do the study. Now if I am wrong about that intent and effect of the amendment, then we've had a wonderful debate in which we all agree that the Secretary and the Department of the Interior should continue to always study the land and to take into account new information, new science, new knowledge, new GPS or satellite photos of the land. So I think, as I understand the amendment, and the intent of the amendment, it is to stop the Department from continuing to study these multiple attributes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Reclaiming my time, the Secretarial order which is in question needs to be withdrawn, and then he needs to issue a new one which doesn't include this new designation of wild lands because that still stands out there even though he says he's not going to designate any new wild lands.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Is it not true that the ability to designate and study and do these inventories comes under FLPMA regulation which is not changed by this amendment?

Mr. SIMPSON. That's exactly correct.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This amendment only deals with the category that was called wild lands, which is a made up category that has nothing to do with any kind of law.

Is it not true that the Secretary and the Interior Department can still do inventories on any consequence, but they are not allowed only to do inventory for one characteristic. They can inventory for all characteristics they're supposed to, and that comes in FLPMA.

Mr. SIMPSON. The amendment deals with the Secretarial order, not just wild lands.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Section 124 prohibits expenditures for the Bureau of Land Management to carry out its duties under section 201 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. Secretarial order 3310 states a policy that the Bureau of Land Management should act consistently with section 201 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and maintain a current inventory of land under its jurisdiction, and identify within that inventory the resource values, including wilderness, of those lands.

Despite what some have claimed, it does not create de facto wilderness. It returns BLM wilderness policy to the way it operated for 27 years before being unilaterally changed by then Interior Secretary Gale Norton in 2003. It

directs the BLM to develop recommendations to Congress regarding wilderness land designation, and it directs public involvement in the development of those recommendations.

Section 124 removes the requirement for public involvement and removes the requirement for the BLM to provide recommendations to Congress. Section 124 doesn't prevent Congress from designating wilderness; it just prevents us from being properly informed before we consider these designations.

Secretarial order 3310 is the kind of good government process that encourages public involvement and forward thinking. As a demonstration of that forward thinking, the Secretary reached out to Congress in June asking for Members' input into the wilderness characteristics of land within their districts. I'm not sure what more we can ask for from the BLM and the Secretary but an open public process, as Mr. MORAN has stated.

Section 124 seeks to foreclose that process, a process that the majority in the committee report on H.R. 2584 applauded. These wild lands have real benefit—economic, environmental, and aesthetic. It's important that we protect not only public land in its natural state but our ability to make informed decisions about what areas should or should not be designated wilderness. We need the Secretarial order, and we need to be informed.

I yield to the gentleman from California if he would like to make a final comment here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's useful to read, and the characteristic of order No. 3310, which is the subject matter, was well described by the gentleman from Washington—if one were to read the order, the order basically directs the Bureau of Land Management to continue to do its studies for the purpose of identifying those lands that have wilderness characteristics. This is exactly what I was talking about when I raised my first point, that this particular section that is in this appropriation bill, section 124, fits directly with the piece of legislation that was authored by Mr. MCCARTHY and was heard in the subcommittee yesterday, and that is to terminate efforts to create wilderness areas in the United States. That's what this is all about. This is about opening lands to development, and to prohibit the Department from exercising its authority under the law to continue to investigate and to analyze our land for the value of its wilderness characteristics.

□ 1630

Therefore, this particular clause, 124 in the appropriation bill, runs directly counter to the requirement under the existing law that's been there for more than three decades for the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Land Management, to carry out its responsibilities.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman, who I just heard a few minutes ago praising Secretary Salazar for the way he conducts himself, that he's a good man. And now 3310 is like the Communist Manifesto.

Mr. SIMPSON. Part of the reason I was praising him is because he came over and sat down and listened to us and realized that there was a problem with Secretarial order 3310.

Mr. DICKS. Well, then why don't we trust him?

Mr. SIMPSON. I trust him.

Mr. DICKS. Well, then why do we have this amendment?

Mr. SIMPSON. What does it hurt? It doesn't hurt a thing.

What the gentleman is suggesting is because we are essentially saying you can't follow Secretarial order 3310, that means you can't follow FLPMA, which requires the inventory of these lands. They still have to do the inventory of the lands under FLPMA whether or not there is a Secretarial order 3310.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman from Washington and our colleague on the other side.

It's useful to read the Secretarial order rather than all of the hullabaloo of what this is all about. The Secretarial order follows the law. It says that the BLM shall do an analysis as to the wilderness characteristics. That is in FLPMA; that's the law. And so it says that's what it's doing.

Mr. DICKS. Are you suggesting that this provision says that he shouldn't follow the law?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I believe that's precisely what they're trying to do is tell the Secretary not to follow the law.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. It is absurd to think that repealing a Secretarial order which does not supercede Federal law somehow changes the underlying Federal law. It does not. FLPMA still exists whether the Secretarial order is there or not.

Mr. DICKS. Secretary Norton did it.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. In fact, the Secretarial order does follow the law. It precisely follows the law.

Mr. DICKS. Let's vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I didn't want it, but thank you.

Let me just simply try and come up with this one last time. The idea of inventory is covered in FLPMA; that doesn't change. The Secretarial order that established wild lands is a new policy. That has been superseded by another Secretarial order. It doesn't have an impact on this, which is one of the reasons why the administrative policy says it is unnecessary, given the Department's policy that includes collaboration with stakeholders, to identify public lands that may be appropriated.

The administration is not fighting this thing; they're on board with us. All we're saying is the reason you want to keep this language in here—until the supersession has taken place and the entire thing is repealed and you go back to FLPMA—is in case someone wants to litigate outside of it and try and force the Department of the Interior to do something it has said it will not do. That's what we're about here.

All these other arguments are extraneous. Its relationship to other legislation. It does not have any impact whatsoever. This is simply saying what the policy is, and the policy they're going to continue will be substantiated in the statute in case someone else wants to play around with it.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, so the point is this: The administration does not object, as I understand it, to the language of my amendment. The executive order, if it were repealed, would allow FLPMA to function as it is designed in the law. The problem that has been called to my attention is that the executive order has not been repealed. Secretary Salazar communicated privately with Chairman SIMPSON and Chairman BISHOP that he did not intend to enforce the wild lands order, but the order is still in place. So until the order is withdrawn, this amendment is necessary.

Democrats strongly opposed including this language in the committee level. They've offered this amendment today. And then the President has threatened veto because this language might be in the bill. Now given that development, my initial skepticism on including this language is long gone. I'm not even skeptical anymore. Clearly, there are those who still want the Secretary to operate outside his legal authority and declare wilderness or wild lands areas without Congress. Only Congress can do that.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

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

I'm glad the gentleman brought up Secretarial order 3310 because that's what we're talking about here.

Now the first sentence under section one, Purpose, it says: The Secretarial order affirms the protection of wilderness characteristics. Nobody is arguing about that at all. Then you go to page

2 of the Secretarial order, section 4, Policy, and it goes on through the process of inventorying and so forth.

And the last sentence is the problem where we have our heartburn. It says: "Where the BLM concludes that protection of wilderness characteristics"—which nobody argues about—"is appropriate, the BLM shall designate these lands as 'Wild Lands.'"

Now that is a made-up definition. Nobody argues about the inventory part, but now all of a sudden they're superseding and suggesting that there should be a new designation called wild lands. That is what the problem is. They have no authority to do that. And they affirmed that, by the way, in testimony in front of our committee. This part of the Interior bill simply says we're not going to fund that. And until the Secretarial order is withdrawn—this one here that says wild lands—once this is withdrawn, you're right, there's no issue. But it hasn't been withdrawn. That's why that language needs to stay in there. It's nothing more complicated than that.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Reclaiming my time, this issue is not just an academic discussion on this floor. People in the West are terrified that the Department of the Interior is going to create a new category of lands called "wild lands" that will be managed differently than the law provides.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I want to speak in favor of Mr. MORAN's amendment to strike an irresponsible provision in the underlying spending bill.

Sec. 124 puts our wild lands in harm's way by prohibiting funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce Secretarial Order 3310, or the "wild lands" policy.

This policy is a reasonable, well-grounded approach that will facilitate public participation and will restore balance to our public lands management policies.

Most importantly, it will protect cherished natural icons from development.

I commend the Secretary on his Order to resume the Interior Department's compliance with Wilderness Act and other existing laws that guarantee wilderness preservation.

The Secretarial Order overturns a flawed decision made by former Interior Secretary Norton during the Bush Administration to halt all assessment or new protection of public land with wilderness characteristics.

In effect, the Bush Administration stopped complying with the statutory requirements of the Wilderness Act and other laws.

The Salazar Order reverses that decision.

As a Member of Congress who understands the value of preserving wild places I fully support Salazar's decision to restore balance to public land management and any other measures taken to ensure the protection of ecologically important spaces.

Clearly, some of my colleagues do not agree with me.

Once again, the majority is trying to block BLM's and Congress' ability to manage public lands for the people.

They are breaking with years of bipartisan tradition of protecting these important spaces.

But we've witnessed these same tactics before with H.R. 1 earlier this year.

Blocking funds for the "wild lands policy" will have the immediate effect of despoiling thousands of acres of wild lands.

Destroying what could have been a legacy for future generations.

It allows the American people, through their elected representatives, to decide which lands should be permanently preserved as wilderness.

It is supported by the millions of Americans who are committed to the preservation of our wilderness heritage.

Without the policy, many of our nation's pristine wild and public lands remain at risk.

Don't take nature away from the American people.

Vote "yes" on Mr. MORAN's amendment to strike this irresponsible provision from the Interior spending bill.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL  
PROTECTION AGENCY  
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; and other operating expenses in support of research and development, \$754,611,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR.  
LATOURETTE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk occurring on page 65, line 5. I actually have three amendments all on the same subject, but one amendment touches line 21 and one amendment touches line 73. In the interest of comity, I would ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer all of those amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to considering all three amendments en bloc at this point in the reading?

Hearing none, the Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$13,000,000)".

Page 65, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 73, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

□ 1640

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the Chair.

There's a lot going on in Washington, Mr. Chairman, and I would tell you that people back home think we can't

get along, but this is a great example of how we're going to get along, and I'm going to become the second member of this subcommittee to say something nice about a member of the Democratic Party, and that's the President of the United States, Barack Obama.

President Obama became the first President of the United States in history to recognize that we needed to put real money into Great Lakes restoration. Those of us who live in the region selfishly know it, and those around the world know it as about 20 percent of the world's freshwater.

We've nicked-and-dimed and sort of moved along with some nice legislation in this House, some of it written by one of our former colleagues, Mr. Ehlers of Michigan, the Great Lakes Legacy Act, but it wasn't until President Obama, and I suspect that his then-Chief of Staff, the new mayor of Chicago, Mr. Emanuel, was whispering in his ear because he was certainly conversant with these issues, that we need to address the Great Lakes as an ecosystem and make sure that we deal with it appropriately.

So President Obama proposed \$475 million a couple of years ago for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. However, as so many things occur around here, that went from 475 to 300, and now in this bill we find it to be \$250 million. The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is designed to mitigate toxic substances in the Great Lakes, to reduce the impact of invasive species, to improve nearshore health and reduce nonpoint source pollution, improve habitat and reduce species loss, and improve information engagement and accountability in the program overall.

I just want to focus on one of those, and that is the invasive species, and not the invasive species that come in ballast water. This is an invasive species that is swimming up the Mississippi River, the Asian carp. The Asian carp and I have something in common: The Asian carp can eat 20 percent of its body weight a day, and this Asian carp, if it is successful in breaking through the electronic barrier and getting into the Great Lakes, will devastate that entire ecosystem. This is important.

I know that there are some Members who are going to say, well, I love the Great Lakes; I love the fact that the President made this designation; you're right, we need more money, but what doesn't need more money in this bill, and the account from which I'm taking it, climate change, but if we don't take care of the Great Lakes, 20 percent of the world's freshwater, we're not going to have to worry about climate change because we're all going to be dead. We need to make sure that we protect this valuable resource. And on this instance, Ms. Jackson, the administrator at the EPA, has been really a great partner in implementing these programs. She has over 300 projects under way at this current time.

I know this is a heavy lift, I know that it's selfish, but I would tell you that it's not selfish because the Great Lakes continue to be the treasure of the world, and there's going to come a time when water is the new oil when it comes to an important resource. I urge Members of the House to please support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. This is really hard, Mr. Chairman, but given our allocation, we had to cut many EPA programs, including programs we support like the clean water and drinking water State revolving funds. In the base bill, we reduced nearly every EPA geographic program below the 2011 enacted level, in addition to providing none of the requested increases.

Despite the cuts, restoration of the Great Lakes remains a committee priority as demonstrated by the fact that the Great Lakes program is the largest recipient of funds in the geographic programs. It's the largest geographical area, also, so you would probably expect that.

While I appreciate the intent of the gentleman's offset, where he offset this from, we cut EPA's climate budget by \$23 million—and it's easy to vote against funding for climate change or the increased funding that we have put into climate change—in the chairman's mark, and, believe it or not, there are some EPA programs we support under the climate change heading, including research and development of new automotive technologies, including the hydraulic hybrid technology for trucks, carbon capture and sequestration, and initiatives to increase methane transmission.

The reality is that over a period of time, because "climate change" is now kind of the key phrase, that if you want to get money for your basic science, you call it "climate change." Just like after 9/11, if you wanted money for some program, you called it "homeland security." That was the key phrase. Now "climate change" is the key phrase. A lot of the requests from the administration have been basic science programs that have been going on for a long time but have been shifted over and called climate change.

While we looked at the funding for climate change and the increases that had occurred in this budget over the years and that have been substantial, the fact is, when we looked at them, many of them were just basic science that needed to be continued. So we couldn't just go out and eliminate all the climate change or reduce it, I believe, any more than we did, and climate change took an \$83 million hit in this bill.

We see the same thing happening in the Department of the Interior, where base programs have been reclassified as climate change. So we really need to be

careful about what we are using as an offset under the administration's classification of a "climate change program."

In addition, funding for the Great Lakes restoration efforts grew from \$60 million in 2009 to \$475 million in 2010. Therefore, at the chairman's mark of \$250 million, funding for the Great Lakes is still four times above its historical levels. And, again, it continues to be a committee priority as evidenced by the fact that the Great Lakes program is the largest recipient of funds in the EPA's geographic programs.

If I felt we could fund the Great Lakes at a higher level within our allocation, then believe me, I would have done so. I would have done anything to avoid this debate with the gentleman from Ohio, but, unfortunately, even though the gentleman makes a good point and I agree with him and if we had more money in the allocation I would be more than happy to do it, it's the offset and where it comes from that causes me some concern.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be more than happy to yield.

Mr. LATOURETTE. If I seek to amend my amendment to say "Great Lakes Restoration Fund/Climate Change," will the gentleman give me my 50 bucks?

Mr. SIMPSON. Well, that would be one of the overall problems with the title, Climate Change, but I would have to oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak against the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his work on the Great Lakes.

I represent a Great Lakes region in Minnesota. As the chairman pointed out, the climate change has been cut, Great Lakes have been cut, and I'm here to tell the gentleman from Ohio, I think we can have a win-win even without supporting your amendment. The reason being is, by leaving the dollars where they are in the climate change, I think we can count on and, through our work, make sure that what is happening to the Great Lakes is documented and proven so that the facts are out there about what we need to do about climate change, and I'm going to refer to two examples. One is from a local paper of mine, the Star Tribune, from July 13:

It talks about how, with climate change, that they're seeing that Isle Royale in Lake Superior used to be too cold for deer ticks, but not anymore. Scientists are watching the effects of climate change and what is happening to the Great Lakes region. The ticks that carry Lyme disease have been

found for the first time on the island off the coast of northern Minnesota. At the end of the century, nesting loons may disappear altogether from most of the Great Lakes. These are findings from a report on the effects of climate change on the Great Lakes. It talks about, also, its effect on five of the largest national parks and public waters that we share in our region.

The series of studies has concluded that the current and future effects of warming, global climate change on national parks from California to Virginia and the consequences of it. But if people think that that is not hard enough to really kind of get, to make sure that we do climate change, that we look at what is going on in the Great Lakes, let me speak from another report that dealt with shipping on the Great Lakes.

□ 1650

I will enter for the RECORD which reports I use, but let me quote from this. It says: "The expected higher temperatures of climate change are predicted to increase evaporation, lower runoff, reduce ice formation, and raise surface water temperatures in the Great Lakes, resulting in a fall in lake levels. The increased precipitation will not be sufficient to completely offset the reduction in lake levels.

"For international commercial navigation in the Great Lakes, the impact of lower lake levels will be restrictions in vessel draughts and tonnage carriage, thus increasing the number of trips and the total costs to move a given tonnage of cargo."

In other words, climate change on the Great Lakes has an effect on the economy.

I know that the chairman did not have, in my opinion, sufficient allocations to address many issues I care passionately about, like climate change, including the economic consequences of climate change, as well as do some of the funding that the gentleman from Ohio and I both sought for the Great Lakes.

But I think the gentleman from Ohio could actually see benefit to the Great Lakes in research by not having his amendment move forward and keeping the dollars that we do have for science and climate change.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. As the chairman says, with great risk, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATOURETTE. No, no, no, you're going to like this. Actually, the deer tick is misnamed because it really doesn't come on deer. It comes more on the little gray mouse because the gray mouse is closer to the ground. And if you treat a cotton ball with an appropriate substance, you can relieve the deer ticks not only in Minnesota but here in Virginia and also in Ohio.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for sharing that. I know how to remove leeches, deer ticks, fish hooks.

Yes, I've been out there. But I really do think the Members should reject this amendment and leave the dollars where they are. We need to work harder to put more dollars into our environment, not only for its natural beauty and to leave a valued treasure to our children, but also because it has a direct impact on the economy of many of our States.

[From the StarTribune, July 13, 2011]

MORE DEER TICKS, FEWER LOONS: CLIMATE CHANGE ON THE GREAT LAKES

Isle Royale in Lake Superior used to be too cold for deer ticks. But not anymore.

The ticks, which carry Lyme disease, have been found for the first time on the island off the coast of northern Minnesota. And by the end of the century, nesting loons may disappear altogether from most of the Great Lakes.

Those are some of the findings of a report on the effects of climate change on the Great Lakes' five largest national parks.

It was the latest in a series of studies they have conducted on the current and future effects of a warming global climate on national parks from California to Virginia.

The report, the authors said, provides an early look at what's to come if the Republican-led Congress continues to thwart federal efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Republicans this week tried and failed to repeal new standards for more energy efficient lightbulbs, and are resisting the new federal rules regulating greenhouse gas emissions expected later this summer. They say the rules are unnecessary intrusions on freedom, and job-killers.

"We have an increasing partisan divide on this," said Stephen Saunders, president of the Rocky Mountain Climate Organization and a former national parks official with the Department of the Interior. "If people pay attention to how the places they know and love respond to climate change, I hope that makes people aware of what we should be doing differently."

The authors analyzed a century's worth of temperature trends for the Great Lakes area drawn from two weather stations on Lake Michigan, and found that both show more rapid change than the global averages. The one near the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, near Chicago, showed that in the last decade average temperatures have increased by 1.6 degrees, and the one near Picture Rocks National Lakeshore in Michigan showed an average increase of 2.7 degrees.

Lee Frelich, a University of Minnesota researcher who studies the effects of climate change in the Upper Midwest, said the analysis used widely accepted climate models and data, and the findings are right on the mark.

"Climate changes are more extreme in the mid continents," said Frelich, who was not involved in the report. "If you are fairly far north you will see bigger magnitudes of climate change than other places."

Water temperatures in Lake Superior have increased 4.5 degrees between 1979 and 2006, twice the rate of land temperatures, the report found. Between the 1970s and 2009, winter ice cover over the lakes shrunk 15 percent.

The report also documented a 31 percent increase in rain falling during big storms, and a 12 percent increase in wind speeds. Combined with less ice during the winter, those changes lead to faster erosion along the shores, putting fragile landscapes like the Sleeping Bear Sand Dunes in Michigan at risk. Frelich said that he's already seen the effect on his family's cabin in Door County, Wis., where winter storms have taken out trees on the edge of his property.

The report found that temperature changes are having a sometimes dramatic effect on wildlife. A growing number of botulism outbreaks, linked to higher water temperatures, have killed hundreds to thousands of birds in recent years in the Sleeping Bear Sand Dunes. Meanwhile, Isle Royale used to be free of deer ticks, which can only survive in average winter temperatures of 19 degrees or higher. But a park service employee this year reported finding a deer tick on his body after he'd been there for a month, meaning he had picked it up while on the island.

The report projects that average temperatures at Isle Royale and the Apostle Islands would increase by an average of 3.6 and 4.6 degrees by 2040 to 2069, depending on the rate of future air emissions—warm enough to squeeze nesting loons into the northwest corner of Lake Superior.

Mark Seeley, Minnesota state climatologist, said it's difficult to make projections about Lake Superior using data from two weather stations in Lake Michigan. But he said the report accurately documented the extreme upward shift in minimum temperatures in the winter. "The winter season is showing more dramatic increase in temperatures than summer," he said.

The authors said that the five parks in the study draw 3.7 million visitors per year, generate \$200 million in spending and support close to 3,000 jobs. "We face the financial reality that climate change may bring tremendous economic challenge," said Larry McDonald, the mayor of Bayfield, Wis., a tourist town on the edge of the Apostle Islands. He joined the authors of the report in a telephone news conference. "We need to respect and protect Lake Superior," he said.

[From the Transportation Research Board  
Special Report 291, May 2007]

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING, TRADE, AND AQUATIC  
INVASIVE SPECIES

(By Frank Millerd, Wilfrid Laurier  
University, Waterloo, Ontario)

SUMMARY

The possible impacts of climate change on Great Lakes international shipping and on nonindigenous species are examined. The expected higher temperatures of climate change are predicted to increase evaporation, lower runoff, reduce ice formation, and raise surface water temperatures in the Great Lakes, resulting in a fall in lake levels. The increased precipitation will not be sufficient to completely offset the reduction in lake levels.

For international commercial navigation in the Great Lakes the impact of lower lake levels will be restrictions in vessel draughts and tonnages carried, thus increasing the number of trips and the total costs to move a given tonnage of cargo. Estimates of these impacts are derived from a simulation of international cargo movements from and to the Great Lakes in a recent year. In other words, climate effects the economy of the Great Lakes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I must agree with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee and object to this amendment. I want to make a number of points. One is that the amendment adds funds for what are called geographic programs. That is a pretty broad category. It includes the Chesapeake Bay, the Puget Sound, the Great

Lakes, and other water bodies that need restoration projects. So if the amendment passes, I trust the gentleman understands that the funding will be and should be divided up amongst all of those programs.

Now, I do support the efforts of the Congress to clean up the Great Lakes and to deal with these invasive species. Clearly, it is a very serious problem. Asian carp is horribly destructive. But I think it is worth pointing out that it was during Democratic leadership in the Congress that the Great Lakes Restoration Project received its largest increases. In fiscal year 2010, the program received \$475 million, and this current year they're getting \$300 million. With all due respect, it would seem that the funding level of \$250 million, which is in this bill, that cuts far more dramatically many other programs, would be seen as something of a success. I think if anything, Mr. SIMPSON should be thanked for protecting this program.

I will let Mr. DICKS speak about Puget Sound—but the Chesapeake Bay was funded at \$17 million below the request, and it's only getting \$50 million. Now, I understand the gentleman's frustration that more could not have been done in this bill for all of the geographic programs.

But the reason why we are in this position of underfunding these admittedly critical water programs is because of two actions. I know the gentleman will remember those two actions because he supported them. One was the so-called Ryan Republican budget resolution that the gentleman voted for; and the second was the 302(b) allocation to the Interior Department. I think that set the stage. It really set parameters that were far too tight to be able to provide the kinds of funds for many programs, including Great Lakes restoration, that are needed.

Now, another point that needs to be made is that the GAO reported to the committee, and I quote: "Progress remains slow as the program has delisted only one of the 31 areas of concern." EPA officials said that the program set less ambitious goals for fiscal year 2012 because it has had such trouble in meeting past goals. The agency did set lower goals in 2012, and so it does seem to make some sense that reduced funding might be appropriate in view of those lesser goals.

But I also want to point out that the offset is really untenable. It reduces EPA's science account and environmental programs with what I think is the express intent of cutting additional climate change and clean energy programs.

Now, I also want to point out, and I know that the gentleman offering the amendment may not be excited about this, but it does seem a bit hypocritical, the gentleman offering this amendment, to add funds for the Great Lakes restoration also offered language which was put in the bill to defund the Great Lakes restoration over the ballast water standards. That amendment would save—

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I will yield when I'm finished.

