Agriculture is one of the Nation's most energy-intensive industries and will be negatively impacted by this legislation. Even a small increase in operating costs could devastate rural farmers and ranchers, and this bill could prove to be a huge burden on our agricultural producers. U.S. farmers would also be at a severe disadvantage compared to farmers in nations which do not have cap-and-trade systems with the correspondingly high input costs.

Yesterday I offered an amendment which would have helped defray increased costs of production and declining prices resulting from increased imports or decreased exports.

It is simply not appropriate for allowances to be set aside for other industries heard by the cap-and-trade bill, but agriculture is left out.

PUBLIC HEALTH INSURANCE OPTION

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I hope today we are going to pass a transformational climate bill that will not only grow jobs in this country but will make us truly energy independent.

And when we get back from our break, it is time to turn our attention to health care. There is a lot of controversy around these issues, but out in the American public, there is no controversy over their desire to see a public insurance option be part of health care reform: 69 percent support in a recent Kaiser Foundation poll; 72 percent in a CBS/New York Times poll; 76 percent by NBC and Wall Street Journal. And it is nonpartisan: 50 percent of Republicans support it, over 80 percent of Democrats.

There might be a lot of controversy on the issue of energy or health care, but on the issue of whether or not Americans want a public option on their table as part of health care reform, the jury has decided.

DRIVING UP PRICES

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I have noticed that most environmental radicals come from very wealthy or very upper-income families. Perhaps they do not realize how much they have hurt the poor and the lower income and the working people by destroying jobs and driving up prices.

Now, those who seem to be the loudest in saying they are for the little guy are about to pass a bill that is going to hurt the little guy most of all. This cap-and-trade bill is going to drive up prices for gas, utilities, and especially costs for small businesses and farms. Businesses in China and India will probably jump for joy because this will give them even greater advantages.

And college graduates all over this country wonder why they cannot find good jobs and have to keep working as waiters and waitresses because this bill will drive even more jobs to other countries.

I hope everyone who is undecided on this bill will vote for the little guy instead of the big money environmental groups and the very big businesses which will benefit from this very costly bill.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HIRONO) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Given my nomination by the President as Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, this letter serves as my intent to resign from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, effective today.

Sincerely,

ELLEN O. TAUSCHER,
Member of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2454, AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2009

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 587 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 587

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2454) to create clean energy jobs, achieve energy independence, reduce global warming pollution and transition to a clean energy economy. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2998, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate, with two and one half hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Forbes of Virginia or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MATSUI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I would like to speak briefly about all that the Speaker has meant to this body.

Since coming to Congress, I have watched ELLEN TAUSCHER navigate the legislative and political waters of the House of Representatives. She has always done so with uncommon grace, skill and acumen which we would all be well served to emulate.

We will all miss her presence here in this Chamber, whether in the chair or on the floor. But we know that she will continue to serve our country well in her new capacity as Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security at the State Department.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 587 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2454, the American Clean Energy and Security Act. The resolution provides for 3 hours of general debate with 2½ hours controlled by the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Madam Speaker, from coast to coast we are seeing the effects of our changing climate. Just last week, experts from 13 government agencies and several universities issued a new report on global climate change impacts in the United States. Their analysis was clear: global warming is caused by human-induced emissions.

It is also already having visible impacts in the United States. We are seeing these effects throughout our country, from increases in heavy storms to rising sea levels. From earlier snow melt to alterations in river flows. These experts concluded that negative effects of climate change will continue to worsen.

Climate change will combine with other air pollution, population growth,

overuse of resources, and social, economic, and environmental stresses to create larger impacts that will be felt around the world and here at home. For my constituents, this threat is very real and very urgent.

California's Department of Water Resources projects that the Sierra Nevada snow pack will experience a 25 to 40 percent reduction by 2050. These are not empty numbers. As California's climate warms, more of the Sierra Nevada's watershed will continue to peak storm runoff. High-frequency flood events are projected to increase as a result. We have no choice but to adapt to these changing realities.

In Sacramento, we live at the confluence of two great rivers, the Sacramento and the American. As global warming intensifies, scientists predict greater storm intensity that could forever change these rivers' flow patterns. This means that my district will have to cope with more direct runoff and more flooding.

I want to thank Chairman WAXMAN and Chairman MARKEY for working with me to ensure that this bill addresses California's water needs in the context of climate change. Allowances are distributed to States for urgent projects to help fight extreme weather and flooding. These resources are vital as we work to adapt to changing climates and more intense weather patterns.

In order to deal with these issues and with others that confront us all, the Energy and Commerce Committee has held countless hearings on energy and climate change policy over the past 2½ years. This year alone we have convened over a dozen hearings and heard from numerous experts, as well as national and international leaders. In total, the committee has held over 40 days of hearings on energy and climate change policy over the past two Congresses. During these deliberations, over 300 witnesses testified, including 130 in this year alone.

Whether or not we all agree with Chairman WAXMAN and Chairman MARKEY on the issue of global warming, and I personally do, we should all applaud the work these two chairmen have done to get us here today.

This bill is not only an achievement for the American people but also for our children and our grandchildren. By spurring a new era of clean energy jobs, this bill puts our economy on a new trajectory. And because of this investment, our children and grandchildren will live in a country that is more sustainable, more economically viable, and more efficient than the country we live in today.

The legislation will create millions of new clean energy jobs, enhance America's energy independence, and protect the environment. Specifically, it requires electric utilities to meet 20 percent of the electricity demand through renewable and energy sources and energy efficiency by 2020.

It also invests in new clean energy technologies and energy efficiencies, including energy efficiency and renewable energy carbon capture and sequestration, and basic scientific research and development.

It mandates new energy-saving standards for buildings, appliances, and industry, and it reduces carbon emissions from major U.S. sources by 17 percent by 2020 and over 80 percent by 2050. These are the nationwide impacts of this groundbreaking legislation.

Part of the brilliance of this bill before us today, though, is that it also gives tools to local communities to fight climate change on their own. One of the ways this bill does so is through the transportation sector. Transportation accounts for 30 percent of the greenhouse gases emitted into the atmosphere each year. Therefore, effective climate change legislation must include a transportation component if we are going to achieve the emission reduction levels that scientists say are vital to saving our planet.