If we want to help the Great Lakes get the kind of money they need, it doesn't seem to me that we should be offering amendments that would completely defund all EPA programs for the States bordering the Great Lakes if they don't meet adequate ballast water standards, which is the amendment that the gentleman put in the bill.

So I think that is a sufficient number of points to urge defeat of the amendment.

Now I will be happy to yield to my very good friend from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman very much. I wanted you to yield because you mischaracterized the other part.

What the other piece of language in the bill does, it says to the State of New York—

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

(On request of Mr. LATOURETTE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank you. You know there are eight States that border the Great Lakes. One State in particular, New York, has imposed ballast water exchange in innocent passage that can't be met by any technology that exists today. That set of standards will cripple, will literally cripple and bring to a halt all waterborne commerce in the Great Lakes. My amendment says, listen, if you want to impose that kind of standard, you're not going to get any money until this thing gets sorted out when the EPA and the Coast Guard come up with a uniform ballast water exchange.

But let me just tell you, since you're talking about the regional programs, the Great Lakes are unique. The Great Lakes were unique in the world. And I can remember a couple of years ago, Senator Dodd, he wanted to have Lake Champlain become a Great Lake. And I said to the distinguished Senator at the time: Lake Champlain is a good lake; but it's not a Great Lake. The Great Lakes are the five Great Lakes that every grade schooler learns on how to identify them. It is 20 percent of the world's fresh water. And if we don't take care of them, as the President of the United States recognized we needed to do in a big way, we're going to be in trouble in this country. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of transferring \$50 million in funding from EPA climate change programs to support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. While I have serious concerns about the offsets used in Mr. LATOURETTE's amendment, I strongly believe that we need to continue to restore the Great Lakes to preserve its many rare environmental attributes and to strengthen the American economy.

The Great Lakes are vitally important to the American manufacturing industry. According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, nearly 200 million tons of cargo travel through the Great Lakes each year. The Corps reports that the Great Lakes saves manufacturers and other industries approximately \$3.6 billion per year in transportation costs.

Studies undertaken by the University of Michigan show that more than 1.5 million jobs are directly connected to the Great Lakes generating \$62 billion in wages. The Great Lakes help provide nearly 1 million manufacturing jobs, over 200,000 jobs in tourism and recreation, nearly 120,000 jobs in shipping and more than 118,000 jobs in agriculture, fishing and food production.

The University of Michigan study also states that the 83 million people living in the Great Lakes area helped produce 27 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product and 24 percent of the country's exports in 2009. The basin is home to 38 percent of Fortune 500 companies. Moreover, the region's colleges and universities award 32 percent of the nation's advanced science and engineering degrees resulting in a stronger American workforce to compete against nations such as China and India.

Furthermore, the Great Lakes are an environmental treasure containing nearly 20 percent of the world's fresh surface water. The lakes also support over 200 globally rare plants and animals, and more than 40 species that are found nowhere else in the world according to the U.S. Department of the Interior.

In addition, the Great Lakes provide one of the best areas for fishery and other recreational activities in the world. It is estimated that 180 species of native fish, including small and large mouth bass, the northern pike and lake herring all reside in the Great Lakes. A study conducted by the Great Lakes Commissions reports that there are 4.3 million boats registered in the Great Lakes states, which is nearly one-third of all registered boats in the United States.

The many environmental and economic benefits generated by the Great Lakes are in danger because of its damaged ecosystem and numerous environmental conditions. Despite recent improvements, there is much work still to be done such as eliminating toxic substance pollution, controlling invasive species, reducing nonpoint source pollution and protecting against habitat and species losses.

Recognizing the importance of the Great Lakes, the Federal Government developed the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan to implement solutions to the many environmental challenges facing the Great Lakes. The Initiative has been focusing on ecosystem protection, enhancement, rehabilitation, and remediation within the Great Lakes Region.

According to a study by the Brookings Institution, fully implementing the Great Lakes restoration strategy would not only protect various rare fish and wildlife it would also generate \$50 billion in long-term economic benefits and \$50 million to \$125 million in reduced costs to municipalities.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support protecting our environment and our economy by voting to transfer funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative—so vital to restoring fresh water resources for the next generation and beyond.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by

the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON 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 65, line 5, insert "and fellowships" after "development".

□ 1700

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, my amendment would simply highlight the long-standing role of EPA in supporting the education of our Nation's top environmental scientists by inserting the word "fellowships" after research and development in the Science and Technology Account. EPA currently awards the fellowships, and thus my amendment has no scoring impact and does not authorize a new activity.

I realize that my Republican colleagues will surely not agree to this amendment, but they have to agree that science is the underpinning of great and good environmental policy. As the scientific arm of EPA, the Office of Research and Development supports world-class research and development activities to protect man's health and the environment. Supporting the next generation of scientists and engineers through fellowships is just one way the government supports the kind of critically important research that private industry and academia alone cannot and will not do.

With no real justification or detail, the committee's report language for this bill specifies that funds are not provided for the fellowship programs, amounting to a substantial \$17 million loss to this field. Lab equipment cannot operate itself. They cannot publish important papers or make groundbreaking discoveries, which creates jobs. That requires people. And EPA has a history of fostering some of the Nation's top young researchers that have gone on to apply their talents across government, academia, and industry. For instance, since 1995, EPA has awarded approximately 1,500 STAR fellowships.

Turning our backs on the next generation of academic researchers, gov-

ernments scientists, science educators, and environmental engineers all but ensures that we are doomed to make bad, uninformed environmental decisions for the future.

I realize the gentleman's point of order. I do not agree with it. But I'm sure he will be upheld by the Parliamentarian. So I simply would ask that if we could work together to try to preserve some of this talent that we have already put in place and some of the equipment that's already in place to continue groundbreaking research, that is going to be one of the few ways that we're going to develop good sound jobs for the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate what the gentlewoman is trying to do, and actually agree with what she's trying to do, I must insist on my point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part:

"An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law."

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for an earmark that is not authorized. The amendment therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I accept that point of order, but I would like to appeal to the chairman of this committee to work with us and see if we can't preserve some of the investments we've already made and some of the talent that is in place.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment expands the eligible uses of appropriations in the pending paragraph to include "fellowships." As such, it proposes to appropriate for that purpose.

The proponent of an item of appropriation carries the burden of persuasion on the question of whether it is supported by an authorization in law.

Having reviewed the amendment and entertained argument on the point of order, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation in question is authorized in law.

The Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2(a) of rule XXI.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, as somebody who has spent many, many years working in my community and around the country on the promotion of livable communities, I am

frankly mystified to see included in this bill an end to the program that provides technical assistance and guidance to communities who are looking for ways to increase economic development, plan for economic growth, and make their communities safer, healthier, and more economically secure. It is mystifying.

The EPA Office of Sustainable Communities was established to provide a resource for communities that need technical assistance to plan for economic growth, to deal with development, to account for a changing population and the demographics, to expand their economic development options, and make communities more attractive to business and local citizens.

Mr. Chairman, there are hundreds of examples from across the country about the work that the Office of Sustainable Communities has accomplished. Some of the most important projects were situations where the Office of Smart Growth has helped in brownfield redevelopment. These are very complicated problems for local communities where they help turn unusable, polluted land into land that's ready for development. This helps create housing and business opportunities and provide cities with an important foundation for planning future growth. This is precisely the sort of thing that we should be doing to help communities leverage resources and prepare for the future.

In Iowa City, Iowa, the Office of Smart Growth recently approved a grant to redo their downtown riverfront area after the 2008 flood devastated that community. With the help of EPA, they created a plan with input and support from local elected officials, business leaders, and local residents that's helped regenerate the downtown business area while preserving green space and recreational areas for families who are moving into the newly redeveloped residential buildings. Closer to my side of the continent, just picking at random, the communities of Driggs and Victor in Idaho received a Smart Growth Implementation Assistance Grant to help analyze the barriers and opportunities of infill development in support of downtown revitalization efforts. This small Federal investment helped communities take advantage of public-private partnerships and redevelopment opportunities that helped revitalize these small rural towns.

Hundreds of other communities across the country have received similar assistance under the Smart Growth Program. But these cooperative efforts would come to an end under this House legislation. The services offered by EPA's Sustainable Communities Office are in high demand. They've been able to assist only 9 percent of the communities that are interested, due to existing budget constraints.

In addition to their technical assistance work, the Office of Sustainable Communities is engaged in a partner-

ship that we all should be supporting and encouraging between HUD, the Department of Transportation, and EPA. The Partnership for Sustainable Communities enables these three Departments to work together to ensure that Federal funds work in conjunction with each other, break down the silos that frustrate us all to ensure that the Federal funds are spent as efficiently as possible and eliminate duplicative processes.

Despite the obvious connections between housing, transportation, and land use, we all know and have been frustrated that in the past the three agencies have not always worked well together as we would like. But Secretaries Donovan, our former colleague LaHood, Administrator Jackson, and the agency have spent these last 2 years cutting down the redtape and coordinating to meet multiple economic, environmental, and community objectives while also cutting redtape and working to partner better with local communities. The EPA's Office of Sustainable Communities helps fill a critical need by providing assistance and support to local communities.

□ 1710

I find it ridiculous that at a time when this type of help is needed more than ever, when there is nary a Member of Congress who hasn't been frustrated about the lack of coordination and implementation, that the House is now considering ending critical support to communities looking for ways to jump-start their own economic recovery, looking to improve the quality of life for their communities by making the Federal Government a better partner. This is something for which there should be no geographic, regional, partisan or ideological divide. This is an outstanding program. It deserves to be supported, and I hope, as this bill works its way through the process, that we find a way to retain this valuable service.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, beside me is a picture of the Cuyahoga River in 1952. The river is on fire.

The reason for this fire is that the river was heavily contaminated with flammable industrial waste. This water was dangerous to drink, needless to say, and to swim in. Fish and wildlife could not survive here. Flooding in this river would have spread pollution onto the shore and into neighborhoods. In short, this pollution was dangerous for the health of the people and the communities that depended on this river.

It was incidents like these that helped raise public awareness of the dangers of water pollution. Ultimately, that awareness became government action, including the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA,

in 1970 and of the passage of the Clean Water Act in 1972.

The EPA's purpose is simple: to protect human health and the environment. It does this by ensuring minimum standards for water quality nationwide while acting as a referee between the States.

Despite this important mission, this bill slashes the EPA's budget by 18 percent from current levels, so of course I rise to speak against this underlying bill. It also includes a number of riders that will prevent the EPA from carrying out the duties it is already legally required to perform. I don't know why the majority is so keen on undermining the vital mission of the EPA. I hear them talk a lot about the costs of certain EPA regulations; but what about the cost of getting rid of these regulations?

One serious cost that would go up is the cost of public health. The impact of polluting our air and water isn't a speculative matter. We know that it will make people and communities sick. More mercury in the air we breathe means more deaths and debilitating illnesses. More water pollution means families and communities will be subjected to a variety of health risks. In short, more pollution means rapidly escalating health care costs.

Another cost is the cost to our environment. Our rivers, coastlines and wetlands are the places that we take our children to experience the wonders of our country. This is where their interests in the natural sciences and the outdoors are kindled. Polluted waters and coastlines mean less wildlife, poorer fishing and a lot less beauty in this world. We have to remember that we are merely stewards of our natural resources and that the cost of polluting those resources isn't only borne now; it will be borne by future generations.

Finally, the EPA helps to ensure a fair playing field for businesses. This helps keep their long-term costs manageable. It's a simple fact that a few dollars in prevention is far, far cheaper than expensive cleanup costs later. For those who disagree or question that, I encourage you to contact BP Oil. That company will—and should—be paying for their damage for years to come.

So those are the costs the EPA helps to mitigate. That's why we need the EPA. We need a referee that is empowered to make sure that everyone plays by the rules and protects our natural resources. If we pass this bill, we are essentially ejecting the referee from the game of calling out misconduct on certain players, which will only encourage more misbehavior in the future.

Take a look at this picture. Is that what we want?

This bill is so flawed, there is little hope for it. I hope that my colleagues will reevaluate their approach to this legislation, will pull it from the floor and go back to the drawing board.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. We should be here today passing a clean debt ceiling and creating jobs; but in these challenging times of high deficits and a fragile economy, when it is critical that our limited spending priorities be focused on programs that can achieve results and encourage the creation of jobs and economic growth, the majority is, instead, bringing an unprecedented attempt to gut pollution controls and public health protections in order to give bigger profits to Big Oil and other special interest polluters.

By attaching more than three dozen policy riders to H.R. 2584, the House GOP is attempting to use a spending bill to make backdoor changes to 40 years of important Federal laws.

H.R. 2584 makes drastic spending cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency, as you've just heard, and to the Department of the Interior. It fuels a multi-front assault on America's air, water, lands, wildlife, and public health; and it severely undermines the environmental integrity of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. In doing so, this legislation cripples the budgets of key Federal agencies charged with protecting American citizens and natural resources.

The bill is laden with contradictions and regressive reforms:

It slashes funding to the Environmental Protection Agency by \$1.8 billion, yet restores \$55 million in oil and gas subsidies;

It dramatically cuts the U.S. Fish and Wildlife budget by 30 percent;

It zeros out funding to list new endangered species;

It reduces the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration budget by 18 percent from the President's 2012 budget and wholly eliminates funding for NOAA's climate service;

It cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund by 80 percent—a program that has been critical to my district of the U.S. Virgin Islands and to everyone's districts. H.R. 2584 renders this program's funding to its lowest level in history;

It cuts \$19.7 million from the National Endowment for the Humanities, threatening support for teachers, community colleges, museums, libraries, and archives of important historic documents and many others, as well as the preservation projects that enhance local economies and create jobs.

Another program that is affected is one that's near and dear to my community. That's the National Heritage Area program. I have recently introduced a bill to create a National Heritage Area on the island of St. Croix, which we have been looking forward to, not only to preserve and protect some of our local historical treasures, but as a badly needed economic development tool that would create jobs. National Heritage Areas are some of the most effective public-private partnerships for

resource conservation and heritage tourism supported by the Federal Government. National Heritage Areas have matched every dollar of Federal support with \$5.50 of other public and private funding, demonstrating a high yield of return on Federal resources.

I am appalled that this bill puts so much energy into tearing down America's foundational environmental protections, especially as the Representative of a place with some of the highest greenhouse gas emissions per square mile in the country. Instead of working on the bigger looming issue of our deficit crisis, this bill flies in the face of decades of bipartisan support for the protection of public health and environmental issues.

It does not put the American people first as it should. It further endangers them by allowing for more dangerous air pollution. It does not clean up urban and other critical waterways. It threatens clean water that millions of our constituents depend on. It shuts the door on endangered species, and ties the hands of our Federal agencies.

As leaders, we should not advance a budget that eliminates critical protections that our constituents so desperately need. We should not turn a blind eye to corporate polluters while holding the right of our future generations to clean health and a clean environment hostage just as the leadership is holding the well-being of the poor and middle class Americans and the economic security of our country hostage to an absolutely necessary lifting of this debt ceiling.

□ 1720

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against the fiscal year 2012 Interior and Environmental appropriations bill and any anti-environment and antipublic health and anti-American amendments that may be offered.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill which guts longstanding environmental policy. Unfortunately, this is not the only thing that's wrong with America today.

Once again, Speaker BOEHNER and the GOP are putting the needs of a few right-wing Members of Congress ahead of ordinary, hardworking, everyday Americans, many of whom lit up the phone lines yesterday in record numbers to express their disgust with Republican intransigence that's holding our Nation and international markets hostage. Not only did they call in record numbers, but 50 to 60 people came to my district office yesterday to show their support for a balanced approach to solving this debt ceiling issue. I also received a petition with over 1,500 names begging that we protect Social Security.

But still, against the urgent pleas of international financial institutions,

Wall Street executives, and millions of Americans who can ill-afford any reduction in their ability to borrow or an increase in interest rates for a car, home, or student loan, Republicans continue to show contempt for the American people by saying "no" to increasing the debt ceiling.

Do you realize out there how many of us have adjustable rate mortgages on our primary residence? Can you imagine what will happen if this Nation defaults on its obligations to pay its debt and, as a result, interest rates go up? That means your adjustable rate mortgage, my adjustable rate mortgage rate goes up. Could I stand to pay \$1,000 extra or \$2,000 extra per month on my mortgage because interest rates went up because we didn't do what we should have done here, which is to increase the debt ceiling, something we've done 21 times, I believe, over the last several—we did 18 times with Ronald Reagan as President?

But we can't afford not to deal with this debt ceiling issue.

Mr. Chairman, The Washington Post reports that House Republicans watched a movie together about bank robbers to motivate members of their caucus to stand firm in their solidarity against raising the debt ceiling. What kind of example does this set for the American people? What would they say if they knew that there is a concerted effort by Republicans not only to prevent an increase in the debt ceiling, but to impede economic progress, slow or stop job creation, cause the loss of 700,000 jobs, with the passage of cut, cap, and kill?

What about our seniors, our veterans, our students? What about our credit rating in this country?

Mr. Chairman, just like bank robbers, it appears that Republicans seek to threaten society as a whole, leaving a trail of destruction in their wake. Republicans have now taken hostage of the U.S. economy, threatening the livelihoods and well-being of Americans, young and old, rich and poor. They can see the hands of the clock ticking, precious seconds, minutes, and hours wasted.

Speaker BOEHNER and his cohorts say "no" to the President's request for reasonable compromise, "no" to the desperate pleas of businesses begging for a sense of certainty about the debt ceiling, and "no" to the American people who have shouted at the top of their lungs for shared sacrifice in these budget negotiations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if Republicans are looking for some additional inspiration in the debt ceiling negotiations, I'd recommend that they watch "Saving Private Ryan." It's about a man who makes the ultimate sacrifice to save the lives of his fellow Americans. He was not a survival-of-the-fittest-type guy, you're on your own.

We're all in this together.

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this country is in the middle of a great crisis, entirely an artificial crisis created by an attempt by one political party to blackmail the entire country into adopting its program of destroying Medicare and Social Security and food stamps and unemployment and all of the things that many of our people depend on.

But why do I say it's an artificial crisis? Because the debt ceiling increase is something we normally do—seven times during President Bush's administration.

Some people think to raise the debt ceiling is to say we're going to borrow and spend more. No, it's not. You raise the debt ceiling in order to pay for bills you already incurred because of decisions made 2 and 3 and 5 years ago, mostly during the Bush administration.

Not to raise the debt ceiling is like going into an expensive restaurant, having an expensive meal, and then getting the bill and saying, Oh, my God. I've got too much money on my credit card. I don't think I'll pay the bill. Well, if that's the case, you shouldn't have had the meal.

If you don't want to pay the bill, you shouldn't have made those budget decisions. You shouldn't have cut those taxes 10 years ago and gotten into those wars 7 and 8 years ago and made the other decisions that piled up the deficit.

If you want to have a debate, which we should, on how to change our policies in the future, that's for the budget debate. We're going to pass the budget at some point. We're going to debate tax levels, expenditure levels.

But instead, what are they doing? They're saying, That's a nice economy you've got there; pity if something should happen to it. And if you don't do exactly what we want, we're going to destroy it by not raising the debt ceiling and causing a collapse in credit so that everybody's interest rates go up and that people have to pay a thousand dollars more a month on their mortgage or whatever, because it's a ripple right throughout the economy.

A default would be a real crisis for the economy, and it will cost the economy probably a trillion dollars in extra deficit spending over the next 10 years just in higher interest costs. But if we don't do exactly what they want, to destroy Medicare and Social Security and the other things they never liked in the first place, they will wreck the economy by not raising the debt ceiling in order not to pay the bills that they incurred.

Then we hear that we have a deficit crisis, that, after all, the country is broke. We've got to cut the budget. Even the President says the country is broke. We've got to cut the budget—a little less savagely, but we've still got to cut.

Wrong.

The country is not broke. It is just that we are not taxing the millionaires and the billionaires and the corporations the way we used to.

In 1950, the corporations paid 6 percent of the entire economy of the GDP in corporate taxes. Today, it's under 1 percent. Twenty years ago, 30 percent of all income taxes came from corporations; today, it's under 6 percent. And that's why the middle class feels overtaxed, because they are, because we don't tax the millionaires and the billionaires the way we used to. We don't tax the corporations the way we used to—the big multinationals, I'm talking about, not the small businesses. Instead, we've shifted the tax burden to the middle class, and we don't get enough tax revenue.

And the fact of the matter is, if you look at the budget of 2001 and if you look at the budget of 2011, in 2001, the budget was \$258 billion in surplus. It was the last Clinton budget. How has it changed? Why is this budget \$1.2 trillion in deficit and that was a quarter trillion in balance? What's changed?

□ 1730

Well, adjusted for inflation and for population growth, nondefense discretionary spending, everything they want to cut now, hasn't changed at all. It was \$369 billion then; it's \$369 billion now.

What's changed? Well, defense spending and homeland security spending have gone up 74 percent because of two wars and a lot of bloat, a 74 percent increase in defense spending. Mandatory programs, that is to say, Medicare, Social Security, veterans, up 32 percent. And it is not only those. There is also unemployment insurance, mostly because we're in a recession, and you have to pay more unemployment insurance and food stamps and so forth. Total revenues are down 24 percent. From a bigger country, we're getting 24 percent less revenue today. Why? Because in 2001, the taxes collected 20 percent of GDP, and today it's 14.5 percent of GDP.

So what should we be doing? Well, first of all, we should raise the debt ceiling to recognize the debts that were already incurred, and we should do it cleanly, so as not to throw the economy into a tailspin. Then we should debate all of these issues in the budget. We should raise taxes on the millionaires, the billionaires, the corporations; cut defense; and try not to tamper with people's Social Security, Medicare, and the things that they depend on.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and oper-

ation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; administrative costs of the brownfields program under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002; and not to exceed \$19,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$2,498,433,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That of the funds included under this heading, not less than \$346,280,000 shall be for the Geographic Programs specified in the explanatory statement accompanying this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$48,206,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$48,206,000)”.

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

Mr. FLEMING. A little over a year ago, the GAO reported alarming findings at the ENERGY STAR program, a joint EPA and DOE program designed to save American consumers money on their utility bills. Although well intentioned, I have concerns that the ENERGY STAR program is leveraging hard-earned tax dollars and the trust of the American people for a program that lacks oversight, could still be subject to fraud and abuse, and one that would be better administered by the private sector.

I have the report here in my hand. In March 2010, the report indicates that the GAO released its report, documenting that the program was mainly a self-certification program without much oversight or accountability. In fact, according to the report, GAO created several fictitious companies without any relevant products on the market that easily became ENERGY STAR manufacturing partners. This new status granted these groups unlimited access to ENERGY STAR logos and promotional resources, and GAO was also able to obtain certification for 15 bogus products, including a gas-powered alarm clock and a “room cleaner” which was incredulously a feather duster taped to a space heater. Prior to approving these items, EPA failed to review any additional materials, including Web sites and self-incriminating pictures.

My amendment will simply reduce the Environmental Programs and Management account within EPA by \$48,206,000, with the intent of removing the EPA's portion of funding for the ENERGY STAR program. The savings from my amendment will be added to the spending reduction account.

Mr. Chairman, the ENERGY STAR program, created in 1992, enables companies and manufacturers to voluntarily label qualifying and EPA-approved household products and goods such as air conditioners, refrigerators,

computers, and light bulbs, et cetera. ENERGY STAR also grants energy-efficient labeling for home improvements and businesses. ENERGY STAR labeling encourages consumers to purchase such products and make home improvements in order to be more energy efficient, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and save money on utility bills, all very good value-oriented ideas and concepts.

It is my belief that the Federal program should not be paying anything for the ENERGY STAR program, however. Rather, this program would be better served as a private entity, saving the taxpayers millions of dollars each year. There are several good examples of well-respected, well-run independent private sector initiatives, including the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, an internationally recognized green building certification system; Consumers Union, an expert independent nonprofit organization which publishes the widely acclaimed Consumer Reports; and Underwriters Laboratories, Inc., UL, a global independent safety science company offering expertise in five areas, including product safety and environment.

These are just a few examples of nongovernment, nontaxpayer-funded entities that understand that if you don't do a good job, they will lose credibility. Not as much can be said for the ENERGY STAR program.

Americans rely heavily on this program and look to purchase household products with the ENERGY STAR label. Companies use the EPA-approved logo to market products. The Federal Government and several States offer tax credits to those who purchase ENERGY STAR products, and Federal agencies are required to use certain ENERGY STAR-approved products.

The ENERGY STAR program continues to receive millions of dollars, including approximately \$300 million through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus bill, and \$48 million in the underlying legislation. It's time for the Federal Government to allow the private sector to take over and to stop funding programs riddled with loopholes that investigators need to point out before the EPA institutes systematic changes.

So in summary, Mr. Chairman, we could well afford to save \$48 million, and we have plenty of good models where private entities have been doing a much better job for a much longer time. I ask others to support this amendment. This is good for not only energy savings but is a money-saving idea. Let's turn it over to the private sector. They do a much better job.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate the EN-

ERGY STAR program, even though a great many American consumers rely on it to choose appliances that meet Federal energy efficiency standards, such as windows, refrigerators, dishwashers, and clothes washers.

The program has improved since an Inspector General report highlighted flaws with the program. In response to the IG's report, ENERGY STAR moved away from allowing manufacturers to self-certify that they comply with efficiency standards, and now it requires third-party certifiers. Well, I'm sure there's room left for further improvement in the program.

As the gentleman from Louisiana has stated, many, many consumers have come to rely on this program in their everyday purchases and would, frankly, be stunned to think that this program is now being targeted. Americans, with the help of ENERGY STAR, saved nearly \$18 billion on their utility bills last year alone and enough energy to avoid greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to those from 33 million cars. Isn't that a good thing?

This is a voluntary program that works. We've heard so much railing coming particularly from the other side about EPA's regulations, and now the majority wants to attack a voluntary pro-consumer program. The underlying bill already contains a very substantial cut to the ENERGY STAR program, notwithstanding the fact that it has saved hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars and has enabled consumers to be much better informed as to what their appliances might cost them in terms of energy requirements.

But the ENERGY STAR program has been funded in this bill at the 2008 level, 4 years ago. Since then, the population has expanded, the number of appliances and things that use a great deal of electricity, particularly computers, has expanded almost geometrically. People's bills are going up. They want to know what are the most energy-efficient products, so they rely upon the ENERGY STAR program, again, a voluntary program and one that has been improved since the IG report. They have third-party certification now as to what they are saying so that we should have some confidence now in the ENERGY STAR imprimatur, if you will, on appliances.

□ 1740

It doesn't seem that this is the kind of thing that we should be cutting. This is a pro-consumer, voluntary effort that works. So I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLEMING. I don't disagree with the gentleman's comments. It's a good program, although it has been a flawed program. Hopefully, it's been improved.

My point is that this could be better done in the private sector, a fee or whatever paid directly to whatever pri-

vate entity out there that would be nonprofit for this. Why should the taxpayers have to subsidize it? That's really the issue here.

Mr. MORAN. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman, we have things like the Better Business Bureau which, frankly, doesn't have that kind of certification. Almost anybody can get designations. Sometimes it's helpful. Other times it's less so.

I think the American consumer wants some level of credibility in the organization that is certifying that an appliance is energy efficient. The Energy Star designation means something. And if this was self-policing, done completely in the private sector, you wouldn't have had an Inspector General report. You wouldn't have had this corrective mechanism that now says, you've got to fix this. You can't rely completely upon self-certification, which is exactly what you'd have under the private sector.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLEMING. There are plenty of private sector oversight organizations. And again, UL: No appliance ever goes to market now without a UL stamp, and again, that's done through a private entity. So, again, it's a great program. Don't get me wrong. I just don't see where taxpayers should be funding that. We can do much better through the private sector.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I appreciate the gentleman's shared desire to reduce spending, however, I must oppose this amendment. As the minority pointed out, to meet the 2012 302(b) allocation, we cut the Energy Star program by \$27.5 million, funding for the Energy Star program down to \$48.2 million, which is below the 2006 level. And we believe that significant cuts took place in this program, as they should have been taken. And with that we reluctantly oppose the amendment, and would ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the gentleman. We agree with his position on this, and we oppose the amendment as well.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

Mr. POMPEO. 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 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,246,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,246,000)”.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying thank you to the committee chairman for running a great piece of legislation. I think this bill will go a long way towards creating a pro-growth economy. We've done a great deal of work to reduce spending on this bill, and I stand here this afternoon hoping to help out even just a little bit more.

The amendment I offer I offered during H.R. 1. It passed. It passed with votes from both sides of the aisle. The Senate failed to act on it, so I'm here today again to offer this amendment one more time, and I hope it will pass again with bipartisan support, and that we will, once again, move towards a smaller, more humble Federal Government that does only those things that it's intended to do.

The amendment I offer today seeks to reduce by \$6.2 million the amount of money available for the EPA's greenhouse gas registry program. If I had my druthers, I'd probably prefer to see the program go away. But I offer a more modest amount today.

This amendment only reduces spending for this program back to the levels from 2009. Now, this is very consistent with the legislation that we're acting on, the bigger bill which takes us back to 2009. This is a program that currently stands, without this amendment, 95 percent higher than the funding for the greenhouse gas registry in 2009. I think we can all agree that we weren't spending too little money in 2009 regulating greenhouse gases in America.

We know the EPA says that this registry is just about data collection. We'd just like a little bit more information. But those of us in Kansas who are trying to operate businesses and make a go of it know that there's an agenda far beyond that. This is an agenda that is job-killing. This is an agenda that will destroy jobs, not only in Kansas, but will drive up the cost of energy for every American. And so I urge my colleagues today to support this amendment.

If we simply restore funding back to the 2009 level we will roll back, I hope, again with bipartisan support, and we'll create jobs and keep EPA doing those things it ought to be doing.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. MORAN. I do rise in opposition to this amendment because it attempts to strip half of the remaining funding for EPA's greenhouse gas registry pro-

gram. This amendment is part of an effort to ignore what the scientists tell us is the most serious environmental problem of our time, climate change.

Republicans have already passed a bill to repeal a scientific finding that greenhouse gases pose a danger to human health. The underlying bill we're considering says that no stationary source, no matter how large, or how lethal to human health, should ever have to reduce its carbon pollution.

But this amendment goes even further. It says that we should not even bother to find out how much pollution is being put into the air. I guess you could call it the “ignorance is bliss” amendment.

What we should be doing is the opposite of what the gentleman is trying to do. The bill already makes a 30 percent cut to the registry program in order to cripple the efforts of EPA with regard to greenhouse gases.

The Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program simply requires the largest sources of carbon pollution, power plants, refineries, and the very largest factories, to tell EPA and the public how much they pollute. If we're ever going to deal responsibly with this pollution that is costing us billions in health care and shortening thousands of lives, we need to know where it is coming from and have some idea of how much is being emitted.

This amendment is yet one more example of putting the profits of industry, and particularly those industries that pollute the air and eventually clog the water, that poison much of our environment, to put their profits ahead of the public interest and the public's health.

We all know that pollution is dangerous to our health. The scientists tell us that, certainly the reputable scientists. Let's allow EPA to fulfill its core responsibility, which is to collect this information and inform the public.

I know our friends on the other side hate regulations because they believe that the Environmental Protection Agency doesn't understand the impact of those regulations on businesses and on the economy and on jobs and so on. EPA's job is to protect the public health, and in doing so, and in encouraging cleaner sources of energy, we will not only protect the public's health, but we will grow this economy, grow it in a more competitive and a healthier way and a far more sustainable manner.

□ 1750

I oppose this amendment vigorously. At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, who offered the amendment.

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will be very brief.

I certainly care deeply about clean air, so do all the businesses in Kansas, so do all the agriculture people. We want clean water, but we know how to do it and we're doing it.

You said this was the “ignorance is bliss” amendment. I would prefer to call it the “jobs are a good thing” amendment.

When things get mischaracterized—I'm not suggesting we abolish this. There is still \$6.2 million available for the Greenhouse Gas Registry. That's as much as was available in 2009.

This is a simple, modest amendment that many on your side voted for when I offered it before, and I hope many of them will continue to do that.

I thank you for yielding.

Mr. MORAN. I was happy to yield.

Reclaiming my time, it just seems to me that more information, accurate information, should not be a threat. Isn't it appropriate to let the public know—in fact, to let lawmakers know who might need to respond—how lethal is the pollution? How substantial is the pollution? What's the composition of the pollution coming from the very largest polluters? What are we doing to our people? What are we doing to our environment? What are the sources of much of the billions of dollars that we're spending in health care, twice as much as any other country spends on a per capita basis?

So all we're trying to do here is to have a registry—information. That ought not be threatening.

This amendment should be defeated.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. A few years ago, the Supreme Court said that the EPA, under the Clean Air Act, had to come up with and look at the consequences of greenhouse gases and to create this registry, which is a scientific document that allows us to know just exactly what the various sources of these greenhouse gases are.

Now we hear a lot about climate change. I just want to point out there is another more immediate problem. The gentleman from Kansas may not be aware of this because it affects our oceans, and Kansas is in the middle of our country. The oceans are now a sink for carbon dioxide. And as we get more and more CO<sub>2</sub> in the ocean, it creates acidity, the so-called pH factor, which at normal range is around 8.1, and when it goes down—we have places in Hood Canal, in my home area, that are down at 7.3. At that level of acidity, it starts to take apart coral. It takes apart oyster shells. It takes apart the vital plankton, which are the food for salmon, 60 percent of the food for salmon.

This is an incredibly important situation. So the more we can learn about greenhouse gases and what their effect is not only on our climate, but also on the ocean. We are poisoning the ocean. And again, there is this “let's not take time to work on this issue because somehow it's going to cut away jobs.”

It may end civilization. Think about that.

Your grandchildren, my grandchildren—your children, maybe. Maybe you're younger. I worry about them. I worry about what's going to happen if we don't deal with this climate change issue. And we should take this seriously. The best scientists in the world say this is something that needs to be dealt with.

So, again, I think this idea of taking out the money for the Greenhouse Gas Registry so that we will have a scientific underpinning to know what these problems are and how much various sources produce is the "ignorance is bliss" amendment.

Let's defeat this amendment and let the EPA do its job.

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$41,099,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$36,428,000, to remain available until expended.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

Ms. RICHARDSON. 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 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 68, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to speak on the Richardson amendment.

This amendment adds an additional \$5 million to the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act—also known as DERA grants—by cutting \$10 million from the EPA Buildings and Facilities account. The Richardson amendment is about creating jobs, saving lives, and improving our Nation's air quality.

Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress I introduced legislation that extended DERA for 5 years. The DERA legislation received large bipartisan support and was later signed into law by President Obama. DERA is supported by a coalition of over 500 leading transportation, environmental, and health organizations.

I represent a region that's home to the largest port complex in the Nation and consists of some of the busiest freeways and railways in our country. However, the area also suffers from poor air quality, which has led to much higher rates of asthma and cancer than any other area in the Nation. DERA improves our air quality by reducing the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by up to 35,600 tons per year. It has been estimated that nearly 2,000 lives will be saved over the next 5 years through DERA by increased air quality.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today reduces the funding for DERA grants by \$19.9 million, which is well below the fiscal year 2011 levels. The EPA estimates that the DERA program averages more than \$13 in health and economic benefits for every \$1 we authorize in funding. The EPA also estimates that DERA saves more than 3.2 million gallons of fuel annually, which means that truckers and other diesel operators will spend \$8 million less on fuel. Mr. Chairman, that's less dependency on foreign oil.

In these tight economic times, it makes sense that we invest in programs that work and are cost effective. The CBO score on the Richardson amendment showed that it will decrease the budget authority by \$5 million without creating any new budget outlays. Simply put, the Richardson amendment saves money.

Since DERA funding began in 2007, more than 3,000 projects nationwide have benefited from this program. In fact, there have been nine projects in the Los Angeles County area, where I reside, alone.

Mr. Chairman, DERA projects have created jobs and improved air quality in my district and across the country. The Richardson amendment saves lives, saves money, and creates jobs, which is certainly what we need and we should be talking about more in these dark hours.

I urge my colleagues to support the Richardson amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I do this extremely reluctantly because I am very supportive of the DERA program, but I can't support the offset.

The DERA program, as the gentlelady is aware, was not in the administration's mark, and in this underlying bill, we provide for \$10 million for the DERA program. As she well knows,

throughout the country this is a way to remove old diesel engines that pollute, and this is something that actually works.

It's not a program; it's not a study; it's not some academic exercise. It's actually something that cleans up the air, so it's something I am very much supportive of. But right now EPA's Buildings and Facilities accounts are cut by nearly one-third. We have cut back these accounts substantially, and so we just can't support the offset in the bill.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1800

Ms. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman from California, which we both serve, and it's my understanding that the account that the funds we're requesting that it would be taken from do, with what we're taking, still meet its outlay that's required, so I don't believe that this would be a hurt to that account.

Mr. CALVERT. Reclaiming my time, the program has already taken a substantial hit, a \$20 million hit, as a matter of fact. Almost every other program in our bill has taken substantial hits.

We're serious about reducing spending. If we had the additional money, I'm sure the chairman would have added more money in the DERA account in the first place if we had the extra money to do so, because it's an extremely successful program, something that I certainly support. I understand the gentlelady's conviction, but we just don't have the money to take care of this offset, so we have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished Member from California. I know my colleague—and she's more than a colleague, a friend—is very passionate about this program, and it has a sweet acronym, DERA. As I said during the H.R. 1 debate, the diesel emissions program is a good program. That's not the issue. Right now, with regard to this amendment, the issue is whether or not we should be raiding other EPA accounts to give this diesel program even more funding than it actually has already gotten in this bill.

Chairman SIMPSON funded the diesel program at \$30 million, even though President Obama requested nothing for it. Now this amendment would add a mere \$5 million, but it would take \$10 million from EPA's buildings to pay for it. It may be politically attractive to take from a buildings account, until you know what it funds.

The following facilities would have to give up funding to add this \$5 million to the diesel program: the Ann

Arbor, Michigan, national vehicle and fuel emissions lab; the Andrew Breidenbach environmental research center in Cincinnati, Ohio; the Region 9 office in San Francisco; the Research Triangle Park main laboratory in North Carolina. In that regard, the project in 2012 needs to be funded so we can save future lease costs that would be in jeopardy if we were to take this money away from the Research Triangle Park lab. The Narragansett, Rhode Island, research lab would be cut, and the air and radiation lab in Montgomery, Alabama.

All of these facilities have requests in this fiscal year 2012 budget for needed facilities improvements. To cut those in order to increase a program that was already plussed up \$30 million above the request doesn't seem to me to be the right thing to do.

In addition, we have an amendment filed from another Member—and I see her here so I suspect it's going to come up right now—to take away the \$30 million that's already in the bill. I would hope my good friend would stick around to strike the last word and address this amendment that would zero out the diesel program. I don't want to zero it out, but neither do I want to zero out money for six important EPA facilities. So I hope the supporters of the diesel program will stick around, will defend it against its elimination, which is an amendment that's coming up very soon, but right now it seems to me that the wisest thing to do is to try to protect the \$30 million that's already in the program, which is \$30 million more than the President requested.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. 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.

#### 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:

The first amendment by Mr. DICKS of Washington.

The second amendment by Mr. DICKS of Washington.

The amendments en bloc by Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment No. 23 by Ms. RICHARDSON of California.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 237, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 658]

AYES—174

Ackerman	Fudge	Nadler
Andrews	Garamendi	Napolitano
Baca	Gonzalez	Neal
Baldwin	Green, Al	Olver
Barrow	Grijalva	Owens
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pallone
Becerra	Hahn	Pascarell
Berkley	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Heinrich	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Higgins	Perlmutter
Boswell	Himes	Peters
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Bralley (IA)	Hirono	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Holden	Quigley
Capps	Holt	Rahall
Capuano	Hoyer	Rangel
Carnahan	Inslie	Reichert
Carney	Israel	Reyes
Carson (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Rothman (NJ)
Chu	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (MI)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	T.
Clay	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kind	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kissell	Schiff
Connolly (VA)	Kucinich	Schwartz
Conyers	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Costa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costello	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Courtney	Levin	Sherman
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cuellar	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cummings	Loebback	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Davis (IL)	Lujan	Stark
DeFazio	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Markey	Tierney
Deutch	Matheson	Tonko
Dicks	Matsui	Towns
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Doggett	McCollum	Van Hollen
Donnelly (IN)	McDermott	Visclosky
Doyle	McGovern	Walz (MN)
Edwards	McIntyre	Wasserman
Ellison	McNerney	Schultz
Engel	Meeke	Waters
Eshoo	Michaud	Watt
Farr	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Fattah	Miller, George	Welch
Filner	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Moran	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth

NOES—237

Adams	Bilbray	Burgess
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Burton (IN)
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Alexander	Black	Camp
Altmore	Blackburn	Campbell
Amash	Bonner	Canseco
Bachus	Bono Mack	Cantor
Barletta	Boren	Capito
Bartlett	Boustany	Cardoza
Barton (TX)	Brady (TX)	Carter
Bass (NH)	Brooks	Chabot
Benishek	Buchanan	Chaffetz
Berg	Bucshon	Coble
Biggart	Buerkle	Coffman (CO)

Cole	Jenkins	Price (GA)
Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Quayle
Cravaack	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg
Crenshaw	Jones	Renacci
Critz	Jordan	Ribble
Culberson	Kelly	Rigell
Davis (KY)	King (IA)	Rivera
Denham	King (NY)	Roby
Dent	Kingston	Roe (TN)
DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Dold	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Dreier	Lamborn	Rokita
Duffy	Lance	Rooney
Duncan (SC)	Landry	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Roskam
Ellmers	Latham	Ross (AR)
Emerson	LaTourette	Ross (FL)
Farenthold	Latta	Royce
Fincher	Lewis (CA)	Runyan
Flake	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Long	Scalise
Fleming	Lucas	Schilling
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Schmidt
Forbes	Lummis	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Scott (SC)
Foxo	E.	Scott, Austin
Franks (AZ)	Mack	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Sessions
Gallagher	Marchant	Shimkus
Gardner	Marino	Shuler
Garrett	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster
Gerlach	McCaul	Simpson
Gibbs	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Gibson	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Gohmert	McKinley	Southerland
Goodlatte	McMorris	Stearns
Gosar	Rodgers	Stivers
Gowdy	Meehan	Stutzman
Granger	Mica	Sullivan
Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Sutton
Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)	Terry
Green, Gene	Miller, Gary	Thompson (PA)
Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney	Thornberry
Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)	Tipton
Grimm	Myrick	Turner
Guinta	Neugebauer	Upton
Guthrie	Noem	Walberg
Hall	Nugent	Walden
Hanna	Nunes	Walsh (IL)
Harper	Nunnelee	Webster
Hartzler	Olson	West
Hastings (WA)	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Hayworth	Paul	Whitfield
Heck	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)
Hensarling	Pearce	Wittman
Herger	Pence	Wolf
Herrera Beutler	Peterson	Womack
Huelskamp	Petri	Woodall
Huizenga (MI)	Pitts	Yoder
Hultgren	Platts	Young (AK)
Hunter	Poe (TX)	Young (FL)
Hurt	Pompeo	Young (IN)
Issa	Posey	

NOT VOTING—21

Austria	Harris	Ruppersberger
Bachmann	Hinchey	Rush
Bishop (GA)	Honda	Schock
Broun (GA)	Lowey	Schrader
Cassidy	McCotter	Tiberi
Chandler	Richmond	Velázquez
Giffords	Rogers (MI)	Wu

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1829

Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. ROONEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CARNEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 658 I was unavoidably detained, and could not be present for the rollcall. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 250, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 659]

AYES—174

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Pallone
Andrews	Green, Al	Pascarell
Baldwin	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Payne
Becerra	Hahn	Pelosi
Berkley	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Berman	Harris	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Heinrich	Polis
Blumenauer	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Hirono	Reichert
Butterfield	Holt	Reyes
Capps	Honda	Richardson
Capuano	Hoyer	Richmond
Carnahan	Inslee	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	(TX)	T.
Ciçilline	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (IL)	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Schakowsky
Clay	Kaptur	Schiff
Cleaver	Keating	Schrader
Clyburn	Kildee	Schwartz
Cohen	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Scott, David
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Costello	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Sires
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Cummings	Loebstack	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Davis (IL)	Lowe	Stark
DeFazio	Lujan	Sutton
DeGette	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Markey	Tierney
Dicks	Matsui	Tonko
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Doggett	McCollum	Tsongas
Dold	McDermott	Van Hollen
Doyle	McGovern	Velázquez
Edwards	McNerney	Visclosky
Ellison	Meehan	Wasserman
Engel	Meeks	Schultz
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watt
Fattah	Moore	Waxman
Filner	Moran	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Woolsey
Fudge	Napolitano	Wu
Gallegly	Neal	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Oliver	Young (FL)

NOES—250

Adams	Bachmann	Berg
Aderholt	Bachus	Biggart
Akin	Barletta	Bilbray
Alexander	Barrow	Bilirakis
Altmire	Bartlett	Black
Amash	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Austria	Bass (NH)	Bonner
Baca	Benishek	Bono Mack

Boren	Harper	Pearce
Boswell	Hartzler	Pence
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Peterson
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Petri
Brooks	Heck	Pitts
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Platts
Buchanan	Herger	Poe (TX)
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo
Buerkle	Hochul	Posey
Burgess	Holden	Price (GA)
Burton (IN)	Huelskamp	Quayle
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Rahall
Camp	Hultgren	Reed
Campbell	Hunter	Renacci
Canseco	Hurt	Ribble
Cantor	Issa	Rigell
Capito	Jenkins	Rivera
Cardoza	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Jones	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Kelly	Rogers (MI)
Coble	Kind	Rohrabacher
Coffman (CO)	King (IA)	Rokita
Cole	King (NY)	Rooney
Conaway	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Costa	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam
Cravaack	Kissell	Ross (AR)
Crawford	Kline	Ross (FL)
Crenshaw	Labrador	Royce
Critz	Lamborn	Runyan
Culberson	Lance	Ryan (OH)
Davis (KY)	Landry	Ryan (WI)
Denham	Lankford	Scalise
Dent	Latham	Schilling
DesJarlais	LaTourette	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Schock
Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (CA)	Schweikert
Dreier	LoBiondo	Scott (SC)
Duffy	Long	Scott, Austin
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Elmgers	Lummis	Shimkus
Emerson	Lungren, Daniel	Shuler
Farenthold	E.	Shuster
Fincher	Manzullo	Simpson
Flake	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Fleischmann	Marino	Smith (TX)
Fleming	Matheson	Southerland
Flores	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns
Forbes	McCaul	Stivers
Fortenberry	McClintock	Stutzman
Fox	McHenry	Sullivan
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Terry
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Gardner	McKinley	Thornberry
Garrett	McMorris	Tiberi
Gerlach	Rodgers	Tipton
Gibbs	Mica	Turner
Gibson	Michaud	Upton
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Walden
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Walsh (IL)
Gosar	Mulvaney	Walz (MN)
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Webster
Granger	Myrick	West
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Graves (MO)	Noem	Whitfield
Green, Gene	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Griffin (AR)	Nunes	Wittman
Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee	Wolf
Grimm	Olson	Womack
Guinta	Owens	Woodall
Guthrie	Palazzo	Yoder
Hall	Paul	Young (AK)
Hanna	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Bishop (UT)	Hinche	Rehberg
Chandler	Mack	Rush
Giffords	McCotter	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1836

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR.

LA TOURETTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr.