I appreciated working with the committee on section 222, which seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive transportation efficiency and land use planning. The way we plan our communities and transportation systems has a real effect on how well we reduce emissions from transportation. This legislation also protects consumers from energy price increases.

According to estimates from the EPA, the reductions in carbon pollution required by the legislation will cost American families only 22 to 30 cents per day. But fighting global warming is not just about preserving our current way of life; it is also about creating a cleaner, stronger economy that will power the United States toward a clean energy future.

EPA analysis shows that the Nation's gross domestic product would grow from $13 trillion in 2008 to over $22 trillion in 2030 while deploying clean energy technology and reducing global warming pollution. And consumption, an economic measure of a household's purchasing potential, would grow by 8 to 10 percent from 2010 to 2015, and 23 percent to 28 percent by 2030.

With the American Clean Energy and Security Act, we are making smart investments. We are giving entrepreneurs the tools they need to create clean energy jobs that demand American skills and that put our country in a strong position to compete internationally.

Madam Speaker, with the American Clean Energy and Security Act, we will show the rest of the world that America is back and we are ready to lead again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to, on behalf of my Republican colleagues, congratulate you for your wonderful new responsibilities that you will have at the State Department, and congratulations on your Senate confirmation yesterday.

Mr. UPTON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UPTON. I, too, extend my congratulations, as I understand it, in charge of arms control. And I think this is a particularly worthy day that you have this job still, as a Member of Congress, until the end of the day, because you're going to need to repair a lot of arms on that side of the aisle after this vote is over.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman, but congratulations very much, Ellen.

At the very top, Madam Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to the gentlewoman from California if we could extend the time of debate. I am inundated with the amount of requests and would like to ask that we extend it 30 minutes, extending both sides an additional 15 minutes.

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

Ms. MATSUI. No, we will not agree to that. We object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection is heard.

Mr. SESSIONS. You do object. I would like to ask the gentlewoman if we could extend the time on both sides by 5 minutes then.

Ms. MATSUI. We object. There are 3 hours on the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to see if we could extend by 1 minute this debate on both sides.

Ms. MATSUI. We object.

Mr. SESSIONS. You object. Okay.

Madam Speaker, good morning. I yield myself such time as I may consume. And I appreciate the gentlewoman extending me these few minutes that she has given us to debate this very important bill.

I rise in opposition to this lockdown rule and the underlying legislation which, if passed, The Wall Street Journal correctly notes will become the ''biggest tax in American history.''

After limited committee hearings and only one markup on this 1,200-plus page bill, the negotiations that have brought this bill to the floor have completely excluded Republicans and ignored our good ideas on how to stop the most economically devastating and job-killing parts of this bill.

For example, during the bill's brief deliberation in committee, Republicans offered three commonsense amendments, one to suspend the program if gas prices hit $5 a gallon, one to suspend the program if electricity prices rise 10 percent over 2009, and one to suspend the program if unemployment rates hit 15 percent. But, unfortunately, the committee's Democrats defeated them all.

To make matters worse, for the past 2 weeks, despite numerous contrary promises to our Democrat colleagues and to the American people, Speaker PELOSI and her handpicked lieutenants on the Rules Committee have limited

open debate and, once again here on the floor, debate to talk about this unprecedented bill that is before the American people.

While this behavior is undemocratic and mildly irritating when dealing with bills like Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009, it is simply unacceptable when it comes to legislation of such great importance to the future of American jobs and families.

So once again, early this morning in the Rules Committee, after—and by the way, that was about 2–3:30 this morning—after being handed a brand-new 309-page revision of the bill, this unacceptable behavior continued.

My Republican colleagues and I offered numerous good ideas and improvements to this brand-new bill this morning, which not one Member has even read. As a matter of fact, we even joked about that as we walked in at 2 o'clock this morning about, sure everybody had a chance to read the bill, that's why we were up so late last night. This legislation that Republicans proposed would have provided commonsense relief for farmers and small businesses that drive our economy. Unsurprisingly, each of these good ideas was rejected by our Democrat colleagues along party lines.

Whether or not to impose the biggest tax increase in American history is a very serious issue, and one that affects every American family, legislation that the Heritage Foundation estimates will cost working families in the 32nd Congressional District of Texas, just one district which I happen to represent, some 4,178 jobs in 2012. We believe that this bill should actually be debated and openly read so that everyone doesn't just rush through this day but, rather, understands the true impact of what we're doing.

The rule being proposed here today is a grave mistake and an undemocratic embarrassment. And I, for one, think this body can do better. We owe it to the American people to allow Members, Members of this body on both sides, who have good ideas to be heard, especially the ideas to address the needs of rural and working class people who will see their incomes and choices slashed by this bill.

Instead of an inclusive debate on how to conserve our resources and provide clean, affordable energy for American businesses and families, the Democrats' answer to the worst recession in decades is a national energy tax, thinly disguised as a climate change bill.

Billions of dollars wasted on extra energy costs and millions of jobs lost is an extremely high price to pay for a bill that is estimated, at best, to slow the Earth's temperature rises by one-hundredth of a single degree by 2050, and no more than two-tenths of a degree by the end of this century.

Madam Speaker, the facts are clear: Nancy Pelosi's national energy tax will kill American jobs, it will raise prices on hardworking Americans, and do almost nothing to clean up our environment. But the American people watching today's debate don't need to take my word for it. President Obama and his senior administration officials, and many prominent Democrats, agree that cap-and-trade is actually cap-and-tax.

In January of 2008, President Obama told the San Francisco Chronicle that under his preferred cap-and-trade system electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. Then on February 26, 2009, the President's own budget estimates that the climate revenue generated by this legislation to pay for Washington bureaucrat-run health care and a jobless stimulus package would cost American manufacturers and energy producers $646 billion over 10 years. Three weeks later, the administration's top economic advisers disagreed with this lowball figure, suggesting that cap-and-trade could actually cost up to $1.9 trillion over 10 years.

Next, former Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman, JOHN DINGELL, stated in a hearing on cap-and-trade: ''Nobody in this country realizes that cap-and-trade is a tax, and it's a big one.''

As recently as this week, Congressman GENE GREEN of Texas stated in an op-ed: ''Instituting a cap on nationwide greenhouse emissions will raise the price of energy for consumers and businesses alike.''