LA TOURETTE) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 660]

AYES—220

Adams	Goodlatte	Nunnelee
Akin	Gowdy	Olson
Alexander	Granger	Owens
Altmire	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Amash	Graves (MO)	Pastor (AZ)
Austria	Green, Gene	Paulsen
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Peters
Barletta	Grimm	Peterson
Bartlett	Guinta	Petri
Bartlett	Guthrie	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Hall	Platts
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Posey
Benishek	Harper	Price (GA)
Berg	Harris	Quayle
Biggart	Hartzler	Quigley
Bilirakis	Herger	Rahall
Boswell	Herrera Beutler	Rehberg
Boustany	Higgins	Renacci
Brooks	Hochul	Ribble
Brown (GA)	Holden	Rivera
Brown (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Buerkle	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Rooney
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Canseco	Johnson, Sam	Ross (FL)
Cantor	Jones	Royce
Capito	Jordan	Runyan
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Carter	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kildee	Scalise
Chabot	King (IA)	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	King (NY)	Schilling
Clyburn	Kingston	Schmidt
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Coffman (CO)	Klaine	Schweikert
Cohen	Kucinich	Scott (SC)
Conaway	Lamborn	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Landry	Scott, Austin
Costello	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Cravaack	LaTourette	Sessions
Critz	Latta	Shimkus
Culberson	Levin	Shuster
Cummings	Lipinski	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Loebstack	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stivers
Dingell	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Dold	E.	Sutton
Donnelly (IN)	Mack	Terry
Duffy	Manzullo	Thompson (MS)
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Thornberry
Emerson	Marino	Tiberi
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Fincher	McCaul	Turner
Flake	McClintock	Upton
Fleming	McHenry	Velázquez
Flores	McKinley	Walberg
Fortenberry	Meehan	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Walsh (IL)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Walz (MN)
Fudge	Miller (MI)	Waters
Gardner	Moore	Webster
Garrett	Mulvaney	West
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Myrick	Whitfield
Gibson	Nadler	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Nugent	Young (IN)
Gonzalez	Nunes	



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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 232, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 662]

AYES—193

Ackerman	Gibson	Nadler
Aderholt	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Altmire	Goodlatte	Neal
Bachmann	Green, Al	Pastorell
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Paul
Barrow	Grijalva	Paulsen
Bartlett	Gutierrez	Payne
Bass (CA)	Hahn	Pelosi
Becerra	Hall	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Hanabusa	Polis
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Posey
Bilbray	Heinrich	Quigley
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Rangel
Blumenauer	Hirono	Reed
Boren	Hochul	Reichert
Boswell	Holden	Renacci
Brady (PA)	Holt	Richardson
Bralley (IA)	Honda	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Hultgren	Rooney
Bucshon	Inslee	Ross (AR)
Butterfield	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda
Carney	Johnson (GA)	T.
Carson (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cassidy	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Jones	Schakowsky
Chu	Kaptur	Schiff
Cicilline	Keating	Schilling
Clarke (MI)	Kelly	Schock
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schrader
Clay	Kind	Schwartz
Cleaver	King (IA)	Scott, David
Clyburn	Kinzinger (IL)	Senenbrenner
Cohen	Kissell	Sewell
Conaway	Kline	Sherman
Conyers	Kucinich	Shimkus
Cooper	Langevin	Shuler
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Slaughter
Costello	Larson (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Critz	Lee (CA)	Stearns
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Stivers
Cuellar	Lipinski	Stutzman
Cummings	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Davis (IL)	Loeback	Sutton
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Dent	Luján	Tierney
Deutch	Lynch	Tonko
Dingell	Manzullo	Towns
Doyle	Marchant	Townsend
Duncan (TN)	Markey	Upton
Engel	Matsui	Wasserman
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Schultz
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Waters
Fattah	McClintock	Watt
Filner	McDermott	Waxman
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	McNerney	Woolsey
Fudge	Meehan	Wu
Garamendi	Meeks	Yarmuth
Gerlach	Moore	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Murphy (CT)	

NOES—232

Adams	Black	Camp
Alexander	Blackburn	Campbell
Amash	Bonner	Cantaco
Andrews	Bono Mack	Cantor
Austria	Boustany	Capito
Baca	Brady (TX)	Capps
Bachus	Brooks	Carter
Bass (NH)	Broun (GA)	Chabot
Benishkek	Buchanan	Chaffetz
Berg	Buerkle	Coble
Biggert	Burgess	Coffman (CO)
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Cole
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Connolly (VA)

Courtney	Johnson (OH)	Price (NC)
Cravaack	Johnson, Sam	Quayle
Crawford	Jordan	Rehberg
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Reyes
Culberson	Kingston	Ribble
Davis (CA)	Labrador	Rigell
Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Rivera
DeLauro	Lance	Roby
Denham	Landry	Roe (TN)
DesJarlais	Lankford	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Dicks	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Doggett	Latta	Rohrabacher
Dold	Levin	Rokita
Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Long	Roskam
Duffy	Lowe	Ross (FL)
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Royce
Edwards	Lummis	Runyan
Ellison	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger
Ellmers	E.	Ryan (WI)
Emerson	Mack	Scalise
Eshoo	Maloney	Schmidt
Fincher	Marino	Schweikert
Flake	Matheson	Scott (SC)
Fleischmann	McCauley	Scott (VA)
Fleming	McCollum	Scott, Austin
Flores	McGovern	Serrano
Forbes	McHenry	Sessions
Fortenberry	McKeon	Shuster
Fox	McKinley	Simpson
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Sires
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Galleghy	Mica	Smith (TX)
Michaud	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Southerland
Miller (MI)	Miller (MI)	Speier
Miller (NC)	Miller (NC)	Stark
Miller, Gary	Miller, Gary	Terry
Miller, George	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Moran	Moran	Thompson (PA)
Mulvaney	Mulvaney	Tiberi
Murphy (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Tipton
Myrick	Myrick	Tsongas
Neugebauer	Neugebauer	Turner
Noem	Noem	Van Hollen
Nugent	Nugent	Velázquez
Nunes	Nunes	Visclosky
Nunnelee	Nunnelee	Walberg
Olson	Olson	Walden
Olver	Olver	Walsh (IL)
Owens	Owens	Walz (MN)
Palazzo	Palazzo	Webster
Pallone	Pallone	Welch
Pearce	Pearce	West
Pence	Pence	Westmoreland
Perlmutter	Perlmutter	Whitfield
Peters	Peters	Wilson (SC)
Peterson	Peterson	Wittman
Petri	Petri	Wolf
Pitts	Pitts	Womack
Platts	Platts	Woodall
Poe (TX)	Poe (TX)	Yoder
Pompeo	Pompeo	Young (FL)
Price (GA)	Price (GA)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Akin	Giffords	Rush
Barton (TX)	Hinche	
Chandler	McCotter	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1856

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611) \$1,224,295,000, to remain available until expended, consisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund on September 30, 2011, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to \$1,224,295,000 as

a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$9,955,000 shall be paid to the "Office of Inspector General" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2013, and \$23,016,000 shall be paid to the "Science and Technology" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2013.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, \$105,669,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$78,051,000 shall be for carrying out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended; \$34,430,000 shall be for carrying out the other provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act specified in section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended: *Provided*, That the Administrator is authorized to use appropriations made available under this heading to implement section 9013 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide financial assistance to federally recognized Indian tribes for the development and implementation of programs to manage underground storage tanks.

INLAND OIL SPILL PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$18,274,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, \$2,610,393,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$689,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the "Act"); of which \$829,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended; \$60,000,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs; \$30,000,000 shall be for grants under title VII, subtitle G of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; and \$1,002,393,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104-134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, of which \$49,396,000 shall be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA, as amended, \$9,980,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs, \$11,300,000 of the funds available for grants under section 106 of the Act shall be for state participation in national- and

state-level statistical surveys of water resources and enhancements to state monitoring programs and, in addition to funds appropriated under the heading "Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program" to carry out the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act specified in section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code other than section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, \$1,550,000 shall be for grants to States under section 2007(f)(2) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2012 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Federally recognized Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(i) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, up to a total of 2 percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under such Acts may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) and section 1452(i) of such Acts: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012, notwithstanding the amounts specified in section 205(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, up to 1.5 percent of the aggregate funds appropriated for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program under the Act less any sums reserved under section 518(c) of the Act, may be reserved by the Administrator for grants made under title II of the Clean Water Act for American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and United States Virgin Islands: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012, notwithstanding the limitations on amounts specified in section 1452(j) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund programs under the Safe Drinking Water Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants made under section 1452(j) of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided further*, That not less than 30 percent of the funds made available under this title to each State for Clean Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants and not less than 30 percent of the funds made available under this title to each State for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants shall be used by the State to provide additional subsidy to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans, or grants (or any combination of these), and shall be so used by the State only where such funds are provided as initial financing for an eligible recipient or to buy, refinance, or restructure the debt obligations of eligible recipients only where such debt was incurred on or after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That no funds provided by this appropriations Act to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforce-

able local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2012 and hereafter, of the funds provided for the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act State Revolving Fund Tribal Set-Asides, the Administrator may transfer funds between those accounts in the same manner as provided to States under section 302(a) of Public Law 104-182, as amended by Public Law 109-54.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

Page 68, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$30,000,000)".

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to begin by commending our Appropriations Committee for the extraordinary job that they have done to claw back this money and to reduce spending below the levels that we had last year or the levels in the CR.

They have, indeed, done an exemplary job. But I think during these extraordinary and unprecedented times, we have to do more. And this Diesel Emissions Reduction program is one of those areas of funding that we can look at and say, indeed, this is duplicative, and because of that, we can eliminate this \$30 million and move that funding into the spending reduction account.

Now, DERA, the program under discussion, is a grant program administered by EPA. It seeks to reduce diesel emissions—that's a worthy goal—by providing funds for technologies to retrofit existing vehicles and infrastructure not subject to updated diesel air standards. This is something that at one point in time, yes, it was important and had a tremendous impact on some of our communities, and they have done grants all across this country.

□ 1900

Now I want to point out that President Obama's fiscal year 2012 budget recommends completely eliminating funding for the DERA grants, and there is a reason that it has done that.

One of the reasons that they have done that is because since 2007, new diesel engines have to comply with a much higher emissions standard, therefore, it is decreasing the need for retrofits. There's also other funding available for such retrofits through the Department of Transportation Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program. They have about \$45 million for diesel retrofits annually,

and through the EPA's Supplemental Environmental Project enforcement agreements, where there's \$7.1 million for that.

There are other programs with similar grants, the EPA's Smart Growth Program, the EPA's Performance Partnership Grants, the Clean Fuels Formula Grants. Indeed, the administration has not increased Federal funding for this program above the \$60 million level in place since fiscal year 2009, when it received an additional \$300 million in the Stimulus Act.

This is a program that we can say, indeed, has been a helpful program, but it is duplicative, it has outlived its usefulness because there are emissions standards on diesel vehicles that have been in place since 2007. There is less need for these grants.

Indeed, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as we were debating the CR, had recommended that we use this program, an offset with this program, and eliminate the funding for this program. Mr. MORAN had offered, at that point in time, that we do that, and one the reasons he gave was because the President had eliminated it in order to encourage the truck industry to increase its own diesel R&D. I agree with that.

This is a program that we would save \$30 million. I know that it is duplicative. We need to save every penny we can possibly save of the taxpayers' money. This is a step that we should take. I appreciate the support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. I rise in strong opposition to the amendment that's brought forward to us today. If you look at the history, actually, of the DERA program, it's one of the rare programs in this House that has enjoyed bipartisan support from day one. When you consider the inception of the program and the continued amendments that have been passed on this floor, it has garnered support. And let's talk about why.

There is evidence to show that for every \$1 of investment that's made into this particular program, \$13 is received back, \$13 in economic benefits, in terms of jobs and in terms of health savings. Why?

DERA is the diesel emission program. I would say, is there anyone here who honestly believes that the American public that is driving on the highways every single day and sees the spewing of smog and soot coming out of trucks thinks that we no longer need this program?

There are thousands and thousands of trucks on our highways, and if this program weren't needed, I would suggest, then why are we receiving thousands and thousands of applications every single day? When the trucks have been

replaced and we have reduced the emissions, then there will be the time to re-evaluate this program. But that time is not now. We are finally making progress.

And let's talk about the benefits of the diesel emission program. Yes, one, it helps us to reduce the old trucks that are on the highways. But what does it also do?

By having diesel emission, it allows us to also save in terms of fuel that's being used. And we all know our dependency currently on foreign oil, so when we consider the ability to be able to reduce the amount of oil that we have to purchase, that individuals are purchasing, that truckers are purchasing, it reduces that cost of our dependence on oil. It reduces the cost of what the end users receive when they're getting the various products.

Now, let's talk about safety. When we look at the old trucks, if we can incentivize truckers to be able to upgrade their equipment, which would include filters, protection with diesel emissions, oftentimes there are other benefits that they're gaining with those vehicles, and so we're also saving lives.

I would say any suggestion of this amendment is shortsighted and ill-advised. This is a good working program, and the maker of the amendment agrees to that, and it garners bipartisan support.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and strongly urge that my colleagues would all join us in opposition to this amendment. Let's keep this program that is working in this country, and let's address the desperate diesel emission that's impacting asthma and many health issues in our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise to oppose the gentlelady's amendment. I think it's instructive to point out, I offered an amendment to strike funding for this program during H.R. 1, back in February, so that we could add funds to the North American Wetlands Conservation Program.

Now my colleague from Tennessee, let me just check the record here, voted "no," so I'm a little confused that now, a few months later, 5 months later, she has changed her mind. It seems to me, my amendment from February would have been preferable to the Members who have anglers and hunters in their district, which I suspect the gentlelady from Tennessee does. They rely upon healthy wetlands, which have been very much endangered by what was an elimination of the North American Wetlands Conservation Program in this bill.

This amendment simply throws away the needed funding. And I know the chairman of the subcommittee understands how needed those dollars are. So

it does seem to me that our amendment to have restored money for wetlands made more sense.

But, not only did I lose that vote, Mrs. BLACKBURN voted against eliminating this diesel program. So we did not eliminate that money largely because of the compelling argument that was made by Ms. RICHARDSON at the time. In the meantime, she has continued to lobby for this program. I found some of her arguments convincing. So we're not trying to take the money out that the chairman added. We can understand why it was added to the bill. So we would agree with the chairman. Let's leave it in the bill, even though it had been zeroed out by the President.

So I think Ms. RICHARDSON not only won that vote back in February, but I think she should win this vote as well. The money should be kept in the program—\$30 million does seem to be doing some good things. And so I would oppose the gentlelady from Tennessee's amendment to eliminate the program, and not even to use the \$30 million for any other constructive purpose.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

When I first looked at the President's proposal to eliminate funding for the diesel emissions reductions grant, I knew that there was a budget gimmick that we would have to backfill when we did this budget. This was an issue I addressed with the EPA administrator when she came before the subcommittee to justify her budget.

The diesel emissions reduction program, or DERA, is a proven program with known, quantifiable health benefits. The DERA program provides grants to States to retrofit old diesel engines in order to reduce pollution.

□ 1910

These grants produce \$13 of economic benefit per Federal dollar. And the technology supported by DERA reduced black carbon emissions by 90 percent.

When I asked the administrator why she would propose to eliminate funding for a program with proven technology that works in order to fund new, nice-to-have voluntary initiatives that we have no idea what they do, she responded that it was a tough budget choice. Well, it was the wrong choice.

I think the committee supports this program, it has in the past. As I said, it's a proven program that has proven results, and that's why we backfilled the request—even though the President didn't request any funding for this—to put \$30 million in. It is \$20 million below what was funded at the current level. So it did have a reduction just like every other program, but we did keep it alive at \$30 million.

I yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And, indeed, we are all for clean air; we are all for clean water; we are all for a clean environment. I think that during these times we have to look at how we're going to spend that money. And Mr. MORAN is right. I did vote against his amendment because the money was going to wetlands and not into a spending reduction account.

This is a program that is duplicative. There are other programs on the books. As we look at how to remove these redundancies and the duplications that are in the budget, this is an area where we can do it. We all want to make certain that we clean up the diesel emissions, but I would remind you all, since 2008 there have been a total of 500 grants that the EPA has given through this program, and we have four other programs that do this same work.

This is an area where we can go and achieve a savings. It is \$30 million, but these are the types of steps in the right direction that, Mr. Chairman, we have to be willing to take if we're going to get the Federal spending under control.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentlelady.

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 OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 68, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 76, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to speak on Richardson amendment No. 2.

This amendment would direct \$5 million for clean air grants, which were cut by nearly 15 percent in the current legislation.

Air pollution is a national problem. According to the EPA, approximately 127 million people live in counties that exceed at least one of the health-based national ambient air quality standards in 2008. New health-based standards for ozone will likely increase this number.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a region that's home to the largest port complex in the Nation and consists of some

of the busiest freeways and railways in the country. However, the area also suffers from poor air quality, which has led to much higher rates of asthma and cancer than the current national average.

Exposure to dirty air causes tens of thousands of premature deaths each year and results in serious health problems, such as the aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, difficulty breathing, increased susceptibility to respiratory infections, adverse effects on learning, memory, IQ, and behavior, as well as cancer.

Improvements in air quality lead to greater productivity, fewer sick days, and less money spent on health care to address air pollution-related problems. State and local air pollution control agencies have the primary responsibility to implement our Nation's clean air programs that are required by the Clean Air Act. However, due to this current recession, State and local governments are increasingly strapped for resources and are finding it ever more difficult to carry the Federal Government's share of funding this responsibility.

Because of the continuing adverse impacts of this recession on State and localities, air agencies will continue to make more painful decisions, such as reducing or cutting air programs that protect our public health. So in other words, we took 10 steps forward and now we're taking 20 back.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen firsthand that clean air grants are effective, when you consider, in an area of mine that's home to 16.8 million people and is one of the smoggiest areas in the Nation, the South Coast Air Quality Management District is one of the air pollution control agencies for Orange County and Los Angeles urban areas, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties as well. Clean air agencies also assist companies in being able to help them to comply with Clean Air Act regulations. This assistance has allowed many businesses to expand and to create jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support clean air, support public health, and support American jobs. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, a good friend of mine from Virginia once said that he would hear this on the floor, and I guess this is probably the first time that he's going to hear it; that is, the gentlelady makes a good point. But given the allocation that we have and the low funding level, frankly, we just don't have the money to do what she's requesting.

Her offset is to take money out of the Capital Improvement and Maintenance program. That's a program that has already been cut by \$94 million in this

bill. We've had to make some tough decisions. And while we haven't eliminated the funding for this, obviously, we just don't have that kind of money to put back into it.

Every program is going to have to suffer some cuts. I don't think we should be taking money out of the Capital Improvement and Maintenance program allocation that has already been cut by nearly \$100 million. So I would oppose the gentlelady's amendment and hope my colleagues will oppose it also.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

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

Mr. SIMPSON. 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.

Ms. EDWARDS. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I didn't think I would be down here this evening debating the Interior-EPA appropriations bill, in part because of the number of hours that we have spent in this Chamber on this bill when we actually should be facing the Nation's debt ceiling, giving the President a clean debt ceiling and moving forward with rebuilding our economy and creating jobs. Instead, we're debating yet another flawed bill. It is the biggest assault on clean air, clean water, the endangered species, and public lands that we've seen in our Nation's history.

The bill's unprecedented funding cuts and polluter riders to benefit rich and often reckless mining and oil companies will cripple the EPA's employees, health professionals, and scientists' ability to do their job protecting our Nation and its public health.

Rather than celebrating the advancements that we've made over the last 40 years in air and water quality, instead, these Republican "riders to ruin" are driving us back to the sixties, a time when Rachel Carson wrote "Silent Spring" to awaken the American public to the man-made impacts on the environment. And I just want to take a few moments to discuss a couple of them. There are so many that it's a tough challenge, these Republican "riders to ruin."

The bill would prohibit funding for the Endangered Species Act listings. Hundreds of animals have been protected under the Endangered Species Act. The bill would eliminate the protection that leads to the repopulation and revitalization of bald eagle populations in our Nation. And for all the flag pins that we wear, we're about

ready to decimate the very act that protects our Nation's symbol, the bald eagle.

Among other things, the bill also strikes out at ending regulations to expand the storm water discharge program under the Clean Water Act. The program prevents harmful pollutants from being washed or dumped into our water systems. And as our cities and urbanized areas grow, storm water runoff can become a threat if we're not able to better manage the discharge waters and possible impact of toxins and pollutants.

And here we are, something I can hardly believe. I recall taking my son to the Grand Canyon and camping along the side of the south rim many years ago. What are we going to do now? We can pitch our tents next to the uranium mines at the Grand Canyon. This is insane.

□ 1920

For the 5 million visitors a year who visit the Grand Canyon, we're going to jeopardize the water quality of our Nation's most important rivers. I can't imagine families visiting the Grand Canyon. I can't imagine future generations pitching their tent next to the Grand Canyon, next to a uranium mine, because of this senseless legislation.

It almost makes you breathless to wonder why it is that we've decided that the Federal Government doesn't have a role anymore in protecting our water and our land and our air and our air quality. The majority is pushing a bill on the floor that blocks Clean Air Act regulations of fine particles and soot and delays the EPA from limiting toxic mercury pollution from power plants. Why don't we just break up all our thermometers and dump them in the water?

I'm not sure who these riders are meant to help, but I know that they don't help children in communities in my district and across the country who are vulnerable to air pollution. Thirty percent of childhood asthma is due to environmental exposures, costing the Nation \$2 billion per year. These riders add to the arsenal. They just add to the arsenal. Low-income and minority children experience more doctor visits and hospitalization due to asthma than the general population and three times the rate of white Americans.

This is a really sad day, but it's most especially sad because we should be doing the Nation's business. Today, we watched the stock market plummet because of the uncertainty that we've created in this body because of the recalcitrance of the Republican majority. I know that we have to do this horrible EPA appropriations bill, but what we need to do is fix this Nation's economy, get people back to work building our roads and our bridges and our infrastructure, and protecting our national parks. Instead, we're engaged in the silliness of trying to play dice and chicken with the American economy.

It's a really sad day for the American public. Just a really sad day.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike last word.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Thank you.

The majority has been saying how concerned they are about future generations, that we shouldn't be overburdening them with our debt. I wholeheartedly agree. That's why I'm disappointed that, instead of addressing the urgent debt crisis, we are on the floor debating a bill that will gut pollution controls and public health protections in order to boost profits, the profits of America's biggest polluters, the last people who probably need a hand right now.

This bill does a number of things, Mr. Chairman. It blocks even modest pollution control standards that could mitigate climate change; the bill also erases 40 years of Federal laws that protect clean air, water, lands and wildlife; and it cripples the budgets of the Federal agencies we've charged with protecting our constituents.

As a mother and grandmother, I'm appalled that this bill signals a willingness to leave our families a more unhealthy environment than we have today. Isn't the idea always to leave things better than we found them?

Instead of protecting our citizens and shorelines, this bill exempts oil companies from complying with the Clean Air Act for offshore drilling.

Instead of protecting our drinking water and waterways, it cuts nearly \$1 billion in funding for the clean water State revolving funds and will, if enacted, compromise the ability to address urban stormwater runoff, one of San Diego's greatest environmental threats.

And instead of supporting a cleaner, more efficient auto industry, it blocks an improved fuel efficiency standard, jeopardizing a process projected to create up to 700,000 new green jobs, cut fuel costs and save 2.4 million barrels of oil every day by 2030.

It's alarming, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues who speak so passionately about giving the next generations a clean financial slate would so carelessly leave them a dirty planet. I suspect that the grandchildren of some oil company executives can always jet off to pristine resorts, but quite frankly that's not the situation for most of my constituents. The grandchildren of the 85 percent of Americans who just told The Washington Post/ABC News poll that they are, quote, just getting by or falling behind will be stuck paying high gas prices and worrying about their jobs and worrying about their health.

We should be leaving our children and our grandchildren a chance at the American Dream of middle class prosperity and a legacy of environmental

responsibility and stewardship, not one of reckless disregard.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill and getting back to bridging the debt divide so our constituents can focus on their own jobs rather than being concerned about whether we're doing ours.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In some respects, I feel like I'm in the Twilight Zone. Can anyone explain, when we are 144 hours from crossing the brink, from going over the ledge, to have this country come to a screeching halt financially, tell me why we are debating the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior? Why aren't we dealing with what the American people want us to be dealing with right now, and that is the debt limit, raising the ceiling on the debt limit? But, no, we're going to spend hundreds of hours here over the next couple of days talking about the Interior appropriations bill.

Let me tell you what I'm hearing from my constituents, and maybe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle aren't getting phone calls from their constituents, but I am, and let me tell you what I'm hearing.

One woman wrote me and said: "My mom is 79 years old, worked all her life in a factory and retired. Her pension was handed to her on her very last day of work, \$25,000. The plant closed, moved the work to Mexico, and her husband died 8 years later. That \$25,000 didn't last long. Now her only source of income is Social Security. She lives in a senior retirement center that she loves. Last Thursday, she and my aunt, who is 83 and also widowed, called me to pick them up and take them to the bank. They were going to withdraw from their savings money to pay their rent, as they, along with all of the other seniors they live with in that retirement center, are convinced they will not get their Social Security checks come August 1. My mom has a doctor's appointment on August 5, and she wonders if the doctor will continue to see her if the government doesn't pay for Medicare.

"I care deeply about them. I know for a fact that my mom is losing sleep over this. Last week, I thought she was foolish. This week, I'm beginning to think that I'm the fool. How do you look your mom and your aunt in the eye and say with great certainty that the U.S. Government will send them their Social Security?"

That was just one letter I received, and I've gotten lots of phone calls. A 52-year-old woman who's self-employed as a court reporter paid \$13,000 into the Social Security system last year and she's calling me saying, "What are you all doing? The interest rate on my

mortgage is going to go up. Interest rates on my credit cards are going to go up. Why aren't you fixing this problem?"

No, we're standing here talking about the Interior appropriation budget.

A woman from Daly City, 68 years old, previously suffered a stroke, has had seizures and relies on Medicare to treat her rheumatoid arthritis. Her husband, a cab driver, will turn 70 in December, at which point he will go on Social Security and hopefully go from working 5 to 6 hours a day to maybe 4 hours. If he loses his Social Security, he will probably have to work longer hours again.

□ 1930

They're all anguished. They all want us to do our job. They want us to lift this debt ceiling, protect Social Security and Medicare, and fix our attitude that we have here that somehow it's okay to just stall. It's okay to just try and make points, make political points while they're all wringing their hands and while they're taking money out of their savings accounts because they can't pay their rent if they don't get their Social Security check come August 1.

Well, for my colleagues who maybe haven't heard from their constituents, I want the American people to call this telephone number. Call this telephone number and call your Member of Congress and tell them what you think we should be doing. Should we be debating the Interior appropriation bill right now, or should we be fixing this debt limit? A debt limit, I might add, which virtually every economist of every political stripe has said: You have to lift it. President Ronald Reagan said: It has to be lifted.

Why should Congress always take us to the brink before they act? It's time for us to be responsible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I want to thank my colleague from California for reminding all of us that there are consequences for what we do here. This current wholly manufactured debt crisis has people very, very nervous.

The women that Ms. SPEIER talked about, concerned and nervous about their Social Security checks, whether they will be able to get their medical care, and today's Wall Street Journal, the first five items on what's news, various businesses around the world and financial institutions being prepared for the first time ever in America's history that our debt may not be worth a hoot. It may be worthless, that

we're going to default. This is a totally manufactured, unnecessary crisis. We didn't have to be here.

I want us all to step back a little ways, step back to December 2010, when we had another manufactured crisis. It came time to fund the Federal Government and to deal with some issues having to do with unemployment. And the Republicans in the Senate held us hostage and demanded that we extend the high-end Bush tax cuts, which created a \$700 billion deficit. We went ahead and did that, and rolled the issue forward 3 months so that in February we would have yet another crisis, the funding or the shutdown of the Federal Government.

Yet again another opportunity for our Republican colleagues to create a crisis so that they could use it to force onto the American public their policies, which became very evident what they wanted to do. They wanted to reconfigure the entire American scene. They wanted to roll back Social Security. They wanted to end Medicare for all Americans who are not yet 55 years of age. They wanted to end the programs to support higher education, to reduce research, to reduce funding for food safety programs. They used these manufactured crises to shut down a government.

And yet here we are again with the debt limit, first discussed back in May, and then because of the Treasury Department's ability to continue paying bills, we are now up against the final deadline of August 2. Yet again a totally manufactured unnecessary crisis.

Previously, Ronald Reagan said: Don't do this. Do not put the good faith and credit of the American government on the line. He told the Republicans, his Republicans back in the 1980s, honor the debt. This is not about new spending, this is about spending going back a century. This is about the American bills that were paid or not paid years ago, and that's our debt today.

We don't need to do this. There are options. We're putting forth, as we did earlier, a clean debt limit increase. Get us past this. We are also looking at the opportunity for the President to invoke the 14th Amendment, the fourth clause of the 14th Amendment, that says America will honor its debts. I believe he has the power, issuing an Executive order to the Treasury Department: pay our debts. This is something that is fundamental for America, and we must do it.

Put aside this manufactured crisis. It didn't need to be real, but it has become all too real in these last few days as our Republican colleagues are unable to get their act together, even to put forth a proposal that would eviscerate necessary programs. Can't even do that.

The President has called for a balanced approach, one of taxes, raising the taxes that should have been raised back in December and eliminate some \$700 billion of this problem, but let's do

it now. Let's go after the oil companies that are receiving our tax money at the very same time that over the last decade they have created nearly a trillion dollars of profit. They don't need our tax money. The poor in America, the senior citizens in America, they are the ones that need help.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TONKO. I agree with the two previous speakers, my colleagues from California. Here we are dealing with a flawed bill that would deny our stewardship of our environment all while we're faced with an economic consequence, with a default that stares us in the face.

For the past 200 days, the Republican leadership of this body has set aside America's priority of job creation in order to talk about the debt and to talk about the deficit. My concern is that as we face that looming threat of default, my Republican colleagues aren't doing much but talk.

After 200 days with no jobs agenda, after 200 days of voting to destroy millions of jobs, after 200 days of saying that those hardest hit by the recession should bear the burden of unbalanced cuts, after 200 days of rhetoric and walking away, my Republican colleagues have forced this Congress and the American people to wait yet more hours to see and vote on their plan.

As we all know, last night the Congressional Budget Office pointed out that some of the cuts in the Speaker's plan weren't real. Meanwhile, the Tea Party base said that Cut, Cap, and Balance is the only plan they will support. We considered that plan last week, and it has failed in the Senate. It is a plan that Bruce Bartlett—who was a Reagan adviser and a Bush Treasury official—said was “mind-boggling in its insanity.” Others have called it the “most ideologically extreme” budget legislation to come before Congress in decades.

Governing is not always easy. There are extremists on both sides of the political spectrum, and standing up to them takes strength. But our advantage lies in the fact that however vocal, extremists are a minority, a faction.

I have traveled my district extensively in recent weeks. I have held town halls and meetings with local businesses, and here's what I've heard: We have a spending problem in Washington. We have a revenue problem in Washington. But more important than anything else, we have a jobs problem in America.

So what are we going to do about it? Well, my constituents had an easy answer there, too. First, cut what doesn't create jobs and stability for the middle class. That includes wasteful government spending. It also includes tax breaks for corporate jet owners, mil-

lionaires and billionaires, and a system of kickbacks to the big oil companies that even their CEOs say they don't need.

Second, save whatever actually works. That means investment in education so middle class kids have a chance to get good jobs when they finish school. That means boosting innovation so we can get American industry booming again. And it means infrastructure so that we can drive to work on safe roads and bridges and build them with American materials and workers.

Finally, my constituents have told me that whatever talking heads on TV say, they know fair when they see it, regardless of partisan divides. We have an aging population. Nobody disputes that. But cutting Social Security and ending Medicare in order to protect corporate tax breaks and long-standing kickbacks for special interests puts us in a position where ideas are replaced in government by ideology. We have been asked in recent weeks to manipulate the United States Constitution in order to enshrine this ideology. Where I'm from, we believe that the only ideology that belongs in the United States Constitution is that of democracy.

□ 1940

In our democracy, if you want your ideas to become law, you don't rewrite our history or change our foundational documents. You come down to this floor. You tell your colleagues and your constituents what you think, and you let us debate it, amend it, and vote on it right here in front of the cameras and in front of the people we are sworn to serve.

But that's not what's happening today. After 200 days of talking about little else, my Republican colleagues have forced this body and the American people to wait yet hours to see their top secret default plan. Exactly which principled stand was important enough for the Republican House leadership to walk away from the negotiations for the fifth time? More importantly, the clock is ticking. We need to get back to work—and the American people are getting sick and tired of the games.

Just based on rhetoric, we know that their call to end Medicare and end Social Security plans would protect 2 percent of our population at the expense of the rest of us, the 98 percent of us. I'm sure that takes a lot of vote wrangling. But we've had a year to get this done. No matter how much Congress cuts their classroom budgets, even our elementary school children know that a due date is a due date.

Democrats support a balanced, bipartisan solution to reduce our deficit, to create jobs, to grow our economy, and to expand the middle class. My Republican colleagues say they share those same goals. So I would invite them to come down here, join us, share their plan. Let's get on with business. America is waiting and deserves better. We

need to solve this default crisis. It's staring us in the eyes.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, lines 11 and 12, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,411,000,000)".

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the Clean Water State Revolving Fund by \$1.41 billion, from \$689 million to \$2.1 billion, the amount that was appropriated in fiscal year 2010.

All of us recognize the gravity of the financial situation facing this Nation today, and we are struggling to emerge from the worst economic recession since the Great Depression. Clearly, with the national unemployment rate hovering still around 9 percent and the unemployment rate for the construction sector at over 20 percent, we are far from completing our work.

Christine Todd Whitman, the Republican EPA administrator under President George W. Bush, estimated that the needs of our Nation's aging water infrastructure topped \$660 billion. Yet within the FY 2012 Interior appropriations bill, the Republican majority cuts the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, the primary source of investment in our wastewater infrastructure, by \$1.4 billion compared to FY 2010. Coupled with the severe cuts to the Clean Water SRF in H.R. 1, the FY 2011 continuing resolution, and the attacks on clean water in the Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act passed earlier this month, the Republican majority has made it clear that they place no priority—none—on preserving clean water or creating jobs.

In terms of job losses, the cuts in the FY 2012 Interior appropriations bill when compared to FY 2010 funding levels would eliminate over 39,000 direct construction jobs throughout the country and countless additional jobs in the industries and small businesses that support the wastewater construction industry at a time when many small businesses and the construction sector are struggling to recover. Furthermore, this cut undermines long-standing Federal efforts to address our Nation's aging infrastructure systems.

Mr. Chairman, addressing the Nation's debt and deficit should absolutely be a priority; however, we should focus our efforts on finding a balanced approach that focuses on job creation rather than slashing budgets that are proven job creators. We hear repeatedly from our Republican col-

leagues that we should not tax our job creators. I agree. However, in my district and in districts across the Nation, the environment is the job creator.

The economy of my district depends on clean water, clean air, and safe, swimmable beaches. The cuts in this bill place all of these in jeopardy. If the Republican priorities in this bill prevail, we could put an effective tax rate of zero on small businesses in my district, and it wouldn't help because they would have no income. And no income means no jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the extension of the Bush tax cuts give the average millionaire a \$139,100 tax break in 2011. That's a tax break of \$2,700 per week or \$380 per day. Let me be clear: I'm talking only about tax breaks for millionaires—not tax breaks for the middle class—and only for millionaires, using not the \$250,000, but the million.

If our Republican colleagues were to set aside ideology and agree to eliminate the tax breaks for just those millionaires, we could reestablish our commitment to clean water and economic development within 12 days. The Bush tax cuts give millionaires across the Nation such a deal that we could completely shore up the \$1.4 billion deficit in the Clean Water SRF and begin to address the needs outlined by Administrator Whitman in less than 2 weeks.

Even if Congress gave the Bill Gates and the Warren Buffetts of this world the Bush tax breaks for the remaining 353 days of the year, we could put tens of thousands of men and women back to work, protect clean water, and protect the economies that depend on clean water and pristine beaches.

Finally, the Republican majority has included in this bill several special interest policy earmarks to pull back on EPA's compliance and enforcement capabilities, making it far more difficult for the agency to identify and pursue serious violations impacting public health and the environment in communities across the Nation. In my view, this proposal stands in stark contrast to the EPA's efforts to increase compliance in critical areas within a limited budget and suggests that a weakened compliance and enforcement presence is somehow better for our Nation. I strongly disagree with that suggestion.

Combine the lackluster funding for the Clean Water SRF and the dozens of special interest policy earmarks, it's quite clear that Republicans have abandoned the decades-long national, bipartisan commitment to creating jobs, protecting public health, and preserving the ability of local communities to grow their economies through clean water projects.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

"It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI."

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill and is in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I fully expected that my friend from Idaho would insist on his point of order. I fully expect the Chair to sustain the point of order. But let's be clear: The underlying bill violates House rules. There are 39, at least by my count, special interest policy riders in the underlying bill, every one of which is protected by a rule that waives all points of order. Each of these policy riders are in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI. We all know that.

I understand that the point of order will be sustained, but I do wish we would adhere to what we were promised. We were promised an open, transparent House in which regular order would prevail and in which the House would work its will. This rule does not allow that to take place.

I will accept the ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Idaho, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, lines 15 and 17, strike "not less than 30 percent" and insert "30 percent or less".

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

Mr. LANKFORD. As you may know, the Environmental Protection Agency currently administers Clean Water State Revolving Funds and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds to provide low-interest financing through the States. These low-interest loans are a way for States and communities to be able to use their own discretion in making much-needed improvements to their water supplies and infrastructure. This program was a grant program

years ago, but was transitioned into a loan program to save money some 25 years ago.

□ 1950

When the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act passed in 2009, an increase in funding for these accounts was coupled with a provision in those two funds, requiring no less than 30 percent of the financed funds issued to be used as principal forgiveness. It was a type of grant program to them. This principal forgiveness changes the low-interest loan program to a direct funding program. It's a hybrid between a loan program now and a grant program.

Since the stimulus expired and funding for these provisions returned to normal levels, unfortunately, the principal forgiveness provision has remained. This bill rolls back to pre-stimulus funding levels, but it doesn't roll back to pre-stimulus Federal strings.

So my amendment removes the Federal mandate of principal forgiveness and allows the States to use their discretion on the amounts they'd like to offer. States will be allowed to provide principal forgiveness up to 30 percent. Communities rely on these funds to ensure their infrastructure security and safe drinking water. By supporting my amendment, you can empower your State to leverage their already limited funds and ensure that communities all across our Nation receive the much needed infrastructure assistance.

Not to put words in both parties' mouths on this one as well, but there is a very bipartisan focus on this. This is one of the priorities from President Obama. In his budget proposal, he requested the same thing. Also, for conservatives and others, it gives back to the States their rights to be able to make those decisions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

What the amendment does is create the 30 percent language that we've had in the past, which is a floor, and makes it a ceiling rather than a floor.

The EPA's Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Funds provide grants to States to capitalize on their revolving loan fund programs. These programs offer low-interest loans to communities for projects included on a State's Intended Use Plan. These low-interest loans are usually below market rates and are used to finance water and wastewater infrastructure projects.

Many small and disadvantaged communities with a low income base can hardly afford to apply for these loans even with the low-interest rates. Therefore, this provision in the base text, which we have had for a few years, would offer zero-interest loans,

which are loans that forgive a portion of the principal, or grants, to these disadvantaged communities that would otherwise be unable to afford a standard SRF loan. The provision provides some relief to small communities across the Nation that are tirelessly working to provide clean and safe drinking water to their residents and bring construction jobs to their communities, all at the same time as they balance their books.

Given the huge infrastructure needs facing this Nation and the crumbling water and wastewater infrastructure, we should be providing more of this assistance, not less. So, while I appreciate my colleague's amendment and share his interest in preserving the viability of the SRFs, I do not support this amendment, and I would urge a "no" vote.

I would just say, we've talked about this in the subcommittee for a number of years. One of the real problems we have is we have these State revolving loan funds. We put the money out there, and there are a lot of communities that can't even afford the loans, so it doesn't help them rebuild their water systems or the wastewater treatment facilities. With the standards that we have with arsenic and other things, I have a lot of small communities in Idaho, and it doesn't help them that they have a State revolving loan fund, because they can't afford it. What this does is help them through that to meet some of the clean water standards that they have to meet.

As I said, what we've carried in the bill before us is that a minimum of 30 percent, or a floor of 30 percent, of those funds have to be used for those types of things. What the gentleman's amendment would do would make that a ceiling in which you could only use 30 percent of that. I oppose the amendment, and hope my colleagues would also.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RECISSION OF FUNDS)

For fiscal year 2012, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program,

may award cooperative agreements to federally recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended by Public Law 110-94, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act.

The Administrator is authorized to transfer up to \$250,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the Great Lakes Initiative under the heading "Environmental Programs and Management" to the head of any Federal department or agency, with the concurrence of such head, to carry out activities that would support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement programs, projects, or activities; to enter into an interagency agreement with the head of such Federal department or agency to carry out these activities; and to make grants to governmental entities, non-profit organizations, institutions, and individuals for planning, research, monitoring, outreach, and implementation in furtherance of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

From unobligated balances to carry out projects and activities funded through the "State and Tribal Assistance Grants" and "Hazardous Substance Superfund" accounts, \$140,000,000 are permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

For fiscal year 2012 the requirements of section 513 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1372) shall apply to the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part with assistance made available by a State water pollution control revolving fund as authorized by title VI of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), or with assistance made available under section 205(m) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1285(m)), or both.

For fiscal year 2012 the requirements of section 1450(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-9(e)) shall apply to any construction project carried out in whole or in part with assistance made available by a drinking water treatment revolving loan fund as authorized by section 1452 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12).

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, \$277,282,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$66,805,000 is for the forest inventory and analysis program: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, no less than \$29,161,000 is for the forest products laboratory.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, including treatments of pests, pathogens,

and invasive or noxious plants and for restoring and rehabilitating forests damaged by pests or invasive plants, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities as authorized, and conducting an international program as authorized, \$208,608,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law; of which \$3,000,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 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 76, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$20,860,800)”.

Page 158, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$20,860,800)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce State and Private Forestry funding by a modest 10 percent, and it would transfer more than \$20 million to the Spending Reduction Account.

The State and Private Forestry funding sets aside money for international forestry, urban and community forestry, and supports more than 500 million acres of non-Federal forested lands. We are more than \$14.3 trillion in debt, and we need to be cutting areas of our budget wherever possible. It is more than reasonable to request a reduction in this program because the Federal Government has no business giving a handout to private forestry landowners in the first place. This funding would be better managed by the State and local levels of government.

We are broke, Mr. Chairman, as a Nation. We need to be doing what businesses do when they get overextended. They lower their borrowing level; they try to find out ways to pay off their debt, and then they start cutting expenses. This is a mere 10 percent cut. So I urge my colleagues to think about our massive debt, and I urge them to consider sending part of this program back to the State and local governments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to ask if we could see the amendment. It's pretty difficult to address it until we actually see the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is No. 18 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment would take \$21 million from the Forest Service's State and Private program and put it in the Spending Reduction Account.

While it's easy to stand here and say, “It just reduces it by 10 percent. Who

can't stand a 10 percent reduction?” I'd like to note that the State and Private Forestry program has already had a significant cut in this budget—\$133 million below that of FY11, and despite its name, it is critical to managing the national forest system.

The accounts we kept intact are extremely important: for example, cooperative fire protection in rural areas. This helps rural communities fight catastrophic wildfires. With such a large percentage of public land and such a small tax base, many rural communities are hard-pressed to pay for the suppression of large wildfires that start on public lands.

Cooperative forest health: in other words, the prevention and treatment of insects and disease. Improving forest health helps prevent catastrophic wildfires. In the South, I know you're familiar with the southern pine beetle. This program has helped to contain the spread of southern pine beetle. I wish the same were true in the Western United States where 20 million acres are dead due to the mountain pine beetle.

I understand the gentleman is standing on principle. So am I. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I simply rise to associate myself with the very thoughtful, insightful comments of the gentleman from Idaho, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. We agree. The amendment should be defeated.

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 amendment was rejected.

□ 2000

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$50,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$50,000,000)”.

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to have funds available to restore the Forest Legacy Program through the fiscal year 2011 level, as well as the fiscal year 2008 levels, of approximately \$53 million. This amount is \$83 million less than what was requested by the administration and \$22 million less than what was authorized in fiscal year 2010.

The reason for this amendment is we cannot let this very important pro-

gram in essence be eliminated by the present funding of only \$3 million in the present bill before us.

The Forest Legacy Program partners with the States to protect environmentally sensitive forest lands. It is a partnership program in which States are permitted to accomplish this very important goal. It is a voluntary program that encourages the protection of privately owned lands and encourages the purchase of conservation easements without removing the land from private ownership. The easements then act to protect water, air quality, and habitats for threatened and endangered species.

This particular program is important for the State of Hawaii. We have more endangered species per square mile than any other place on the planet. We claim 75 percent of the endangered plants in the United States. We are the most unique archipelago.

One such project is called the Kainalu Forest Watershed, which is an easement that was bought to preserve 614 acres of strategic watershed. This was done in the year 2010. This area produces a large part of the freshwater that contributes to the recharging of the aquifer through the forests and the streams that are preserved and sustains the residents of Molokai.

Molokai may not be known to many of you, but in 2009, this island was made famous with the canonization of Father Damien, when he became St. Damien. This is the island that he so loved.

But this is not a program that only affects Hawaii. It affects many of my colleagues' States. For example, in Idaho, 720 acres called the Bane Creek Neighbors project, which connects to important ecosystems and critical wildlife habitats and important timberlands, were preserved, and it preserved grizzlies' and gray wolves' habitats for these in the future.

Also in Idaho, the McArthur Lake Wildlife Corridor, which basically protects 3,727 acres of critical private timberlands.

Utah benefited from it through the Dry Lakes Ranch, which protects not only the timberlands themselves but a beautiful scenic view and keeps the area pristine and whole.

As of 2010, almost 2 million acres have been so protected.

Now, it is important to realize that it is not taken from private owners, but it is in partnership with all the parties, including the States, to preserve these important habitats for the future.

This is the kind of program that we are always talking about and looking for, the preservation through partnerships—not just simply government going in and buying things. This is making it possible so some of the actual individuals and communities, the neighbors, for example, in Idaho are able to get together with government to preserve important easements.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I ask for a vote in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

While the program that she seeks to increase funding for is a good program, and I think most people support it and its intent and what it does, the problem is that it takes the money out of the Wildfire Suppression Program.

Anybody that has been watching the news for the last 5 months understands the wildfire problems we have in Texas, in New Mexico, in Arizona. And as NOAA has told us, those wildfires are going to climb into the Pacific Northwest later in the year this year. So I suspect August, September, October in the Pacific Northwest is going to be a huge fire suppression cost.

So I think we can ill afford to take the money out of wildfire suppression and put it into the program. It would be nice to increase the funding for those conservation programs to help protect those things, but if they burn up, we're not really protecting them. So we've tried in this bill to fund the wildfire suppression at the 10-year average, which we have done, and I would be hard-pressed to support taking money out of that given the fire situation we find ourselves in this year. And I would 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 Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, \$1,546,463,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$336,722,000 shall be for forest products: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$30,000,000 shall be deposited in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund for ecological restoration treatments as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 7303(f): *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, up to \$122,600,000 is for the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program for Region 1, Region 3 and Region 4.

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:

Page 76, lines 10 and 13, insert after each dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 80, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$16,600,000)".

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

Mr. GOSAR. I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2584, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2012.

This summer, over a million acres of Forest Service lands, as well as another 600,000 acres of Federal, State, and private lands, burned throughout the American Southwest. Those fires are costing millions of taxpayer dollars and immediate fire response, and will cost many millions more in restoration and rehabilitation in the months and years ahead. These fires reinforce the urgent need for landscape-scale restoration.

My amendment ensures this body fully funds proactive, large-scale treatments to our national forests that will reduce wildfire risk, ultimately saving the Federal Government from having to use an astronomical amount of money for fire suppression and expensive post-fire rehab.

Specifically, my amendment increases the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program by \$10 million, fully funding it at the U.S. Forest Service budget request. Authorized in fiscal year 2009, CFLRP was designed to encourage collaborative, science-based, large-scale thinning and ecosystem restoration. The program recognizes that future forest management will be most effective if it is planned and implemented in a collaborative framework through private-public partnerships at the landscape level.

As an offset, the amendment decreases a related funding account, the Wildland Fire Management-Hazardous Fuel account, by \$16.6 million. The Hazardous Fuel account is funded at \$334 million in the underlying bill, \$80 million above the President's budget request. The Congressional Budget Office has confirmed my amendment does not increase 2012 outlays.

□ 2010

While forest treatments focused solely on hazardous fuel reduction around communities may be appropriate in many cases, they do not achieve the enduring fire protection and ecosystem restoration that are urgently required. There are roughly 80 million acres of forest across the West that are overgrown and ripe for catastrophic wildfire, according to the Landfire multi-agency database. We simply cannot afford the status quo, using taxpayer dollars for 100 percent of the large-scale restoration work necessary to prevent unnatural fires like the Wallow fire in Arizona and New Mexico.

If we are going to save what is left of our forests, we must change our priorities and aggressively treat our forests at the pace and scale these fires are occurring. Congress must fully fund proactive collaborative large-scale forest restoration treatments if it truly wants to reverse the degradation of our forests while simultaneously reducing the risk of catastrophic fires.

The private-public partnerships facilitated through the Collaborative

Forest Landscape Restoration program empowers private industry to do important science-based ecological restoration work while minimizing the cost to the American taxpayer. In 2010, 10 landscape-scale restoration projects were selected for the CFLR program. These programs are located in nine States: Montana, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington.

In the case of the Arizona project, the Four Forest Restoration Initiative, known as 4FRI, calls for the Forest Service to contract with economically viable, appropriately scaled industries capable of restoring tens of thousands of acres per year. Once a contract is awarded, it is estimated that the 2.4 million-acre project will be completed at little or no cost to the Federal Government.

Because of this promise, the project has garnered bipartisan support in the Arizona House congressional delegation as well as the support of Senators MCCAIN and KYL, Governor Jan Brewer, leaders in the State legislature, the affected counties and cities, and an unprecedented range of environmental groups, such as the Center for Biological Diversity and industry partners.

Full funding for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program ensures that the 10 existing projects, which are urgently needed, will continue to move expeditiously while allowing the CFLRP to expand into more of the estimated 80 million acres of overgrown and wildfire-prone Forest Service lands across the country that need to be properly treated.