Madam Speaker, I'm confused. Why on this Earth would my friends on your side of the aisle create such a big tax on all American families and businesses during a time that a recession is so serious? Why are we rushing to do this with a $1 trillion spending plan that will have such a large impact on the American people, killing jobs and making it more difficult for us to come out of this recession?

On June 15, I received a letter from the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts stating that the current plan to implement mandatory mission caps would weigh far more heavily on Texas than any other region in the country. It goes on to note that ''based on rising fuel prices as a result of the cap-and-trade provisions of this bill, Texas could see 135,000 to 277,000 fewer jobs in 2012, the first year of the bill.''

Madam Speaker, Texas leads this country in jobs, and people are coming to Texas from all over the United States just to have jobs. Why would we go and diminish the opportunities for people to find those jobs that were available to help their families?

Madam Speaker, families all over Texas are already hurting; and with all the other troubles plaguing the economy, they simply cannot afford the additional and completely avoidable economic assault that the new Democrat majority is placing on the American people.

Perhaps worst of all, Madam Speaker, the economic damage created by this legislation actually favors foreign companies over American ones. China, the number one emitter of greenhouse gases, and India, who is set to expand its emissions, will not be required to modify their behavior at all. That means that this new Democrat majority is taking the astonishing position of asking American small businesses and consumers to carry the global load for the world's carbon consumption because, as everyone understands, if only Americans tax their manufacturing and productions, then only Americans will be losing out while China, India and other countries gain an advantage over our domestic manufacturers, businesses, jobs and future.

Every Member of this Chamber understands that in an era of rising energy costs, Congress must and should be doing everything in its power to ensure that domestic production of clean energy is available at the cheapest price. However, I recently received a letter from the American Petroleum Institute expressing concern that this legislation could add as much as 77 cents to each gallon of gasoline.

Very simply, this legislation means that every American business and consumer will pay more to fuel their vehicles, heat their homes, and purchase everyday goods.

The facts are clear: NANCY PELOSI's national energy tax will kill American jobs, will raise prices on hardworking Americans, and do little to clean up our environment.

I encourage a ''no'' vote on this lockdown rule and a ''no'' vote on the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady from California for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

I want to thank Speaker PELOSI, Leader HOYER, Chairman WAXMAN, and my Massachusetts colleague, ED MARKEY, for crafting and shepherding through this tremendously important legislation.

This bill will reduce the release of greenhouse gases into our atmosphere, reduce global warming, and concurrently will spur the creation of millions of clean-energy jobs in the United States.

Specifically, I would like to thank the chairman for including funding for domestic and international adaptation and clean technology transfer. While I supported greater dedication for adaptation funding, this represents a necessary first step in U.S. commitment.

By dedicating a portion of the allowances to international adaptation financing, we can ensure that those poorest of countries who have already been and will continue to be disproportionately impacted by climate change will receive crucial funding to help them save their farmlands, sources of water, and oftentimes their homes.

As a co-Chair of the Congressional Hunger Caucus, I am particularly concerned with the impacts of climate change upon the hungriest in the world. By investing in sustaining agriculture technology and practices, adaptation financing will help in this fight to end hunger.

For many island nations and equatorial countries, the harmful impacts of climate change have already taken their toll. Sea level rise, caused by rising global temperature, has already fundamentally altered the geography of some nations.

Madam Speaker, to echo what Speaker PELOSI has emphasized consistently, there is a moral imperative to be good stewards of this Earth. And as we look toward the negotiations in Copenhagen this December, the world is looking for leadership from the United States for global solutions to this global problem. And by leading the way on clean-energy technology and services to help the poorest nations build resistance to climate change impacts, the U.S. will experience a boon in job creation and innovation. Solutions such as efficient water systems and irrigation technology can create jobs here while solving problems abroad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. MATSUI. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Devoting portions of revenues from a cap-and-trade system to investments in international adaptation to those countries most vulnerable is a clear signal to the world that the U.S. is ready to lead in combating global climate change.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a column by Ken Hackett, the president of Catholic Relief Services, entitled, ''Combat Hunger By Investing in Agricultural Development.''

[From the Des Moines Register, May 29, 2009]

COMBAT HUNGER BY INVESTING IN AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Ken Hackett)

The world is hungry.

The unprecedented global financial crisis is plummeting more people into poverty. Nearly 1 billion worldwide go hungry, according to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization. Our conscience tells us this is morally reprehensible; our intellect reminds us that hunger pangs can breed riots and civil unrest that jeopardize the peace for us all.

This human calamity—with far-reaching consequences—demands that we strategically and smartly retool our thinking on how to tackle the scourge of global hunger.

One place to begin is to increase our investment in all aspects of agricultural development, from seed to market. Despite the fact that the majority of poor people in the developing world live in rural areas and sustain themselves through farming, overall funding for agriculture has been declining for many years.

As clearly shown by the World Bank, agricultural productivity gains and innovation have been particularly low in Africa. This lack of investment has led to stagnating productivity and missed opportunities to take advantage of improved technologies that enable farmers to grow more food, to process it and to sell it for the best price.

A modest investment in agriculture can pay major dividends, boosting the incomes of farm families and helping to lift them out of poverty. In Niger, where I just visited, Fatou Soumana for years sold her unprocessed sesame seeds for a pittance, barely making enough to feed her family. With some help provided by Catholic Relief Services, including training on how to save and invest and classes on how to process sesame seeds, she is now selling a refined oil for use in skincare products that is fetching top dollar.

Fatou has used her profits to buy a cell phone, six sheep and a refrigerator. The refrigerator helps her to store the ice cream she makes and sells on the side. Here is an example of the multiplier effect of this approach: awakening an entrepreneurial spirit.

We need to move toward more holistic approaches to rural development that reflect the needs of the poor themselves and build permanent solutions to end global hunger. These approaches are starting to take root among the world's poorest countries through the efforts of smart development-assistance programs.

The U.S. Government's Millennium Challenge Corp., for example, is investing in every facet of the agricultural value chain. Millennium Challenge grants are training farmers, including women who make up the majority of farmers throughout the developing world; building the roads and bridges they need to get their crops to market; and bolstering a sound policy environment that secures land rights for farmers or expands the financial services agribusinesses need to flourish. Innovative approaches like the sesame project in Niger are rather small, but Millennium Challenge grants can replicate them on a larger scale.