When the Federal Government partners with local government, stakeholder groups, and private industry, together we can create much needed jobs and a safer environment for our citizens. Landscape-scale, fiscally responsible forest restoration treatments are the only way the country is going to make real progress towards proper forest health.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Gosar Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAULSEN). The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to note that I support the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program, CFLR. This bill funds the program at \$30 million. In the CR, it was funded at \$25 million; and in fiscal year 2010, it was funded at \$10 million. We've supported it enough that we've increased funding for it from the 2010 level through the CR and in this bill. The funding for this program has increased dramatically at a time when other programs are being cut. The offset for this program is hazardous fuels; and because of the budget authority and outlays, the amendment

has to cut \$16.6 million to pay for a \$10 million increase in this program.

The hazardous fuels program has been extremely effective at reducing the threat of catastrophic fire. I would also argue that hazardous fuels funds get to the ground and actually make a meaningful impact much earlier than the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program, which can take years before a project is even implemented.

I understand and agree with the gentleman that in our bill report we state over and over that the Forest Service needs more active management at a much larger scale. But CFLR is not the only program that does this. There are numerous programs and line items for improving forest health and reducing wildfire risk. We funded all of these at FY11 levels.

I am glad that the CFLR program is working well in Arizona, but it is not working as well in other parts of the country. In some areas, other buckets of funding are more effective at actively managing the forest. As a result, I reluctantly have to oppose the gentleman's amendment and urge 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 Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, \$378,088,000, to remain available until expended, for construction, capital improvement, maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities and infrastructure; and for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532-538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: *Provided*, That \$35,000,000 shall be designated for urgently needed road decommissioning, road and trail repair and maintenance and associated activities, and removal of fish passage barriers, especially in areas where Forest Service roads may be contributing to water quality problems in streams and water bodies which support threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or community water sources: *Provided further*, That funds becoming available in fiscal year 2012 under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501) shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury and shall not be available for transfer or obligation for any other purpose unless the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for decommissioning of roads, up to \$9,000,000 may be transferred to the "National Forest System" to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conserva-

tion Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, \$12,500,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS  
SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, \$955,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND  
EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities, and for authorized expenditures from funds deposited by non-Federal parties pursuant to Land Sale and Exchange Acts, pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the 16 Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94-579, as amended, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST  
AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), \$45,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR  
SUSTAINMENT USES

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service to manage Federal lands in Alaska for subsistence uses under title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for forest fire suppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, hazardous fuels reduction on or adjacent to such lands, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, \$1,805,099,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds including unobligated balances under this heading, are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to reimburse State and other cooperating entities for services provided in response to wildfire and other emergencies or disasters to the extent such reimbursements by the Forest Service for non-fire emergencies are fully repaid by the responsible emergency management agency: *Provided further*, That amounts in this paragraph may be transferred to the "State and Private Forestry", "National Forest System", and "For-

est and Rangeland Research" accounts to fund State fire assistance, volunteer fire assistance, forest health management, forest and rangeland research, the Joint Fire Science Program, vegetation and watershed management, heritage site rehabilitation, and wildlife and fish habitat management and restoration: *Provided further*, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein, the Secretary of Agriculture may enter into procurement contracts or cooperative agreements, or issue grants for hazardous fuels reduction activities and for training and monitoring associated with such hazardous fuels reduction activities, on Federal land, or on adjacent non-Federal land for activities that benefit resources on Federal land: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$10,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite jointly funded wildland fire management programs and projects: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for hazardous fuels reduction, not to exceed \$5,000,000, may be used to make grants, using any authorities available to the Forest Service under the State and Private Forestry appropriation, for the purpose of creating incentives for increased use of biomass from national forest lands: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That, before obligating any of the funds provided herein for wildland fire suppression, the Secretary of Agriculture shall obligate all unobligated balances previously made available under this heading that, when appropriated, were designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer not more than \$50,000,000 of the funds provided herein to the Secretary of the Interior if the Secretaries determine that the transfer will enhance the efficiency or effectiveness of Federal wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds for hazardous fuels reduction, up to \$27,100,000 may be transferred to the "National Forest System" to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for large fire suppression operations of the Department of Agriculture and as a reserve fund for suppression and Federal emergency response activities, \$290,418,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts are available only for transfer to the "Wildland Fire Management" account and only following a declaration by the Secretary that either (1) a wildland fire suppression event meets certain previously-established risk-based written criteria for significant complexity, severity, or threat posed by the fire or (2) funds in the "Wildland Fire Management" account will be exhausted within 30 days.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for:

(1) purchase of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition of passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; purchase, lease, operation, maintenance, and acquisition of aircraft from excess sources to maintain the operable fleet for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed \$100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and (7) debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions upon the Secretary's notification of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that all fire suppression funds appropriated under the headings "Wildland Fire Management" and "FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund" will be obligated within 30 days.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States, private organizations, and international organizations.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service up to \$5,000,000 shall be available for priority projects within the scope of the approved budget, which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps and shall be carried out under the authority of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993, Public Law 103-82, as amended by Public Lands Corps Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2005, Public Law 109-154.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, \$4,000 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101-593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to \$3,000,000 may be advanced in a lump sum to the National Forest Foundation to aid conservation partnership projects in support of the Forest Service mission, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than \$300,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds made available by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to Federal or a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds: *Provided further*, That authorized investments of Federal

funds held by the Foundation may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 98-244, \$3,000,000 of the funds available to the Forest Service may be advanced to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation in a lump sum to aid cost-share conservation projects, without regard to when expenses are incurred, on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That such funds shall be matched on at least a one-for-one basis by the Foundation or its sub-recipients: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a Federal or non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities and natural resource-based businesses for sustainable rural development purposes.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, an amount not to exceed \$55,000,000 shall be assessed for the purpose of performing fire, administrative and other facilities maintenance. Such assessments shall occur using a square foot rate charged on the same basis the agency uses to assess programs for payment of rent, utilities, and other support services.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service not to exceed \$500,000 may be used to reimburse the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), Department of Agriculture, for travel and related expenses incurred as a result of OGC assistance or participation requested by the Forest Service at meetings, training sessions, management reviews, land purchase negotiations and similar non-litigation related matters. Future budget justifications for both the Forest Service and Department of Agriculture should clearly display the sums previously transferred and the requested funding transfers.

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the reprogramming procedures contained in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying this Act.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

##### INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, \$4,034,322,000 together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) and 238b for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That \$836,685,000 for contract medical care, including \$51,500,000 for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund, shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of

the funds provided, up to \$36,000,000 shall remain available until expended for implementation of the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Federal Government as authorized by sections 104 and 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a) during the preceding fiscal year for breach of contracts shall be deposited to the Fund authorized by section 108A of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a-1) and shall remain available until expended and, notwithstanding section 108A(c) of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a-1(c)), funds shall be available to make new awards under the loan repayment and scholarship programs under sections 104 and 108 of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a): *Provided further*, That \$16,391,000 is provided for the methamphetamine and suicide prevention and treatment initiative and \$10,000,000 is provided for the domestic violence prevention initiative and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amounts available under this proviso shall be allocated at the discretion of the Director of the Indian Health Service and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used for annual contracts and grants that fall within two fiscal years, provided the total obligation is recorded in the year the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, except for those related to the planning, design, or construction of new facilities: *Provided further*, That funding contained herein for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts provided herein, not to exceed \$573,761,000 shall be for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract or grant support costs associated with contracts, grants, self-governance compacts, or annual funding agreements between the Indian Health Service and a tribe or tribal organization pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, prior to or during fiscal year 2012, of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 may be used for contract support costs associated with new or expanded self-determination contracts, grants, self-governance compacts, or annual funding agreements: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Indian Affairs may collect from the Indian Health Service, tribes and tribal organizations operating health facilities pursuant to Public Law 93-638, such individually identifiable health information relating to disabled children as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out its functions under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq.): *Provided further*, That the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account.

##### INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and

purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, \$427,259,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no less than \$20,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction, renovation or expansion of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land on which such facilities will be located: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 shall be used by the Indian Health Service to purchase TRANSAM equipment from the Department of Defense for distribution to the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service may be used for sanitation facilities construction for new homes funded with grants by the housing programs of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,700,000 from this account and the "Indian Health Services" account shall be used by the Indian Health Service to obtain ambulances for the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities in conjunction with an existing interagency agreement between the Indian Health Service and the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 shall be placed in a Demolition Fund, to remain available until expended, and be used by the Indian Health Service for the demolition of Federal buildings.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations provided in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings that relate to the functions or activities of the Indian Health Service.

In accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651-2653) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation. Notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86-121, the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act and Public Law 93-638, as amended.

Funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations di-

rected at curtailing Federal travel and transportation.

None of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used for any assessments or charges by the Department of Health and Human Services unless identified in the budget justification and provided in this Act, or approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations through the reprogramming process.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title V of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation.

None of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law.

With respect to functions transferred by the Indian Health Service to tribes or tribal organizations, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide goods and services to those entities on a reimbursable basis, including payments in advance with subsequent adjustment. The reimbursements received therefrom, along with the funds received from those entities pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act, may be credited to the same or subsequent appropriation account from which the funds were originally derived, with such amounts to remain available until expended.

Reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance.

The appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without advance notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, and section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, \$79,054,000.

#### AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i) and 111(c)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended; section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended; and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, \$74,039,000, of which up to \$1,000 per eligible employee of the Agency for Toxic

Substance and Disease Registry shall remain available until expended for Individual Learning Accounts: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited health care providers: *Provided further*, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2012, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

#### OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

##### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representation expenses, \$2,661,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 202 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

##### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 98, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,661,000)".

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,661,000)".

□ 2020

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about eliminating the wasteful duplication in our Federal Government, specifically dealing with the Council on Environmental Quality. This amendment would eliminate the funding for the Council on Environmental Quality and transfer the savings to the spending reduction account. This amendment will result in about a \$2.7 million taxpayer savings.

Specifically, the Council on Environmental Quality, if people aren't familiar with it, is a council of one person with a budget typically around \$3 million. Throughout the council's 40-year history, it really has done little to demonstrate additional responsibilities other than what already is being accomplished by the Environmental Protection Agency and NOAA itself. Former Presidents, including President Carter and President Reagan, have proposed reducing the budget for this

council. This council blatantly duplicates the efforts of other Federal agencies, as I already mentioned, the Environmental Protection Agency and NOAA, who are doing an excellent job in these same areas.

This an opportunity to be able to reduce unnecessary waste, duplication, and streamline the bureaucracy and improve agency services to Americans who fund these agencies.

At this critical point in our Nation's history, I recommend that we need to eliminate agencies like this and be able to combine them with existing agencies.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is an organization that was established by President Nixon. It was Bill Ruckleshaus who was the first head of it. What it does is to coordinate the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act. That act, as I recall, goes back to 1976. 1969. It was President Nixon that put it into effect.

The Council on Environmental Quality does the National Environmental Policy Act reviews, and it's a critical function. In addition to that, it coordinates the environmental programs throughout the Federal Government. If you didn't have CEQ, you'd have to invent it. I know if we didn't have it, we'd be creating it in this appropriations bill because this appropriations bill is replete with requests to the administration to coordinate environmental programs, particularly those related to climate change to avoid duplication. Well, that's the role of CEQ.

The Council of Environmental Quality is very inadequately funded. It's a relative handful of people. So the only thing that I can interpret from this amendment is that it's meant to be punitive. You're hardly saving any money, and what you're doing is eliminating the White House's ability to coordinate environmental programs to continue the same tradition that we have had since Richard Nixon. It's now been 40 years, and no one up till now has thought that the Council on Environmental Quality was not performing an important and valuable function.

I'm surprised that the gentleman would offer the amendment, but I would certainly oppose it. It's one of these things that you're only going to realize the full value of when it's gone. And though the small amount of money to save, this is an organization that, person for person, probably does as much as any other person, even in EPA or any of the other agencies of the government in terms of maintaining a consistent, focused policy on the environment.

I would really hope that this amendment would be soundly defeated. It was funded in the bill. There was no criticism registered in the report with re-

gard to the Council on Environmental Quality.

I know they have been reaching out. They're more than happy to go to any Member's office. They're one of the people that, when you have local issues or State issues, they will respond. They'll explain the intent and purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act. And they want to ensure that the administration's actions are consistent with congressional intent.

This is not the kind of constructive amendment that we would expect to see, and I would really hope that this body would reject it. But I'm stunned that this amendment would have been offered.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I also oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Let me just give you a little more background on what the Council on Environmental Quality does. Its focus is to make government more efficient and more effective, and it does this by interagency working groups and coordination with EEOP and CEQ. And it balances the competing positions, sometimes, even within government coordination. In other words, it makes everybody come around the table and figure out how do we do this the most effectively for the American people.

It brings, as Ranking Member MORAN pointed out, Federal agencies, State and local governments to the table too to say how can we be most effective collaboratively in making our environment work better for America.

Let me give you an example of one of the projects that they're working on, and it's solar energy. Solar energy is booming here in the United States; and if we get solar energy technology right, we will be the leaders for the next generation in how we can have energy efficiency, energy independence through renewable energy.

The Solar Energy Industries Association works with this council. And in the first quarter, the solar industry installed 252 megawatts of new solar electric capacity, 66 percent growth from the same timeframe from 2010. That's 3,000 megawatts of solar electric installed in the United States. That's enough to power 600,000 homes.

They worked with the manufacturing sector, the solar power sector. They worked together, and they caused this 33 percent jump in panel production. With the growth of solar energy, thousands of jobs have been created. In fact, solar energy creates more jobs per megawatt than any other energy source. And according to the Solar Foundation's National Solar Job Census, 93,000 Americans were employed in the U.S. solar industry.

The reason why I bring this up is that not only are they helping to bring

everybody around the table to figure out how to move America forward with this; the next thing they do is they work, as I said, with inter-government agencies. So they worked with the Department of Energy to issue loan guarantees for solar projects and manufacturing facilities. That's going to create 26,000 jobs.

They worked with the Department of Veterans Affairs to announce that they will be installing solar panels in their systems in five VA Medical Centers, one in Oklahoma; Temple, Texas; Amarillo, Texas; and in California. Prior to this announcement, the VA had also been awarded dollars for other solar panels in their facilities, and they're seeing that they are being able to control costs and do good things for the environment.

The Department of the Interior has approved solar permits for solar-powered products on public lands that will provide enough energy for 730,000 homes.

The Department of Agriculture actively promotes the deployment of solar energy on farms and ranches working with people and folks out in the private sector. So the list goes on and on.

□ 2030

Coordination is often the key to efficiency. And so I just really think that the Council on Environmental Quality provides America a way forward in making sure that our agencies are talking and being effective with one another when it comes to collaboration on environmental issues. It also reaches out to the local governments, but more importantly, it works in the private sector to create opportunities for jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma briefly to give him a last opportunity to comment.

Mr. LANKFORD. This was a wonderful description that I'm hearing of the responsibility of the Council on Environmental Quality. The problem with it is it's the same responsibilities that EPA has, that the Department of Energy has, that NOAA has. These are executive agencies as well, and to say that you have to create a new executive agency to watch over this executive agency is one of those prime examples of why it's so difficult to be able to combine agencies for efficiency.

We have multiple bureaucracies that are standing out there combining and doing similar functions, and it would save us money. Yes, this is a very small agency, but it's another one of those prime examples why the executive branch has all these multiple agencies doing the same thing, and we have to be able to find ways to be able to combine these.

I understand that we're creating jobs per megawatt in the middle of this, but the reality of this is we've got to be able to find ways to be able to save money.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will point out that the underlying bill reduces CEQ to 2006 levels and caps their full-time equivalence, or their employees, at 2006 levels. So that means that they will have a reduction in force. They will lose three employees.

I might also point out that when I was the general counsel for the Governor in my State, I also ran the Natural Resources Subcabinet. We were actually, at the State level, the mirror image, where I was, of what CEQ does. We were in the position of responding to NEPA documents that were sent to us by the Federal Government from Federal agencies. And as a State, we were attempting to coordinate our responses to NEPA documents for various State agencies—the agency that regulates water, the agency that looks after State land, the agency that does environmental quality in Wyoming, the agency that does State forests, and on and on. And so our Natural Resources Subcabinet was the State equivalent and mirror image in the responding avenue to what CEQ is in Washington.

Now, let me give you an example of some of the things that CEQ has coordinated here in Washington and why it makes sense.

We have seen in this debate, earlier, that fighting Asian carp is a priority for the Great Lakes region. Over the past 1½ years, CEQ has brought all the Federal agencies together with the Great Lakes States to combine efforts to fight this invasive specie. So they have coordinated on an interagency, intergovernmental framework. And without the framework, it's hard to pull the Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Interior, EPA, and these groups together with the States to have a shared response to a multi-State, multijurisdiction, multilevel of government issue like the Asian carp. That is something I believe that makes it appropriate for CEQ's existence to continue.

I understand the frustrations that some people have with it, but, quite frankly, that type of coordination I think could, when managed properly, allow the Federal Government to speak with one voice where their own disparate agencies have different mission statements. So that type of coordination is important.

Mr. Chairman, for those reasons, and for the cuts that have already been undertaken in this bill, I do rise to oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

I didn't plan on speaking, but I couldn't help after hearing the comments, and I would gladly yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady if she wants to explain further.

I have never heard this used as a measurement before, as a positive measurement, the number of jobs per megawatt for solar power.

Now, I'm from Arizona. I like solar power. It's great. But since when are we using, as a positive, the number of jobs it takes to create a megawatt? Will it be seen as a positive in the future if it takes more jobs to create a megawatt? Is that a good thing for the economy? Is that a jobs program of some type? I mean, it just baffles me sometimes at the arguments that are made as to why we should keep programs like this going and keep spending.

I would be glad to yield time to the gentlelady if she wants to explain that further.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman.

The point is is that we are creating jobs using less energy, and when we do that, we save energy. But these jobs that are being created are improving our economy, our ability to compete internationally. And these jobs use less energy. So we're not investing in nuclear power plants and we're not investing in coal burning, which leads to—I kind of figured you would want your time back.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlelady, but that is precisely the opposite of the number of jobs per megawatt. If nuclear creates more energy for fewer jobs and less cost, that's the direction we should go because it's nonpolluting as well. But this notion that we have to keep this going because it just creates jobs and jobs per megawatt, it just baffles me.

I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. We're borrowing 41 cents on every dollar. We ought to save money where we can.

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

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, including hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902,

and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (Board) shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Board: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Board shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of EPA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93-531, \$7,530,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: *Provided further*, That no relocatee shall be provided with more than one new or replacement home: *Provided further*, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 640d-10.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

For payment to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, as authorized by title XV of Public Law 99-498, as amended (20 U.S.C. 56 part A), \$7,900,000.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease agreements of no more than 30 years, and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees, \$626,971,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013, except as otherwise provided herein; of which not to exceed \$20,137,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum

of African American History and Culture, and the repatriation of skeletal remains program shall remain available until expended; and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 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 101, line 10, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$55,624,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$55,624,000)”.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would revert the Smithsonian funding back to the fiscal year 2008 levels. This is simply asking the Smithsonian to tighten their belts, to pull their weight, just like other agencies and departments within the Federal Government are having to do.

Mr. Chairman, this country is broke. We have spent all the money in our bank and then some. We have to prioritize where we can afford to spend money and where we simply cannot afford to. I believe asking the Smithsonian to simply scale back their spending to levels of 2008 is more than reasonable. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the Smithsonian Institution is the world's leading museum complex. People from all over the world come to Washington, oftentimes with the principal intent of seeing the Smithsonian, but it is invariably part of their trip to our Nation's capital. It is something that every Member of the legislative branch should be very proud of. In fact, we should spend more of our time in those museums. They're extraordinary, every single one of them. They tell the story of our Nation's origin. They reflect the evolution of knowledge of the things that are relevant to our very existence.

In addition to the traditional museums along our National Mall, we have a National Zoo—again, known throughout the world. But this amendment that would cut \$55 million would wind up eliminating 600 positions from the Smithsonian because 90 percent of the costs of museums are personnel.

□ 2040

We're told that given the existing costs that have continued to increase over the last 4 years, not just personnel but particularly energy costs, the costs of maintaining the world's finest mu-

seum complex, that the Smithsonian would have to close at least one if not two major museums, or the National Zoo. It doesn't seem to me that in order to save a relative fraction of a bill—this bill is about \$27 billion—in order to save—what is that, half a percent?—that we would want to close one or two of the finest museums in the world.

If you did abolish 600 Federal positions at the Smithsonian, you would also have to pay severance costs and create personnel management turmoil for years. You would be saying to the Smithsonian, which makes us proud for the quality and really the efficiency of its operation, Sorry, but we don't think that you should be a priority. The reality is if you were to ask the Federal taxpayer, not just the people in this region but all over the country how important the Smithsonian is, it seems to me they would make it a priority.

One of the last things we want, it would seem, is that our visitors come from our constituencies, our congressional districts, to Washington, and then we have a sign on the front door of one of the major museums, Sorry, Closed Due to Short-Term Budget Cuts. Now, I trust that that would not be the final reality, but if we were to pass such an amendment when we vote on this, I think it would send a signal. It's a wrong signal. Just as the uncertainty about the debt ceiling is the wrong signal to be sending the rest of the world, for gosh sakes, this is the wrong signal to be sending to the people who work so hard at the Smithsonian to make us proud. It's the wrong signal to send to our constituents. It's the wrong thing to do.

It's kind of shocking that we would have such an amendment, frankly. The committee has looked at every line item, has cut every place they could, with very few exceptions, and we've pointed out those exceptions, but the committee, I'm sure, did not consider closing down one or two of our major museums on the National Mall in order to save a fraction of 1 percent of the cost of this appropriations bill.

So, I would very, very strongly oppose this misguided amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. To follow on the remarks of my good friend from Virginia, I must say, this is almost incomprehensible. The Smithsonian as a collection of museums and zoological park and so forth that my colleague talked about is half the picture, and, indeed, if any of those facilities are closed, there will be a lot of unhappy families from Georgia and Tennessee and Montana and all the 50 States.

But it's a lot more than that. The Smithsonian is a collection of research centers that goes far beyond biplanes

and folk art and portraits and jewelry and pandas:

The Smithsonian astronomical observatory, one of the finest collections of research scientists in the world for understanding the workings of our universe.

Barro Colorado Island in Panama, in the middle of the Panama Canal, probably the principal research center for understanding the workings of our biological world.

Oh, yes, there would be a lot of unhappy families if this amendment were to go through, but among those 600 positions that would be lost no doubt would be some of the finest scientists in the United States, in fact, in the world, and there would be a lot of unhappy scientists around the world who would wonder, what in the world were they thinking of? What in the world were they thinking in Washington, D.C., when they cut back on these research efforts?

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. I would like to point out that the request for this agency's appropriation under the President's budget was \$110 million more than is appropriated and that we as a committee did cut this current budget by \$10 million already.

I would also point out something that's more philosophically based and that is my own personal view, and it's shared by many of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle: That we should be funding Federal functions while we are here in Washington and acknowledge that certain functions really can be handled as well or better by the States and that the States created the Federal Government, not the other way around, and so we should be deferring to the States for everything that is not specified either in the Constitution or is purely a Federal function.

The Smithsonian Institution is a purely Federal function. It is something that was given to the United States of America, that the Federal Government and the people of this country through us are stewards of, and I believe it is appropriate as a purely Federal function that we fund it adequately.

Now we have, as I pointed out, reduced its budget during these tough fiscal times, but as something that is purely Federal in its approach and the benefit to our Nation and indeed to the world that is provided by this great gift that was given to the people of the United States of America centuries ago, I do rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is truly one of the less-thought-out amendments, I think, that's been proposed to this bill.

The Smithsonian is truly a gem in this country—ask the American people—if you look at what they are doing and the important role they play.

A lot of people think that it's not important if you don't come to Washington. The Smithsonian doesn't do anything. They only operate some museums here and a few things like that. That's not the truth. The Smithsonian operates all across this country. If you look at what they're doing in digitalization of the things they have in their museum and stuff, and they're reaching out to schools and so forth, it is making an amazing difference. Go on their Web site and see what they're doing in terms of the applications for your iPhone and things like that that are making a difference in people's lives, plus the research that they do on a variety of things around this country is just amazing.

□ 2050

If the gentleman wants to reduce this, and everybody can take a \$58 million hit, I guess, but this is \$100 million or more below what the President already requested. Another \$58 million hit on this would be a substantial hit.