I applaud the Obama administration for the steps it has taken so far in the fight against global hunger and poverty, specifically in its commitment to increased funding for food security and for demonstrating its support of the Millennium Challenge Corp. in the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year. I urge the administration and Congress to continue America's commitment to assisting the world's poor in the face of fiscal stress and competing budget priorities.

To cure the malady of hunger, we must invest today in agriculture's long-term sustainability. We have smart models of development assistance that are working toward this goal for the world's poor. If we are truly committed to ending global hunger, we must deepen our support for the solutions these models are delivering.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of Energy and Commerce from Ennis, Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, this is the most important economic bill before this House in the last 100 years, and we get, under this rule, 3½ hours of debate, equally divided. I can almost say we have debated ceremonial resolutions longer than this bill if this rule passes.

□ 0945

Let me give you just two or three reasons to vote against the rule. Four hundred pages of this bill have never been seen before. They were literally hot off the Xerox machine when they were handed into the Rules Committee at approximately sometime between 2 and 3 a.m. this morning. That's one reason to vote ''no'' on the rule.

Number two, there is a provision in this revised bill on derivatives that the chairman of the Ag Committee and the chairman of the Financial Services Committee have already said needs to be repealed. But they have agreed to let it be a part of today's package with the understanding that it will then be repealed later this summer. That's another reason to vote against the rule.

There are so many new provisions that have never been seen. Provisions that Chairman PETERSON and Chairman WAXMAN negotiated on agriculture have never been the focus of a hearing or even a public debate. It is a debatable proposition whether the provisions that Chairman PETERSON had negotiated have any value at all since the EPA Administrator still retains the ultimate authority under the bill to regulate any man-made greenhouse gas.

This bill needs to be pulled today. And if we vote against the rule, it will be. We need to go back, make sure that these new provisions are vetted in the committees and in public debate and then bring the revised bill to the floor sometime in July or September and have a week of debate on it with numerous amendments.

Two hundred amendments were presented to the Rules Committee last night. One was made in order, one of 224.

This is a bad rule. It is a closed rule. This is a bad bill. It is the economic disaster bill for the United States of America if it were to pass.

The easiest thing to do is vote ''no'' on the rule and then let's do work together to come up with a more reasonable bill sometime this fall.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada, a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and Education and Labor Committee (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Titus-Giffords-Heinrich amendment, which the manager's amendment incorporates into the American Clean Energy and Security Act.

Our amendment will create clean-energy jobs, promote deployment of renewable energy technology, and put the Federal Government in a position to lead by example. Our amendment extends the limit for the Federal Government to 20 years on a contract for the acquisition of electricity generated from a renewable energy resource, often referred to as a power purchase agreement. This provision will encourage wide-scale deployment of renewable energy technology at Federal buildings, BLM land, and Superfund sites. Additionally, it will allow agencies to plan for more sustainable and

affordable energy use over an extended period of time. This small change will open the door to government investments in cleaner, more sustainable, and ultimately more cost-beneficial energy technologies.

Our amendment also establishes a Renewable Electricity Standard for Federal agencies. This RES will ensure that the Federal Government meets 20 percent of its electricity demands through renewable energy by 2020. It will drive demand for new, clean-energy technologies and help create new, clean-energy jobs. Indeed, we will be leading by example.

I'm proud to have joined my fellow members of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, chaired by JAY INSLEE and STEVE ISRAEL, on this provision. I would like to thank Chairman WAXMAN for his assistance on this important amendment.

I too will miss you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's coming down and speaking this morning. There's an estimate that in her congressional district, there will be 5,334 jobs that will be lost in the first year of this bill.

Madam Speaker, at 3 o'clock, 2:30 this morning, we received the manager's amendment, 309 pages, brand new. And this is the text of the ideas that Chairman BARTON was talking about that were completely ignored by the Democrat majority last night in the Rules Committee. The Members had come up to speak plainly about their ideas. Completely ignored. Completely ignored.

At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, this bill sure is an energy bill. This bill will turn out the lights on America.

You know, there was a chance that we were going to have a bipartisan bill. But that chance melted away when the subcommittee failed to mark up a bill and we went right to full committee. We thought we might have a chance on the House floor. And I can remember when Speaker Hastert was in your chair, Madam Speaker, because 4 years ago we had an energy bill on the floor and there were more than 50 amendments that were offered under Chairman DREIER and the Rules Committee, many of them Democratic amendments. We spent a number of days on this. And at the end of the day, both Mr. DINGELL, the former chairman, and JOE BARTON, the then-chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, were able to vote for a bill because, in fact, it was bipartisan.

Yesterday more than 200 amendments were filed up at the Rules Committee, many of them Republican, many of them bipartisan. Mr. HILL, Democrat from Indiana, and I offered a bipartisan amendment on nuclear. Nuclear is one issue that is absent from this bill. Don't ask me why. There are no greenhouse gas emissions from nuclear. It really is a jobs bill. I've got two nuclear plants in my congressional district. When they were both brought online, 85 percent of the components were made in America. Today for a new nuclear plant, 85 percent is going to come from someplace else because we turned the light from green to red on nuclear the last 20, 25 years. Yet no amendment on nuclear in this bill and in this rule.

I woke up this morning and saw my friend and colleague Mr. INSLEE speaking on C–SPAN. He said this bill was going to cost only a postage stamp. I looked at the paper this morning and saw a full-page ad: gasoline costs will only go up 2 cents a gallon.

You know, I hope they're true. But I don't think that those statements are going to be true. We had amendments as a safety valve in case it does go up. The CBO and American Petroleum Institute say that gas prices are going to go up 77 cents a gallon, diesel prices 88 cents a gallon. Some energy costs could go up by 40 to 50 percent. We had amendments that said, hey, if gasoline goes up to 5 bucks a gallon, we're going to take off this cap-and-trade. If electricity prices go up more than 10 percent, we'll take off cap-and-trade. If unemployment reaches 15 percent, and it's almost there already in Michigan, we'll take off those job-killing provisions. Were those amendments allowed? No.

Then we've got the whole issue of India and China, jobs going someplace else. That consumed a couple of hours of debate, I think, in full committee. Yet no amendment at all allowed on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, my folks want to work and pay taxes. Yet they're going to find themselves laid off, and in Michigan a hundred thousand folks this year will run out of benefits. No amendments are allowed to help those folks. Not even a Republican substitute is allowed as part of this rule.

Madam Speaker, your side has an 80-vote margin. I would like to think that at least we could have the same cards to offer positive constructive amendments and debate it on the merits, not on the politics.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my good friend Congresswoman MATSUI from Florida for yielding and say that it is absolutely appropriate that Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI leads off the debate today on behalf of the Rules Committee because she has been one of America's most outspoken advocates for a new, clean-energy economy.

Madam Speaker, the American people's election of President Obama was a call for a change in the direction of the country, especially our energy policy.

America's energy policy is outdated. We rely too much on foreign oil, which has serious economic and strategic risks. We have not invested in renewable energy or in cost-saving technologies as we should. Meanwhile, carbon pollution is changing our climate and destabilizing global markets. Unless carbon pollution is addressed, we face an uncertain future.

But thanks to the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, Chairman WAXMAN, Chairman MARKEY, and many of my colleagues and businesses and citizens all across America, we now have a golden opportunity to act and to modernize energy policy and to bolster science and research.

We are going to pass the American Clean Energy and Security Act, and none too soon. It comes at a critical time for our Nation and right on the heels of the Economic Recovery Act. Together the Clean Energy Act and the recovery plan provide a new foundation for economic recovery, new jobs, and clean-energy manufacturing. We are going to drive the development of new, clean-energy jobs that pay well and cannot be outsourced.

People are fed up with the wild swings in gas prices and tired of watching America's economy rise and fall along with the price of a barrel of oil. So we're going to commit ourselves to a new economic future.

The Clean Energy Act has special significance to my home State of Florida because alone in the continental United States, my State is surrounded on three sides by water. If we do not take action to address carbon pollution, it is possible that much of my State in future decades will no longer be habitable. We must act now.

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

Ms. MATSUI. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague.

Scientists tell us that if carbon pollution is not addressed, the seas could rise and the coasts could move inland. Florida has already seen increasing droughts and saltwater intrusion of our aquifers. What happens if we do not act? Property insurance rates are already out of sight. What if the scientists are right that warmer waters increase the intensity of hurricanes?

So for those that say that it's not time to build on a new energy economy or that environmental changes can be ignored, you are on the wrong side of history. We are going to make good on the promise to future generations of Americans and break our dependence on foreign oil and create the clean-energy jobs that will revitalize America's economy in the coming century.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Florida's coming down. A vote for this bill will lose 3,500 jobs in her congressional district in the year 2012, the first year of its implementation.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Fifth Congressional District of Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, since the Democrats have taken control of Congress, we have seen their idea to increase the deficit tenfold. We've seen their idea to triple the national debt in 10 years. We've seen their ideas to bail out AIG, GM, Fannie and Freddie, and the list goes on. And today's new idea, a new national energy tax costing every American family $1,500 to $3,000 a year, but only if they choose to turn on a light, cook a meal, or drive their children to school.

Don't take my word for it. Listen to the President of the United States, who said that under his plan, electricity rates would ''necessarily skyrocket.'' That's from our President. Estimates are our gas prices will go up about 77 cents a gallon at the pump.

Now, all of this is due to global warming concerns, and, Madam Speaker, these are legitimate concerns. We have a right to be concerned, and man-made activity does contribute. But is this a smart policy? You know, if India and China don't participate, it is for naught. Even our own Federal Government estimates, at best over a course of a hundred years, this may impact global temperatures 2/10 of 1 degree. Frankly, that variance occurs naturally every single year.

Think about the severe job loss, millions and millions of jobs lost due to the competitive disadvantage we have.

There are smarter ways to deal with global warming, but we hear nothing about clean coal from the other side. We hear nothing about nuclear from the other side.

Think about the huge loss of national wealth that could have been used to cure cancer, send a generation to college, help launch millions of small businesses.

Now, Madam Speaker, some call it ''cap-and-trade.'' It will cap American opportunity. It will trade away American jobs. It's time to reject the new national energy tax.

□ 1000

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS).

Ms. GIFFORDS. Thank you, Ms. MATSUI.

I rise today in support of this legislation. I was pleased to join with my Southwestern colleagues DINA TITUS and MARTIN HEINRICH to offer amendments to this bill, which are now part of the manager's amendment.

With strong support from my colleagues and the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, we cracked an amendment which will significantly expand the government's use of electricity from renewable sources, such as solar energy, in a couple of ways.

First, it extends the allowable period of time for which Federal agencies may sign public power agreements from 10 years to 20 years. This will allow renewable power providers to offer lower rates, making renewable power much more cost competitive. This is going to promote the installation of renewable power projects on government buildings and military installations across the country.

In my district, southern Arizona, both Fort Huachuca and Davis-Monthan Air Force Base are looking at installing solar projects. This time expansion from 10 to 20 years, this provision is going to be a significant benefit to these projects and other projects across the country.

Second, the amendment will establish a target of 20 percent renewable electricity for all government agencies by 2020. Similar to the renewable electricity standard for utilities already crafted in this legislation, this provision simply ensures that our Federal Government is doing the same. We are creating a market for renewable power.

As an enormous consumer of energy, particularly the Department of Defense, the Federal Government can have a significant positive impact by modifying its procurement process to support emerging technologies in this way.

This bill, Madam Speaker, is not a perfect bill, but it's an important piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman, the chairman of the Republican Conference, Mr. PENCE.

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, this is a difficult time in the life of our Nation and the life of our Nation's economy and that of families and small businesses and family farms.

Remarkably, today, with an embarrassingly brief amount of debate and discussion and amendment, the Democrat majority is poised to bring to the floor of the Congress what amounts to the largest tax increase in American history under the guise of climate change legislation.

Now, there is a lot of debate about what this bill will cost the average American household from hundreds of dollars to thousands of dollars, but there actually is no debate over the fact that this legislation will cost millions of American jobs. On that point there is no discussion.

The bill, itself, actually includes a fund that would provide resources for Americans who lose their jobs if cap-and-trade becomes law, and there are news reports this morning, although I am yet to confirm them, that there may be new trade restrictions in this legislation, because the expectation, and it is reasonable, is, by raising the cost of energy for every American business, that we will see businesses flee overseas, taking jobs abroad in these difficult economic times. It is extraordinary, to say the least.

But the way that this bill is coming to the floor ought to be disturbing to every American, Republican, Democrat and Independent that's looking in. Last night, at 3:09 a.m., House Democrats filed a 309-page amendment and denied Republican and Democrat amendments to the tune of the 224 that were submitted.