They also raise \$158 million in private funds. That tells you that private corporations and citizens all across this country love what the Smithsonian does. And they do a fantastic job. If you want to get the public outraged, slice the Smithsonian's funding so that when someone comes here to visit Washington, maybe a trip that they planned on for quite some time, and their kids want to see the number one thing they came to see, guess what it is. The Air and Space Museum, and the other things that occur here.

But the Smithsonian is so much more than that. Go look at what they do at the National Zoo. Go look at what they do in their collections that they have. This is an incredible organization.

I'm only sorry that in this budget climate, and I appreciate the gentleman's desire to address the budget deficit that we have. Everybody wants to do that. There are some things that we should maintain. The Smithsonian is one of them. So I would hope that not only would the Members of this body vote against this amendment, but that they would vote hopefully unanimously against it and in support of the Smithsonian and the work that they do for this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say I'm the coolest grandmother in this country as far as my

grandchildren are concerned, not because I'm a Member of the House of Representatives and have been for 19 years, but because I live within walking distance of the National Zoo. They come here, and they can't get enough of the National Zoo that is sponsored by the Smithsonian. And then when they've had enough of the National Zoo and know they can come back the day after, they are on their way to the Smithsonian; and it depends on their age, and they've developed over the years from wanting the simplest entertainment at the zoo to being very curious and wanting to know more and more.

My 7-year-old grandson who was here over the Fourth of July is committed to be a scientist from what he experienced over his last week and the few times he's been here before.

If you don't have grandchildren, maybe you don't get it. You don't think this is important to the people of this country, but there is nobody who comes into my office of any age who doesn't thank me for the experience they have had at the Smithsonian. I remind them that it is their entity. It isn't ours. They pay for it through their taxes, and they are proud to do that.

I stand here against the amendment and in support of the Smithsonian Institution.

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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FACILITIES CAPITAL

For necessary expenses of repair, revitalization, and alteration of facilities owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), and for construction, including necessary personnel, \$124,750,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That beginning in fiscal year 2012 and thereafter, any procurement for the construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, as authorized under section 8 of the National Museum of African American History and Culture Act (20 U.S.C. 80r-6), may be issued which includes the full scope of the project: *Provided further*, That the solicitation and contract with respect to the procurement shall contain the "availability of funds" clause described in section 52.232.18 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

#### NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and admin-

istrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, \$112,185,000, of which not to exceed \$3,481,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

#### REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, for lease agreements of no more than 10 years that address space needs created by the ongoing renovations in the Master Facilities Plan, as authorized, \$13,938,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

#### JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

##### OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, \$22,455,000.

#### CAPITAL REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and restoration of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, \$13,650,000, to remain available until expended.

#### WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$10,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

#### NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

##### NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

##### GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, \$135,000,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts, including arts education and public outreach activities, through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5 of the Act, for program support, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 105, line 7, insert "(reduced by \$10,600,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 158, line 25, insert "(increased by \$10,600,000)" after the dollar amount.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, tonight I am offering an amendment that would reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Arts to fiscal year 2006 levels.

In February, during the consideration of H.R. 1, I offered a similar amendment to cut NEA funding, which the House adopted. The underlying bill funds the National Endowment for the Arts at \$135 million which is a \$19.7 million reduction from last year's level.

I commend the chairman and the committee for recognizing that this funding has precipitated at an unsustainable rate. Since 2008, the NEA has received increases of over \$10 million each year, including \$50 million in funding from the stimulus in 2009. These spending increases have coincided with annual trillion dollar deficits.

My amendment would take funding levels back to fiscal year 2006 levels at \$124.4 million. If accepted, this cut returns \$10.6 million to the spending reduction account.

I want you to know I believe in the fine arts, and of course I know that's defined by individual standards. In the past, I was privileged to serve on a symphony board for a time as the chairman of the finance committee. In my early years, I was brought to the Chicago Symphony Orchestra by my parents, on school trips and otherwise, and appreciate the impact the fine arts can have. Tramping through art museums is not foreign to me as well, and I enjoy much of what I see.

But at a time when our government must cut Federal spending, at a time when our taxpayers cut and fix and repair and alter their own lifestyles and their spending, the primary source of funding for the arts should be through philanthropy, not forcing open the taxpayers' wallet without their choice.

The National Foundation for the Arts does provide benefits to our country and helps fund our true fine arts. However, we are asking them to only fund their true priorities, and they can make those priorities. We know that the public asks questions about some of the programs that the NEA has supported. I'm tempted to, but I will refrain from, giving explicit illustrations of funded programs and projects that they've undertaken with much taxpayer disapproval. But suffice it to say that in recent years the NEA has funded exhibits that disparage religion, promote pornography, and support Presi-

dential campaigns. That is not supported by the general taxpayer and should not be.

My amendment asks the NEA to only fund their true priorities. Now, if they want to determine those priorities, so be it. But if they want to determine priorities for youth concert series or young composers or you name it, that will be a choice as well, and I think most taxpayers would support those choices.

Our country is in financial hardship. The sponsors of the arts should be sponsors of the arts, as I am. But taxpayers ought to know that we will expect them, like the rest of the programs and certainly the rest of society, to be efficient at this time. Our country is in a financial hardship, and we're not taking programs like the NEA off the table; we're just asking them to establish priorities with reduced funding, yes, but an opportunity to efficiently convey to the taxpayers their understanding of what we're going through as well.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

□ 2100

We're a great country. Great countries understand the importance of the arts. They understand that it's important not only to communicate with one another but to leave a lasting legacy for future generations. The arts have the ability to communicate the most fundamental aspirations of mankind. They have the ability to evoke compassion. They have the ability to evoke the kind of spiritedness that causes countries to show undaunted courage and to rise above the problems of the day in pursuit of far more noble national objectives.

The value of the arts transcends anything that we can quantify in terms of dollars and cents. We should be extraordinarily proud of our National Endowment for the Arts. Denyce Graves, who is one of the finest opera singers in the world, who can stir the emotions just by hearing her beautiful, extraordinary voice, said that she grew up in Washington, where the Kennedy Center is. But it could have been the other end of the world if she had not been able to get into a program funded by the National Endowment for the Arts.

There are any number of men and women, young, middle-aged, old, who have come into contact because of the outreach that the National Endowment for the Arts has provided. And there are any number of communities across the country who, by use of the arts—by setting up a theater, by pulling people together, by getting a small amount of money from the NEA, which is far more an endorsement than it is financial support—have been able to develop local economies.

We've heard from a number of big-name performers now who said they

got their entry, the development of their career through the NEA. Some gave back by developing a theater in communities that they thought had seen their best days behind them. And yet by uniting the community, it's clear now their best days are ahead of them because young people want to stay in that community. They're excited about the arts that are provided.

This program does so much with so little. Yet the gentleman wants to cut \$10.6 million. That's 0.03 of 1 percent of nondefense domestic discretionary funding. We had \$174 million in the fiscal year 2011 bill. It was cut down to \$155 million, ultimately, for FY11. Now it's been cut another \$20 million—down to \$135 million.

I know my good friend from Idaho, the chair of the committee, wishes and knows it should be more. I think most of us, when we reflect, understand that if we continue to take money from programs that provide so much to, really, the heart and the soul of this Nation, we will lose those instruments we have to reduce the harshness and the rancor that divide us. It's the powerful media of the arts that enable us to transcend our differences, to appreciate real beauty, and the truth that comes through the fine arts and the grace that ennobles the human spirit.

NEA is a catalyst. It helps us create and sustain arts. It doesn't really fund much. What it does is to spawn the arts. It generates investment in the arts. In fact, the gentleman mentioned philanthropy. There's a great deal of money out in this country. We're still the wealthiest country in the world, no matter how much people would like us to think that we're poverty-stricken, that we're seeing some of our worst days. We're a great and powerful and wealthy Nation. Philanthropy is the principal source of funding of the arts. But NEA shapes much of that funding. It's a magnet for businesses. Almost 700,000 businesses are involved in creation and distribution of the arts.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MORAN. I do think that it's important that we make this nominal investment in the cultural lives of our citizens and in our children's futures. I can't imagine how a Nation as rich and prosperous as ours would not consider it a priority to provide funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

There's too much that divides us as a Nation. This is something that should be uniting, Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative. Everyone can appreciate the arts because it inspires us all. It inspires us to look past the parochial, the small-mindedness to see the big picture and to appreciate greatness.

This amendment should be defeated, and in it we should send a message that we understand what's important to the lifeblood of our national community.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Walberg amendment. First, let me associate myself with the words of my good friend from Virginia and his comments on this. The Walberg amendment would return the NEA funding to the 2006 levels of \$126 million. The National Endowment for the Arts—the NEA—is funded in this bill at \$135 million, which is a \$20 million reduction from the fiscal year 2011 enacted level, a \$32.5 million reduction from the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, and a \$10 million reduction from the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

I was asked earlier by a Member if I would support just going back to the 2008 level. We could do that but we'd have to add another \$10 million into it. And we, frankly, just don't have it. This would take it back to the 2006 level, as I said. Overall, the committee has cut \$2.1 billion in this bill from the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. This is on top of the \$2.6 billion we cut from the bill earlier this year.

I think this amendment is excessive. But I will tell you that for some people, voting against any funding for the arts is okay with them. I'm not suggesting that that's what the sponsor of this amendment is proposing. He's only proposing a reduction in this. But there are Members who believe that the Federal Government or a State government—no government—should be involved in the arts at all. I disagree.

When we ran into problems several years ago before I was here—maybe it was when Mr. MORAN was here; I can't remember—but they ran into some controversies with the arts and the funding for individual artists that they've done. Since then, the Interior Appropriations Committee has done, working with the NEA, some reforms. So we don't fund individual artists. We fund what the intent is, I think, of the National Endowment for the Arts, and that is to get the arts out to the rest of America. If you're sometimes in a large city and that type of thing, you have access to arts. But when you're in Salmon, Idaho, you don't have access to the arts like they do in some of the other areas.

So one of the things I've been focused on in working with Chairman Landesman is making sure the arts get out to rural America so that they have an opportunity to see these art performances, whether they're the visual arts or the performing arts or other things. But we need to get them out to rural America. If you want to come to Boyce, Idaho, you will have missed Boyce, Idaho, in the summer if you don't go to the Idaho Shakespeare Festival, partly funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

□ 2110

Yes, they raise private funds and have sponsorships and other things, but

part of their funding comes from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Chairman Landesman was out in Idaho last spring, I guess it was, and we toured around Idaho and looked at some of the arts programs, at the local arts agencies that receive some funding from the NEA, and we looked at the impact it had on their operations. We also went to Jerome High School where the actors who did their performances in Boise City, at the Idaho Shakespeare Festival, toured the schools and gave performances to students. Then they sat there afterwards and talked with the students about what it was to be in the performing arts—how you get into it, what the pluses and minuses of it were, and other things. They helped educate these students in these communities. It's a very important thing.

There are a variety of very popular programs in this bill which are popular on both sides of the aisle. The American Jazz Masters program, the Heritage Fellowships, The Big Read program, and Shakespeare in American Communities have their funding maintained, not at the previous levels, but at a level so that they can maintain these very popular programs. The chairman has introduced a new program that we're working with him on—exactly how it would work and what it would be—called Our Town, which is how the arts can help transform local communities and other things through a grant program, so we've been working with him.

I will tell you that the arts are important, and I think having a Federal investment in the arts is an important thing to have.

Mr. WALBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I just want to make it clear because, as I've listened to the opposition to this, it appears one didn't catch my train of thought. I'm not saying that arts or the NEA is wrong. I'm saying it's time to make priority decisions.

Certain priority decisions, as recently as November of 2010, fund programs such as Fire in the Belly—I won't go into the full description of it—and Hide and Seek, which can be considered pornography and which was, in fact, portrayed as that in an exhibit. Those are things that are priority decisions.

So I'm saying it is time, if we're funding those, to give the taxpayer a break and say, if you want to attend those or support those, do it through philanthropy or do it through initial sponsorships themselves but not through the taxpayer.

Mr. SIMPSON. In reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern. The Hide and Seek program, as the gentleman mentioned, was not an NEA program. It was not funded by the NEA, and that was not part of the NEA.

We have a tendency to think that anything that's done in this country or in this State or in this community that is done in the name of arts is done by the NEA. That's not the truth. So, when we attack them because of Hide and Seek, that's just not an accurate statement.

Again, there have been times in the past when there have been criticisms of the NEA, mainly because of the individual artist funding that went on. The committee has addressed that, and they have made reforms in working with the NEA to make sure that those types of things are not funded in this bill and that we don't fund individual artists. The main funding of the program is to get the arts out into the rural communities. Like I said, the American Jazz Masters program and The Big Read program are all vitally important programs that, I think, the American people like and that, I think, Members on both sides of the aisle like.

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. REED) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAULSEN, 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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 627, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-184) on the resolution (H. Res. 375) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 363 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. 2584.

□ 2115

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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment,

and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. PAULSEN (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, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) is pending, and the bill had been read through page 105, line 13.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The National Endowment for the Arts has a 40-year history of investing in communities across the country to expand access to the arts. The NEA has awarded 2,400 grants, spanning communities in all 435 congressional districts.

The proposed cuts to the NEA would have a crippling effect on a program that has been proven to work. Often when I talk about the arts and how I feel about them, I always say how thankful I am to be able to work in an art building that is a masterpiece, but I'm going to be practical tonight. All we're interested in is money, and that's what I'm going to talk about. I hope that people will pay attention to what we get for that little bit of money.

In FY 2010, the Federal Government invested \$167.5 million in the NEA for the purpose of providing funding to nonprofit arts organizations. That funding created \$166.2 billion in total economic activity, supported 5.7 million jobs, and—listen to this one—generated to the U.S. Treasury \$12.6 billion in tax revenue. That does not include the State tax revenue or the local tax revenue. So we spent \$167 million and got back \$12.6 billion.

I defy anybody in here to tell us that we get that kind of return on any money we spend here. I wish we could find more ways to multiply our money by such a magnitude while enhancing the public good at the same time. Investment opportunities like these are few and far between, and we should be expanding our investment in such a successful program, not cutting its funding to the bone.

I am the proud co-chair of the Congressional Arts Caucus, a group that has supported the NEA for almost 30 years. The Arts Caucus is composed of 186 dedicated, bipartisan Members who are committed to the growth and the success of the arts. Why? Because the arts make a difference.

The NEA reached its peak level of funding in fiscal year 1992, but it has never fully recovered from a 40 percent cut in fiscal year 1996 when, once again, people mischaracterized the work of the NEA. We have seen progress with increasing NEA funding since fiscal year 2008, but just last year, the NEA was forced to deal with a crippling cut again to its annual budget. If this year's appropriations

bill takes effect, the NEA will have had its budget cut by 20 percent in just the last few months. These cuts are not sustainable and do great harm to the success of the arts sector across the country.

There is widespread national support for the NEA and the arts, including from companies like Westinghouse and Bravo. Actually, what really happened so much for us that was so good was when Bravo and Westinghouse particularly said they would rather hire people who had backgrounds in art because of what they were able to do—their innovation and using both sides of the brain. Bravo was wonderful, advertising all the time how important arts are to the children in this country. The bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors made art a priority in their 10-point plan, saying Federal resources must also be invested in nonprofit arts organizations through their local arts agencies with the full funding of the Federal arts and cultural agencies.

□ 2120

In addition, I have a letter from 26 national art organizations urging Congress to prevent any further reduction to the investment in our Nation's arts and culture infrastructure, which I would like to submit for the RECORD.

The simple truth is that funding of the arts creates jobs. There are 756,007 arts-related businesses in the United States that employ 3 million people. In my district, there are 1,229 arts-related businesses that employ 15,864 people. And remember what's already been said so well by Mr. SIMPSON is that this is seed money from the National Endowment of the Arts which brings in other money—public money, private money—which is terribly important to make these programs survive. And these programs, as I've already pointed out, are an economic gold mine. They employ creative workforce, they spend money locally, they generate government revenue, and are a cornerstone of tourism and economic development.

Along with creating and supporting jobs, the arts provide job skills to our Nation's youth—this is very important to understand—that are marketable to the innovative companies that drive our economy and push America to the forefront in the global marketplace. I've already mentioned Westinghouse, but there are many more.

Exposure to the arts fosters learning, discovery, and achievement in our country. This is, again, simply a fact. Research has proven participation in arts education programs stimulate the creative, holistic, subjective, and intuitive portions of the human brain.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. SLAUGHTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. For example, from what we've been told by the University of California-Davis, the only doctors

who really understand what they hear in a stethoscope are those who have studied music. High school music students score 102 points higher on the SATs than their peers. Students with 4 years of art in high school obtain 57 points more on their SAT.

So we're making an investment in our students and our future.

But they play other important roles elsewhere in the economy.

Businesses are attracted to communities with a strong arts sector. And we see that everywhere there is art in existence, the presence of the arts can revitalize rural areas, inner cities and areas struggling with poverty. Cultural tourism brings in \$192 billion every year to the U.S. economy.

Listen to those figures. I hope to goodness everybody is as impressed as I am.

Furthermore, American arts are an important export for our country, bringing in \$30 billion more every year.

One statistic that I found particularly telling is that in 2010, the attendance at three New York museums—the Met, MoMA, and the Guggenheim—exceeded the attendance of all of the New York professional sports teams, all of them combined, by over 300,000 visits. People are interested in arts due in part to the NEA, and they come again and again and bring their families.

Along with all of this is a great intrinsic value that we know. I really must say that a lot of people think that art is not important, and they don't think about it or what it does to the human spirit. Art in so many ways tells us who we were, who we are, and who we hope to be. And if you think you're not affected by it, tell me what happens to you when you hear "Taps," "Amazing Grace," "America the Beautiful," and the stirring that it gives in your whole person and makes you want to be better than you are.

Please, please don't decimate this program in which we invest so little but get back so very much.

JULY 25, 2011.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, as the FY12 Interior Appropriations bill comes to the floor for consideration by the full House, we write to urge you to prevent further cuts to funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). The direct federal investment in the artistic capacity of our nation supports thousands of jobs, strengthens communities, improves lifelong learning, and boosts this country's international competitive advantage.

Every U.S. Congressional district benefits from an NEA grant, leveraging additional support from a diverse range of private sources to combine funding from government, business, foundation, and individual donors. The NEA awarded almost 2,400 grants in those districts in FY 2010. The NEA has provided strategic leadership and investment in the arts for more than 40 years. Americans can now see professional productions and exhibitions of high quality in their own hometowns. Among the proudest accomplishments of the NEA is the growth of arts activity in areas of the nation that were previously underserved or not served at all, especially in rural and inner-city communities.

Nationally, there are 668,267 businesses in the United States involved in the creation or distribution of the arts that employ 2.9 million people including visual artists, performing artists, managers, marketers, technicians, teachers, designers, carpenters, and workers in a wide variety of trades and professions. By direct grants and through allocations to each state, NEA dollars are distributed widely to strengthen the arts infrastructure and ensure broad access to the arts for communities across the country.

The NEA funds school-based and community-based programs that help children and youth acquire knowledge and understanding of, and skills in, the arts. The NEA also supports educational programs for adults, collaborations between state arts agencies and state education agencies, and partnerships between arts institutions and educators.

We understand fully the shared sacrifice that we all must make in order to help get our Nation's fiscal house in order. But funding for the National Endowment for the Arts was already reduced by \$12.5 million in FY11, and the FY12 Interior bill currently includes an additional \$20 million in funding cuts. We urge you to prevent any further reduction to the investment in our nation's arts and culture infrastructure when the Interior Appropriations bill is considered on the House floor.

Sincerely,

American Architectural Foundation, American Association of Museums, American Federation of Musicians, American Institute for Conservation of Historic & Artistic Works, American Music Center, Americans for the Arts, Association of Art Museum Directors, Association of Performing Arts Presenters, Chamber Music America, Chorus America, College Art Association, Dance/USA, Fractured Atlas, League of American Orchestras, Literary Network, Local Learning: The National Network for Folk Arts in Education, National Alliance for Media Arts & Culture, National Alliance for Musical Theatre, National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, National Association of Latino Arts and Culture, National Council for the Traditional Arts, National Performance Network, OPERA America, Performing Arts Alliance, Society for the Arts in Healthcare, Theatre Communications Group.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. In Congress, we have to, of course, responsibly cut spending, but at the same time we also have to make the necessary investments that create jobs now, guarantee the future strength of our economy, and renew the vitality of our communities. And that's why we should absolutely reject this effort to further reduce the investment, our Nation's investment, in the National Endowment for the Arts.

Our targeted Federal investment in the arts through the NEA is very modest and is really crucial to spurring the contributions of corporate and foundation partners through their support through philanthropy, sponsorships, and volunteerism that help to sustain and leverage arts investments in communities all across this country.

This investment in the arts becomes all the more important during a time

when States and cities all across this country face greater and greater fiscal constraints and at the same time are searching for opportunities to leverage Federal dollars and to spur economic development and job creation.

I represent a State that has realized an extraordinary return on investments generated by the arts. In Rhode Island, the presence of the arts is really sown into the fabric of our communities and of our economy. According to recent data from Americans for the Arts, in just the First Congressional District, in my district alone, more than 1,400 arts-related businesses employ nearly 6,000 people, and that represents more than 5 percent of the businesses in my district.

As the former mayor of Providence, I've seen firsthand the economic impact of the arts and the power of art to transform people and places.

I know the benefits of the arts in enriching our communities and uniting them as well. Arts nourish our soul.

The United States Conference of Mayors sent a letter to Members of Congress urging us to protect funding in the arts and to reject this amendment, recognizing that arts create jobs and produce tax revenues, that arts put people to work, and that arts attract tourism revenue. Arts in the creative industries are an enormous part of what fuels our local economies, bringing hundreds of thousands of visitors to our cities, generating activity in restaurants, hotels, transportation, and hospitality services.

This activity not only strengthens the vitality of our communities, it generates revenues for State and local governments. Across our country, the arts industry provides much more than aesthetic benefits. It creates meaningful economic benefits and opportunities.

During this period of budget austerity, we shouldn't neglect those investments with a proven positive rate of return. We shouldn't siphon off the fuel that helps power the American arts industry, a sector of our economy comprised of more than 750,000 businesses, employing nearly 3 million people nationwide, and generating more than \$166 billion in economic activity.

Cutting the National Endowment for the Arts undermines our responsibility to create jobs and grow our economy, and diminishes us as a Nation.

As one study demonstrates, when we consider the overall direct Federal cultural spending of \$1.4 billion, we're achieving a return on investment that's nearly 9 to 1. If we're really serious about strengthening our economy, putting more Americans back to work, and reining in our deficit, then we have to be smart about our investments and about our reductions.

With estimates indicating that every dollar of Federal funds invested in the arts generates \$9 in economic benefits, further reductions to the National Endowment of the Arts are counterproductive and, in fact, will move our Nation backwards. It moves us back-

wards not only in the effect that we lose the immediate economic return on the investments, but this cut also pushes our country further behind our competitors and the global economy.

It was one of the great giants of the United States Senate, the great and passionate leadership of Rhode Island Senator Claiborne Pell, that led to the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts in 1965, the program that we're fighting to defend today. In 1963, Senator Pell opened hearings on preliminary legislation on this issue by stating, "I believe that this cause and its implementation has a worldwide application, for as our cultural life is enhanced and strengthened, so does it project itself into the world beyond our shores.

"Let us apply renewed energies to the very concepts we seek to advance, a true renaissance, the reawakening, the quickening, and above all, the unstunted growth of our cultural vitality."

In those words Senator Pell said clearly that this disinvestment that we're discussing today for the National Endowment for the Arts nearly 50 years later is a stark and appalling contrast to the renaissance and reawakening embodied in the National Endowment for the Arts.

For too long, the arts have been the first target for spending cuts in our public schools and here at the Federal level. It is at our own economic peril that we continue to deprive our youth and our communities of their connection to the arts.

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

□ 2130

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

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

Mr. WALBERG. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. As sure as Wednesday follows Tuesday, you can count on congressional Republicans to propose gutting programs benefiting the arts and humanities. It's as predictable as it is irresponsible and unwise. It's the same old penny-wise, pound-foolish approach we have come to expect from a party that wants to spend lavishly on corporate giveaways while cutting just about every initiative that empowers the American people and improves lives and our communities.

I can't believe that while the Nation stands on the brink of default, while Republican stubbornness puts us less than a week away from economic calamity, we're having a debate about funding for the arts that represents 3

cents, 3 cents for every \$100 of non-military discretionary spending. Three cents, Mr. Chairman.