Three hours of debate, one amendment filed at 3:09 in the morning that's 309 pages. And I would ask the Democrat majority and the Speaker respectfully, what's the hurry? What are we hiding here that we can't afford more time for the American people and their elected representatives to examine what's in this bill?

I mean, is there more corporate welfare, more deals for special interests. Were Members that were on the fence placated with special provisions for industries in their districts? We are hurrying to find out, and we have to hurry, because the majority just recently denied us one additional minute of debate.

You know, the term ''Congress,'' Madam Speaker, actually is an ancient term. It means interaction. It means the intercourse between men and women in ideas and philosophies. This is not Congress. I don't know what this is; 3 o'clock in the morning, 300 pages, one amendment is a travesty.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank my colleague.

Madam Speaker, a confident nation acknowledges the challenges it faces. It doesn't ignore them. A confident people, when faced with the challenge, rolls up their sleeves and addresses the problems before them.

Madam Speaker, today, Congress has two questions. The first is will it acknowledge the challenge of global warming that it is real, that it is urgent, and that demands attention now.

And second, will Congress, by this first step of passing this legislation, unleash the power of America to take that step towards American energy independence; to unleash the brilliance of our scientists and engineers to develop alternative and renewable energy; to unleash the competitiveness of our entrepreneurs to bring to market energy-saving devices and to create jobs in America; the frugality and thriftiness of our homeowners and business owners who have buildings to be able to retrofit and make them more energy efficient and save money; the skills of our plumbers, masons, electricians and carpenters to go to work making our buildings more energy independent.

Madam Speaker, every generation faces its challenge, and what we have seen across America is that young people have taken this on, and our question is whether we are going to——

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

Ms. MATSUI. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. The question we face as Congress is simply this: Will we put to

work those young Americans, those scientists, those entrepreneurs, and allow them to make America energy independent?

The questions we face can be solved. We have to give permission and authority for people to act.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I want to give my personal congratulations to Congresswoman TAUSCHER, and I just look for great things out of you. Congratulations.

I rise to speak against this rule. This rule is blatantly unfair to the American people. It is quashed. It is. It has prevented good amendments to be introduced on this floor and to have the proper debate that we should have over something that is extremely important, as this bill is. We have just gotten this, but let me tell what you this bill is, America, Madam Speaker. This bill is going to kill millions of jobs in America. People are going to be put out of work because of this bill.

Now, we hear all the time about global warming. Actually, we have had flatline temperatures globally for the last 8 years. Scientists all over this world say that the idea of human-induced global climate change is one of the greatest hoaxes perpetrated out of the scientific community. It is a hoax. There is no scientific consensus.

But this is going to kill jobs. It's going to raise the cost of food. It's going to raise the cost of medicines. It's going to raise the cost of electricity and gasoline. Every good and service in this country is going to go up, and who is going to be hurt most? The poor, the people on limited income, the retirees, the elderly, the people who can least afford to have their energy taxes raised by, MIT says, over $3,100 per family.

This rule must be defeated. This bill must be defeated. We need to be good stewards of our environment, but this is not it. It's a hoax.

I encourage people to vote against the rule and the bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would like to thank the gentlelady from California, and I would like to express my recognition that this is heavy lifting.

This is for the courageous and the willing who want to see a new vision. I am well aware of the hard task that our friends on the Rules Committee had, so I am voting for the rule, and I come from the energy capital of the world. We are proud to say that. We have obviously lived in the clothing of the energy of this past century and what continues in the century to come.

But I realize it should be a seamless energy policy. I represent the city of Houston, hardworking Americans. And so it's important as we listen to our friends on the other side of the aisle, this is a challenging time. It is a time for heavy lifting, to be able to look at what happened in the past. We realize that under the Bush administration, the increase in what we pay for gasoline went from 2,000-plus to 4,000-plus. We also realize that in this legislation there is a great effort to ensure that the American people are addressed fairly.

So 40 percent of American households will face almost no cost as a result of this bill. Let's get the facts. We know that the CBO score of the bill that had been utilized by our friends on the other side of the aisle is incorrect because the increase on building our energy resources will wind up being $770 per family. But there are issues that we should continue to be focused on, and, therefore, we should look to ensure that no American who may be displaced for any reason, new technology, is not, in essence, overlooked.

There are millions of dollars for green energy job training in this bill. I am looking to offer amendments that focus on making sure that any dip in job positions will be monitored by the Labor Department and, in fact, that resources be available for all Americans.

But what we are trying to do here is to build a new culture and work with what we have, to build the seamless resources that we have across the country and guide the carbons out of the air and make our quality of life better and at the same time give us a new vision for how we handle the energy needs of our Nation.

And so it is important that we recognize that there is a structure to capture that carbon. There is a response to those who are, in essence, impacted. There are credits that are going to be given.

At the same time, I was concerned about the labeling of different buildings, and we are working on language that would ensure that older buildings won't have to participate in the assessment of whether your building is energy efficient. It will be for new construction.

So we are making our way because, in fact, this is a beginning. We will be working with the Senate. We will be working with the President. We will be working on behalf of the American people.

We have to get started. We have to be innovative. We have to claim the 1.7 million jobs that this bill will create. I think America wants us to do that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, could you please advise us how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 9¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation. I am just not sure to which I am more opposed. Americans are watching, as from Iran to North Korea, the forces of darkness are attempting to silence the voices of democracy and freedom.

The irony is, on this day, the democratic process and our Nation's economic freedom are under threat, not by some rogue state but in this very Chamber in which we stand. Good people may disagree on the impact of the merits of this bill, but no one can disagree with the fact that the Speaker and our Rules Committee have silenced the opposition of 224 amendments. Madam Speaker, one, and I repeat, one amendment was actually made in order.

Madam Speaker, I offered an amendment which was, of course, not made in order, that would have allowed a State to opt out of this legislation.

□ 1015

How can we not give them the ability to say that their citizens and their businesses simply cannot afford this Pelosi global warming tax? For some of them, this bill will be an economic death sentence.

And yet, Madam Speaker, this House will not have a chance to vote on this amendment or any of the other 222. They were banned from being debated and voted upon in this, the people's House.

I call upon every Member of this House, oppose and defeat this rule, not just for the sake of the democratic process, but for the sake of our Nation's economy.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule, which includes an amendment I worked to draft with my colleagues, Ms. TITUS of Nevada and Ms. GIFFORDS of Arizona.

This amendment will make sure that the Federal Government leads by example on clean energy. In my district, Kirtland Air Force Base has tried for a number of years to contract with local clean-energy producers to purchase electricity to help power the base, but there are several Federal policies that stand in the way of these kinds of projects.

New Mexico is second in the Nation for solar energy potential, and we have a thriving clean-energy industry in Albuquerque, creating jobs today. So this is a natural partnership.

However, many Federal agencies have discovered that the 10-year limit on Federal power purchase agreements made these kinds of agreements uneconomical for their private sector partners in the solar industry.

Our amendment will extend the length of these contracts to 20 years, allowing more Federal agencies to sign agreements with clean-energy producers. This will put Americans to

work and ensure the Federal Government leads by example in the use of clean energy.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, if I can please ask my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, in an effort to get our time back to an even balance, if she could have one of her speakers up at this time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, the bill today that Chairman WAXMAN has so carefully shepherded to the floor today is a landmark achievement for this body. For the first time as a Nation we are moving towards energy independence, creating millions of new clean jobs, and confronting the threat that global warming poses to the Earth.

As parents, we all struggle to provide our children with a better life. Without the strong action embodied in this bill, the world that we bequeath to our children will be diminished by continued reliance on Middle Eastern oil, by exporting billions of hard-earned American dollars to petro dictatorships, and by a warming Earth.

America has been at her best during her greatest struggles and, as before, her industry and entrepreneurial spirit will prevail. Already, the green technology industry is booming across the country, with new factories built and new companies formed every day.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government itself has not been able to fully utilize renewable energy. Many renewable energy installations have large upfront costs, which then have to be recovered in the form of cheap energy over the course of many years. But the Federal Government has been restricted from signing long-term contracts for energy, so affordable renewable energy has been unavailable to thousands of government offices around the country.

The rule for this bill inserts an important provision that I authored as independent legislation earlier this year and that I worked with many colleagues to include. It loosens the restrictions on energy purchases by the government, and that will spur local green energy development in every State in the Nation.

I hope that we can support this measure, this rule, this bill and fulfill the promise that we have given to our constituents, that we will serve this country not only today and during this Congress, but for the long haul, that we will make not only the easy decisions, but the hard ones.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and the bill. I offered five bipartisan, commonsense amendments to the bill with the support of other Members. Not one of these was made in order.

I offered an amendment to strike the section that mandates national building codes. Because my amendment was rejected, if State and local governments don't comply with these new national mandates, homeowners today who are struggling to make ends meet could be charged $100 a day for not being in compliance. A new tax on American homeowners is the wrong direction.

I had another amendment to strike from this bill the new tax on all transactions cleared via any U.S. regulated derivatives clearing organization. This bill then will have very chilling consequences. It will punish those using U.S.-regulated clearing organizations, discourage the use of central clearing organizations, and reduce transparency and liquidity and encourage legitimate business activities to move to unregulated foreign markets.

Another amendment would revise the Nuclear Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative to set a policy for clean, safe nuclear energy. I oppose this rule and the bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. It's interesting, earlier today someone asked me: How can you vote for this measure, because global warming is a hoax. My answer was: It's very simple. I remove the blinders there that exist with some of my colleagues who think that global warming is a hoax. I remind them that there are zero peer-reviewed scientific studies that say global warming is a hoax.

There are hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific studies that say global warming is real and that man's actions contribute greatly to that increase in temperature.

We are often asked: What is our legacy here? What really matters about what we do? And I'd like to think it's how our children and our grandchildren will react to what we did and what we left behind.

So let's face reality and do what is right for our children and our children's children.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time I would yield a grand total of 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do rise to oppose this rule. Many of my constituents see this as a government regulation of the very air you breathe. They know that this is a liberal's dream, and that indeed many think that the Democrats have become the party of punishment. We are the party of ''no.'' We want people to know what is in this bill.

I offered in committee an amendment that would require disclosure of what this legislation would cost consumers on their electric bills, at the gas pump, and on the products that they buy.

In Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to require every transaction that FERC makes on these allocations and offsets to be listed in a database that is searchable by the public so they will know what is in this. They were voted down.

I encourage all to oppose this rule and this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 5½ minutes. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MATSUI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. If I could, Madam Speaker, is the gentlewoman through with her speakers now? We still have some disparity in the little bit of time that was given. I would like for there to be some parity.

Ms. MATSUI. I have additional speakers coming.

Mr. SESSIONS. If she has additional speakers, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I don't see my speakers present there, so I'm ready to close. I will use my remaining time to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time I yield 1 minute to gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation. I've only been here 6 months, but this is the worst piece of legislation that has come out of the House yet.

It defies logic that at a time of economic recession we would impose a regressive national energy tax that many have predicted will result in a net job loss. Supporters of this legislation only want to talk about the so-called ''green'' jobs that will be created, but they conveniently ignore that some studies indicate that for every one job created, two are eliminated.

Worse, we are creating a costly, confusing program of carbon credits. Let me make one prediction: the only certainty under this bill is Wall Street traders sophisticated enough to understand how these credits are traded will make millions.

I offered an amendment yesterday at the Rules Committee stating that at least bring it to a level playing field between the U.S., China, and India. My feeling is that if Congress is going to pass this legislation, we should require India and China—two enormous and growing resources of greenhouse emissions—to abide by the same standards.

My amendment would have required the U.S. to come to agreement with these two countries on emission reductions before implementing any provision within this bill.

This rule is a sham. It pales in comparison to how awful the bill is. I urge the Members to demand a return to the democratic process and defeat this bill that will certainly exacerbate our economic recession.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this rule. This is a massive energy tax on the backs of the American people all across this country. All estimates show millions of jobs will be lost by this cap-and-trade energy tax.

Every household family will see an increase in their utility bills. And we brought amendments last night to protect American jobs. They ruled every one of those amendments out of order.

We brought amendments to protect American families having their utility bills increased. They ruled every one of those amendments out of order.