Believe me, the budget for the National Endowment for the Arts isn't breaking the bank. Grants to support museums and theater companies are not what caused a huge deficit, and cutting them will not put us on a fiscally responsible course. In fact, investments in the arts more than pay for themselves. For every \$1 spent on arts programs, the country gets back \$9 in economic benefit.

My friends on the other side of the aisle love to make arts funding a scapegoat. They never miss an opportunity to turn a spending debate into a culture war referendum on art. But let's be clear: The arts represent a vital economic industry, a mainstream employer of millions of Americans, and an integral part of a functioning society. The nonprofit arts sector generates more than \$12 billion in tax revenues and more than \$166 billion in economic activity every single year.

Communities that have a vibrant artistic life are magnets for tourism and new businesses that create jobs. There's also evidence that communities that embrace the arts tend to have higher real estate values, more civic activities and volunteerism, less crime, and lower poverty rates.

The arts are also a critical ingredient in the development of our children, with research showing that students receiving arts education perform better academically and are more likely to succeed in life.

But despite all the ways that arts support the common good, Republican leaders want to cut NEA. Instead, Mr. Chairman, I think it's time we cut Big Oil subsidies and cut loopholes for corporate jet owners. Arts programs have already taken a budget hit in recent years and are trying to do more with less. If we can give billions in subsidies to oil companies that are already raking in record profits, then surely we can maintain modest investments in the nonprofit arts sector that makes a vital contribution to American life.

Let's stop blaming small agencies for a fiscal crisis that was caused by three wars and tax cuts for the people who need them the least. Let's maintain robust funding for NEA.

With that, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman.

For too long the arts have been the first target for spending cuts in our public schools here at the Federal level. It is at our own economic peril that we continue to deprive our youth and our community of their connection to the arts. I have seen on so many occasions the power of music and dance and theater to ignite the imagination of a young person, that causes them to stay in school, to follow their passion, and ultimately to realize their dreams.

Today's global economy demands an even greater level of creativity, inno-

vative thinking, and entrepreneurship, a 21st century skill set that is enhanced by exposure to the arts in learning and in daily life. I participated in an arts education roundtable with CEOs from all across the country who said that those skills of creative problem solving, of innovation, of entrepreneurship were skills they were looking for in the workers of the 21st century. And the arts nourishes and enhances those skills.

We cannot underestimate the importance of maintaining critical Federal funding for our arts to fuel our national economic recovery, to grow our local economies, to teach our children, and to expand our civic discourse during these trying economic times.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject further reductions to the National Endowment for the Arts because now, more than ever, we need the National Endowment for the reawakening, quickening, and unstunted growth of not only our cultural vitality but of our economic prosperity as well.

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

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, when we, in this House, decide how the taxpayers' money is going to be spent, it represents a statement of our values, a statement of our priorities. And the question of whether we should adequately fund the National Endowment for the Arts is one of those that speaks loudly to our values. It speaks loudly to our respect for the creative genius of human beings. It speaks loudly about our understanding of what the human soul is about.

We've heard much documentation of the economic impact of the arts throughout our country, \$165 billion annually in economic activity. I certainly can attest to the fact that in my community of Louisville, Kentucky, more than 20,000 of my constituents are involved actively, professionally in the arts. We are one of the only communities that has resident theater, resident opera, ballet, children's theater, a vibrant visual arts community. It is one of the things that significantly enhances the quality of life in my community. It's one of those things that brings people to my community. So the economic importance of the arts is undeniable.

But I ask again about our priorities. The amount of money that we're talking about now, roughly \$10 million over a period of years, we spent in the first few minutes of our activity in Libya. The first few Tomahawk missiles we launched there, that was \$10 million. We spend \$10 million in less than 1 hour in Afghanistan, less than 1 hour. So here we're talking about millions of jobs supported by funding from the National Endowment for the Arts, \$165 billion in economic activity, against all of the other things we do where there is so little payback for where we spend the taxpayers' money.

There are two things I would like to mention in addition to kind of the value-added aspects of arts funding.

If you think back over the history of mankind, what has survived of the great civilizations of this world? The only thing that has survived has been the creative product of the minds of men and women throughout history. Literature, music, architecture, paintings, sculpture, these are the only things that have survived.

□ 2140

If you look around this glorious room that we have the privilege of serving in—famous painting of George Washington, Lafayette, the architecture that's represented here—this is all the creative product of the men and women of generations. This is what our soul speaks to the world, to generations to come, and this is what we're talking about funding.

One of the greatest exports that we have from this country is our cultural product. We export music; we export film; we export drama, theater, all of these things, activities funded by the National Endowment for the Arts. So when we say to our taxpayers, our constituents, what are your values, we can say, you know, those Tomahawk missiles are wonderful.

And I certainly understand that we need to defend our country. But when we talk about our contributions to the history of mankind, humankind, it is undeniable that what we invest, the small amount we invest in supporting our creative genius, will be paid back many, many times over.

So I am proud to stand here and support funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, opposing the Walberg amendment, which would further cut the funding that has already been substantially reduced, and stand for the values of the millions and millions of men and women and children who not only participate in artistic activities, but also benefit immeasurably through an enhanced quality of life in our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, last month I gathered almost 200 individuals interested in the arts and humanities to discuss National Endowment for the Humanities and National Endowment for the Arts programs. The turnout was impressive. But considering their eagerness to win endowment grants, it was also a reminder of how tight funding is for these critical programs.

My friend, poet Paul Muldoon, read some poetry to the attendees and reminded all, in his words, the NEA and the NEH are not properly funded. It is a national disgrace. Now, that was before the amendment that is here tonight that would cut the NEA even further.

The NEA and the NEH help ensure a well-rounded education, and result in a well-rounded society. Now, of course the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are different, but they are similar in what they bring to our Nation.

The arts and humanities inspire our children to explore their own creativity and encourage positive development in the course of their educational careers. The arts and humanities are a fundamental component of our society and they, indeed, warrant Federal funding. The arts and humanities help us know ourselves as a people.

Just a few weeks ago, here on this floor, the House approved a bill that increased the spending for the Department of Defense by \$17 billion. The total funding for the endowments is hardly more than a percent of that increase in defense spending that was passed. Talk about misplaced priorities.

I'm reminded of the often told exchange between Scientist Robert Wilson, the Director of Fermilab, when he was testifying before the Senate and Senator Pastore. The Senator asked, with regard to a science experiment at Fermilab, whether it would help defend this country against the Soviet Union. Replied Dr. Wilson, no, Senator Pastore, this will not help defend us against the Soviet Union, but it will help make our country more worth defending.

This amendment is based on the premise that arts and humanities are a luxury. The author of this amendment to cut the NEA further says America is impoverished. Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you what would leave America really impoverished is if we strangle the arts and humanities.

We've heard what the arts contribute to our economy. The Americans for the Arts, in its report, Arts and Economic Prosperity, details that the arts support more than 5 million jobs and generate tens of billions of dollars in government revenue.

Arts are good for our cultural development, yes. They are good for our society at large and good for our economic development as well.

I've heard from a number of my constituents on this matter, and nearly everyone has pleaded with me to preserve as much funding as possible for the arts and for the humanities. As one of them said poignantly, "A Nation without culture is a Nation without a soul."

I strongly oppose this amendment and other efforts to strangle the arts and humanities in America and to defund the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amend-

ment. Our focus today ought to be on jobs. And as some of my colleagues have already said, funding the arts creates jobs. For negligible investments, we create lots of jobs, because not only are the arts supported, but when you have artistic programs, restaurants and other activities generate jobs all over the community.

And our focus ought to be on education. Those children, for example, who are involved in of the arts, do better in school.

Now we're trying to cut funding for the arts in this amendment, and we cannot ignore why all these cuts are necessary. Last December we passed a tax cut of \$800 billion, \$400 billion a year. Now, we're looking to make cuts. Most of the projections are that we need \$4 trillion over the next 10 years in deficit reduction, \$400 billion a year. I hope we don't ignore the fact that that's the same number, \$400 billion tax cuts a year, and now we're looking for \$400 billion spending cuts a year.

So when we talk about cutting the arts, when we talk about cutting Social Security and Medicare and education and everything else, we cannot ignore the fact that all of these cuts are designed to preserve the tax cuts that we passed last December. And so to preserve those tax cuts—many are going to millionaires, multimillionaires, and oil companies—we find ourselves having to deal with this amendment to cut the arts.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be lulled into accepting caps. Caps just delay the inevitable because caps don't cut anything today. But when you start appropriating under the caps, in a few weeks or a few months, we'll find that there's not enough money for the arts, there's not enough money for Head Start, there's not enough money for education or Social Security or Medicare. So when you accept the caps, you're ultimately going to make these cuts.

We don't have any crisis today, Mr. Chairman, because some don't want to increase the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling is a perfunctory responsibility of this Congress. We've already spent the money. The debt ceiling just acknowledges what we've already done. We need to just pass the debt ceiling and get back to the regular order where we make choices.

Do we want to cut Social Security and Medicare and the arts in order to preserve tax cuts, many going to the oil companies and multimillionaires? I hope not, and we should begin by defeating this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, in Minnesota we understand that the arts are an essential part of our economy and the number of jobs it creates. The arts are so vital to our economy and our de-

velopment and civic life that in 2008, Minnesotans voted to amend our State constitution to raise money, yes, to tax themselves and dedicate part of the revenue to the arts.

Minnesota is the only State in the country where there's a dedicated public funding source for the arts. In our Constitution, Mr. Chair, we passed a legacy amendment. Hunters, anglers, conservationists, parents, seniors, all came together to say the arts, along with preserving our environment, is integral to our legacy, to our way of life in Minnesota.

In my district alone, the arts employ over 8,000 people. And the arts and the culture industry contributes over \$330 million to Minnesota's economy. Investing in the arts makes economic sense, and it's good public policy.

As has been pointed out, for every dollar that is spent by the NEA, \$9 in economic activity is generated. We must make tough choices, given this fiscal crisis, and I believe the NEA's budget has been targeted and it has been shrunk enough.

□ 2150

The NEA's budget has been cut 20 percent since 2010. Our artists, poets, writers, musicians, producers, sculptors, singers, dancers, photographers, and actors contribute millions of dollars to our local economy and create a vibrant social space for us to come together. And we hear time and time again from the major corporations and from the start-up companies, from computer companies to health care companies to our universities that it is American creativity and space for the arts that allows America to move forward.

So I strongly oppose this cut, and I reject any further attacks on the NEA's budget.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, you've heard it. I will explain: I rose previously to claim the time in opposition, now I am rising to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if this was not such a late hour, we would have had five or six times as many Members rising in opposition to this amendment. And I trust they reflect the general sentiment of the country.

Winston Churchill, at the height of World War II, was told by his budget director that to conserve money for armaments, they needed to cut the arts. And he turned to him and said, If we do that, what is it that we're fighting for?

The arts reflect the highest aspirations of our humanity. And in fact, in this country, they're a reflection of the true American spirit—our talent, our ability to communicate, our ability to relate to one another.

Now, let me be specific about what this amendment would do, because every single Member of this body has a direct grant from the National Endowment for the Arts going to that congressional district. If this amendment were to pass, more than \$100 million in non-Federal matching funds for NEA awards would be lost. The number of Americans reached as a result will decline by 36 million compared to the number of Americans reached by NEA this year. The number of children and youth will decline by 3.6 million, and in fact there will be a near-17 percent decrease in State and regional partnerships.

I think if the Members fully consider the impact of this, they will realize this is one of the most effective Federal Government programs that we have. We have a gentleman whose name is Rocco Landesman. He could be making considerably more than he's making today in income, but he has chosen to devote his time and attention to leading the National Endowment for the Arts. In fact, he has suggested that, given the fiscal situation that confronts us, perhaps we should reduce the number of platforms for artists so as to save money. But he is determined not to reduce the quality of artistic performance in this country.

We have so many talented people, so much potential, and it is the NEA that reaches out and finds that potential all over the country. This is a fully national program. Every single congressional district benefits from grants from the NEA. And those grants expand the economy, the focus of the grant, multiple times—I'm trying to recall the number, I think it's five or six times at a minimum, many times 10, 20 times—the amount of money that is contributed to a particular artistic focus when the NEA decides that it's worthy of getting a grant.

They have maintained their credibility. In fact, when they were under attack in the 1990s, they made sure that every grant passes a very high level of scrutiny. Even though I think most of us don't believe in censorship, they understand all the competing political pressures. They have navigated those political waters. The Our Town program that the chairman of the subcommittee referred to is a terrific program. It really develops the best of what America is all about.

This has been a long night. We have tried to fight the good fight over here against any number of efforts to cut programs, to repeal legislation; but this is one of the most important.

I would urge this body to reject this amendment, to show our support for the National Endowment for the Arts, and really for the phenomenal artistic talent that it underscores and generates in this country.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak of the importance of the National Endowment for the Arts. I would like to thank my

friend and fellow Co-Chair of the Congressional Arts Caucus, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, for her tireless efforts in advocating for the arts over the years.

Every day we witness the impact of the arts on our society. The arts in America are an integral component to our cultural vibrancy—fostering creativity and bringing together communities. Museums, performing arts centers, galleries, historical societies, and other cultural institutions not only provide significant contributions to the social fabric of neighborhoods and communities, but also provide significant economic contributions. In my home district in Pennsylvania, 1,410 arts-related businesses provide nearly 6,000 jobs. It is for these reasons that I support responsible investments in the NEA.

As our Nation is facing unprecedented financial challenges, it is critical that we address unsustainable levels of spending. To do this all Federal agencies and recipients of Federal dollars must share in making sacrifices. The fiscal year 2012 Interior Appropriations legislation already includes a 13 percent reduction in spending over fiscal year 2011 and a 20 percent reduction over 2010 for the NEA. Accordingly, I ask that my colleagues not support further cuts to the NEA and oppose the Walberg Amendment.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES  
GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, \$135,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$125,000,000 shall be available for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act and for administering the functions of the Act; and \$10,000,000 shall be available to carry out the matching grants program pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Act, including \$8,000,000 for the purposes of section 7(h): *Provided*, That appropriations for carrying out section 10(a)(2) of such Act shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of subsections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) of such Act during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 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 105, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$13,500,000)".

Page 158, line 258, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$13,500,000)".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities by a mere 10 percent.

I have stood up here and offered amendment after amendment trying to highlight areas of our budget that we can afford reasonable cuts. If you add up all of those modest cuts, the Federal Government could end up saving a significant amount of money. We are facing a fiscal crisis in this Nation, a financial fiasco; and if we can't make the cuts that need to be made, this country is going to go into a total economic collapse.

Now, if someone's broke, they sell their luxury car and get a more efficient one; they stop eating steak and lobster and eat more hamburger and hot dogs. They turn in their membership to the country club. All those things are beautiful things, nice things, luxury things. We have a lot of luxuries that we've been funding through the Federal Government for a long period of time. But, Mr. Chairman, we can't afford to continue doing so because we are in an economic emergency as a Nation. We are broke. We have unsustainable debt. We have unsustainable debt that's going to cause our children and our grandchildren to live at a lower standard than we live today if we keep this up.

Mr. Chairman, in a race a number of years ago, I said Congress was sick; we need a doctor in the House. I'm a medical doctor, and I do addiction medicine. Government needs an intervention for its spending addiction. In addiction medicine we say, if there's no denial, there's no addiction. We've got a tremendous amount of denial about the economic crisis we face in this Nation. We've just simply got to stop the spending.

When a business goes under water, it's overextended as the Federal Government is, what does it do? It lowers its borrowing level—if the lender doesn't do that—it starts trying to figure out how to reduce the debt, and then it goes through every aspect of its expenditures and tries to cut expenses all across the board in every area. The Federal Government needs to do the same.

□ 2200

And then the business will look at how to raise more revenue. Our Democratic colleagues say that we need to raise revenue by raising taxes, but that will just tax away jobs. We must create jobs here in America. We create jobs in America by getting the tax burden and the regulatory burden off the job creators, the small businesses here in America that are suffering and are suffocating with the burden of over-regulation and taxes. We could create more revenue for the Federal Government,

not by raising taxes but by raising taxpayers, and we do that by putting people to work and creating a stronger economy. It's absolutely critical for the future of this Nation. We can't keep going down this road.

The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, I've heard all the arguments, and for the Smithsonian Institute and other things that a lot of people think are very beautiful and nice, just like that luxury automobile, but we need to stop it. The future of our Nation depends upon it. I'm fighting for America. I'm fighting for the future of our children and my grandchildren. Funding for the National Endowment for the Arts does not need to be a priority in the midst of these trying times, and I urge my colleagues to support a very simple request to reduce its funding by 10 percent.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The Acting CHAIR. State your inquiry.

Mr. MORAN. If the Committee does now rise, an amendment has been offered, would not the body, the Committee of the Whole, take up the conclusion of that amendment when we reconvene on the same bill the next time the bill is brought up, whether it be tomorrow, Friday, or Saturday?

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment will still be pending.

The question is on the motion to rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROUN of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAULSEN, 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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 846. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 80 Lafayette Street in Jefferson City, Missouri, as the Christopher S. Bond United States Courthouse, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1406. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 510 19th Street, Bakersfield, California, as the Myron Donovan Crocker United States Courthouse, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 28, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2610. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Australia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2611. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting draft legislation to authorize collection of fees under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2612. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Oregon; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan and Interstate Transport Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0035; FRL-9425-3] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2613. 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; State of Louisiana [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-0924; FRL-9323-7] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2614. 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; Determination of Termination of Section 185 Fees [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0404; FRL-9430-2] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2615. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [PA200-4203; FRL-9314-6] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2616. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation To Mitigate the Misfueling of Vehicles and Engines With Gasoline Containing Greater Than Ten Volume Percent Ethanol and Modifications to the Reformulated and Conventional Gasoline Programs [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0448; FRL-9428-2] (RIN: 2060-AQ17) received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2617. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0383; FRL-9427-9] received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2618. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, Kern County Air Pollution Control District, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0198; FRL-9425-4] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2619. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, Kern County Air Pollution Control District, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0198; FRL-9429-1] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2620. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollutions Control District (SJVUAPCD) [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0907; FRL-9428-7] received July 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2621. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the broadcasting Board of Governors for Fiscal years 2012 and 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2622. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislation the Department requests to be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2623. A letter from the Inspector General, House of Representatives, transmitting Management Advisory Report — Report No. 11-CAO-05; to the Committee on House Administration.

2624. A letter from the Inspector General, House of Representatives, transmitting Audit Report—Report No. 11-CAO-04; to the Committee on House Administration.

2625. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill to authorize \$2,174,600,000 for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) major facility construction projects and \$49,292,000 for major facility leases for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2626. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of Treasury Regulations Pursuant to Section 939A of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act [TD 9533] (RIN: 1545-BK28) received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2627. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting proposed legislation to collect certain fees under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce.

2628. A letter from the Commission, Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan, transmitting Special Report 5, "Sustainability: hidden costs risk new waste"; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

2629. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve Veterans' health care benefits and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Oversight and Government Reform.

2630. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and the Workforce.

#### 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. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 375. Resolution Providing for consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-184). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SIRE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 2663. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to increase the statutory limit

on the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 2664. A bill to reauthorize the Water Desalination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2665. A bill to phase out the use of private military contractors; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 2666. A bill to neutralize the discriminatory effect of any country that employs indirect taxes and grants rebates of the same upon export if United States trade negotiating objectives regarding border tax treatment in World Trade Organization negotiations are not met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2667. A bill to provide for improvements to the administration of bankruptcy in cases under chapter 7 of title 11 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BACA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2668. A bill to designate the station of the United States Border Patrol located at 2136 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the "Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr.

MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TIERNY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEFALZIO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FARR, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 2669. A bill to restrict the use of offshore tax havens and abusive tax shelters to inappropriately avoid Federal taxation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 2670. A bill to provide that States and local governments may pass laws that identify illegal aliens, deter illegal aliens from entering the United States, apprehend illegal aliens, or encourage or otherwise cause illegal aliens to leave the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2671. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of an undiagnosed diseases network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 2672. A bill to clarify the orphan drug exception to the annual fee on branded prescription pharmaceutical manufacturers and importers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2673. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to modify the disposition of qualified treatment qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 2674. A bill to amend section 340B of the Public Health Service Act to improve the provision of discounts on drug purchases for certain safety net providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. PENCE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 2675. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to authorize producers on a farm to produce fruits and vegetables for processing on the base acres of the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):  
H.R. 2676. A bill to lower health premiums and increase choice for small businesses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:  
H. Res. 376. A resolution calling for the repatriation of POW/MIAs and abductees from the Korean War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### 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. WELCH:  
H.R. 2663.  
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 Mrs. NAPOLITANO:  
H.R. 2664.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:  
H.R. 2665.  
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 (Clause 14), which grants Congress the power to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

By Mr. PASCRELL:  
H.R. 2666.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:  
H.R. 2667.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:  
H.R. 2668.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section I and Section 8.

By Mr. DOGGETT:  
H.R. 2669.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BROOKS:  
H.R. 2670.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8. "The Congress shall have the power . . . to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . ."

By Mr. CARTER:  
H.R. 2671.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. GERLACH:  
H.R. 2672.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARKEY:  
H.R. 2673.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8  
By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:  
H.R. 2674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. RIBBLE:  
H.R. 2675.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:  
H.R. 2676.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Art. 1, §8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: "To regulate commerce among foreign nations and the several states."

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 85: Mr. COHEN and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H.R. 104: Mr. ISSA and Mr. BUCSHON.  
H.R. 136: Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 157: Mr. HECK.  
H.R. 365: Mr. REICHERT.  
H.R. 436: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.  
H.R. 452: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. LATOURETTE.  
H.R. 530: Mr. MICHAUD.  
H.R. 563: Mr. PITTS.  
H.R. 593: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 645: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 721: Mrs. CAPPS.  
H.R. 748: Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 763: Mr. KISSELL.  
H.R. 772: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 831: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H.R. 860: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H.R. 878: Mr. DOGGETT.  
H.R. 942: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
H.R. 1063: Mr. HOLDEN.  
H.R. 1172: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1179: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 1219: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. BERMAN.  
H.R. 1283: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.  
H.R. 1381: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.  
H.R. 1464: Mr. CARTER.  
H.R. 1546: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MCCAUL.  
H.R. 1574: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
H.R. 1588: Mrs. BLACK.  
H.R. 1639: Mr. MCHENRY.  
H.R. 1703: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1736: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. CASSIDY.  
H.R. 1744: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
H.R. 1780: Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 1803: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
H.R. 1834: Mr. BOREN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 1852: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 1925: Mr. MICHAUD.  
H.R. 1936: Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 1955: Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 2012: Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 2023: Ms. FOX and Mr. NUNNELEE.  
H.R. 2033: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2108: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.  
H.R. 2123: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
H.R. 2163: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 2164: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 2235: Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMALVA, and Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 2249: Mrs. CAPITO.  
H.R. 2257: Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 2271: Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.R. 2327: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
H.R. 2381: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 2402: Mr. HALL.  
H.R. 2429: Mr. LANKFORD.  
H.R. 2492: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2505: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2529: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
H.R. 2530: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 2541: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
H.R. 2544: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2559: Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 2580: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2592: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2594: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 2600: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LATTI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2607: Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 2644: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STARK, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. BERMAN.  
H.R. 2653: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 2659: Mr. OLVER and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. CARNAHAN.  
H. Res. 19: Mr. HINCHEY.  
H. Res. 21: Mr. HINCHEY.  
H. Res. 295: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. ALEXANDER.  
H. Res. 342: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. RAHALL.

H. Res. 361: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Res. 364: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. THORBERRY, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H. Res. 369: Mr. CONAWAY.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT No. 73: At the end of the bill (before the short title) add the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior for any new oil or gas drilling above the Outer Continental Shelf within 25-miles of the State of Florida.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. LABRADOR

AMENDMENT No. 74: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop or implement a comprehensive conservation plan under the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.) for the Lake Lowell Unit of the Deer Flat National Wildlife Refuge.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

AMENDMENT No. 75: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce a State emissions reduction obligation in the final rule entitled “Federal Implementation Plans to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone in 27 States; Correction of SIP Approvals for 22 States” (popularly referred to as the “Cross-State Air Pollution Rule”) signed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on July 6, 2011, for a State for which the Administrator did not propose a State emissions budget in the proposed rule entitled “Federal Implementation Plans To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone” published in the Federal Register on August 2, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 45210 et seq.).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

AMENDMENT No. 76: Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$48,206,000)”.

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$48,206,000)”.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT No. 77: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

FUNDING LIMITATION RELATED TO REGULATION OF OFFSHORE SERVICE CONTRACTORS

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to regulate, under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), any person that is not a lessee under that Act.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

AMENDMENT No. 78: 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 add the lesser prairie chicken to the list of threatened species or endangered species published under section 4(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)).