What is Speaker PELOSI and this liberal leadership trying to hide from the American people? We should have an open, honest debate on this bill. It's a bad bill and a bad rule. I urge rejection of the rule.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Our country's dependence on foreign oils threatens our economy and security. We need to take bold steps to become energy independent by growing a new energy economy. Comprehensive energy reform will reduce our dependence on foreign oil, making us more secure as a Nation.

The energy bill we consider today will also create clean-energy jobs, inspiring a new economy. As a former utility commissioner, I saw firsthand the positive impact energy reform had on my State of New Mexico. We instituted a renewable energy standard that increased the generation of renewables. We encouraged energy efficiency to reduce costs for homes and businesses. And it's now time to see these steps at a national level.

For too long we have accepted the status quo on energy, and now, with the American Clean Energy and Security Act, we can put America on a path to energy independence, make America the global leader in energy technology, cut costly and harmful pollution, create new jobs, and save billions in the long run.

I support this rule and urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this rule and this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his superb management. The American people are hurting. We know that very, very well. We hear it daily. Jobs are being lost, people are losing their businesses, people are losing their homes. They don't want to see another tax burden imposed on them, which is exactly what this bill is going to do. Everyone recognizes that there is going to be an increase in the burden on the American people.

Unfortunately, as we pursue green technology, we have not been given an opportunity to do that. My friend from Ohio has been very thoughtful on this issue. He had an idea—several ideas that I offered before the committee.

One of the things I believe we should do, Madam Speaker, is allow for the free flow of green technology globally. I'm working with my friend from Ohio in a bipartisan way on that.

Mr. KUCINICH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'd be happy to yield to the gentleman.

□ 1030

Mr. KUCINICH. I believe the choices we are being offered in this bill are insufficient to address the immediate real threat of global warming. We can take market-based approaches that protect the planet, respect nature through incentivizing the mass production and worldwide distribution of American-made wind and solar microtechnologies, lowering our carbon footprint, lowering our energy costs, and rallying the American people to join in a great economic and social cause of creating a green future. We can do that. We can still do that.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time. Let me say that I totally agree with the statement of my friend. Here is a demonstration of bipartisanship. It's not often that Mr. KUCINICH and I work together on the exact same issue. We believe that the free flow of tremendous green technology around the world will, in fact, dramatically improve our economy and the standard of living and quality of life for the American people and for the rest of the world.

Defeat this rule, so that we can bring back some of the 224 brilliant ideas that were offered but totally denied by this majority.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. The rule before us today is a fair rule. It allows us to highlight our current energy policy challenges and a vision for a better tomorrow.

The bill contains expedited procedures for consideration of a joint resolution of approval related to an international reserve allowance program. Such procedures are within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, and it is the committee's understanding that the procedures are placeholder language that will be finalized as the legislation moves forward. The Rules Committee looks forward to working with the other committees of jurisdiction on this provision.

From water, to energy, to transportation, agriculture and public health, climate change is a defining environmental challenge of our time. The action we take today will impact our country in a positive way for generations.

Today, it is this Congress' responsibility to pass comprehensive energy policy that charts a new course towards a clean energy economy. The underlying bill, the American Clean Energy and Security Act, takes huge steps to create jobs, help end our dangerous dependence on foreign oil and fight global warming.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the urgent nature of the challenge before us today. If we do not act, we face disastrous consequences. Nearly every scientific society around the world has warned of the cost of inaction.

On the other hand, if we do act here today, we make our planet more sustainable, more economically viable and more efficient than the world we live in today. We will make a positive impact, not only on the billions of people who live on the Earth today, but for generations into the future.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule. I offered a commonsense amendment to strike the International Climate Change Adaptation program and the allocation of emission allowances to this program. We don't need to establish yet another foreign assistance program that is not only redundant but will actually hurt American manufacturers.

This legislation calls for the U.S. to transfer to developing nations a portion of America's emission allowances so that these nations can continue to pollute. By giving away additional allowances this legislation will put America's manufacturers at an even worse competitive footing than ever before. This is another incentive to encourage American manufacturers to leave this country.

And, this initiative will not reduce emissions. According to an article in yesterday's Washington Times, David Bookbinder, chief climate counsel to the Sierra Club, said, ''emissions could actually stay the same or increase domestically because companies could choose to buy permits instead of investing in technology to make their operations cleaner.'' I ask unanimous consent to insert the full article into the RECORD.

Plus, this Rule prohibits a debate on some other commonsense amendments. My fellow Illinoisan, Representative JUDY BIGGERT, had a responsible amendment to strike the federalization of local building codes and replace it with positive incentives to encourage federal, state, and local governments to move towards green building codes. Even the liberal Washington Post editorialized against this provision in the bill. I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial into the RECORD. This amendment was defeated 3 to 7 in the Rules Committee last night.

The Rule also prohibits a debate on an amendment offered by Representative DAVID ROE of Tennessee to waive this bill until the U.S. reaches an agreement with China and India on greenhouse gas reductions. Again, this sensible amendment was defeated by a vote of 3 to 7 in the Rules Committee last night. This is atrocious. We are only fooling ourselves if we think we're doing something to save the planet when all we're doing is transferring our manufacturing jobs and our pollution problems to China, India, and other developing nations. This bill will not lower global emissions of greenhouse gasses. The Roe

amendment would have prevented this mistake.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the final "cap and tax" bill.

[From the Washington Times, June 25, 2009]

CLIMATE BILL GIVES BILLIONS TO FOREIGN FOLIAGE

(By Amanda DeBard)

If a tree falls in Brazil, it will, in fact, be heard in the U.S.—at least if a little-noticed provision in the pending climate-change bill in Congress becomes law.

As part of the far-reaching climate bill, the House is set to vote Friday on a plan to pay companies billions of dollars not to chop down trees around the world, as a way to reduce global warming.

The provision, called "offsets," has been attacked by both environmentalists and business groups as ineffective and poorly designed. Critics contend it would send scarce federal dollars overseas to plant trees when subsidies are needed at home, while the purported ecological benefits would be difficult to quantify.

The offsets "would be a transfer of wealth overseas," said William Kovacs, vice president for environmental affairs at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the official fiscal scorekeeper on Capitol Hill, has not offered an estimate on how much the offset plan would cost, but the liberal Center for American Progress says it will be pricey.

"The international offsets market is not a huge or cheap market," said Joseph Romm, a climate expert at the center. "By 2020, the U.S. could be spending $4 billion on international offsets."

Supporters of the legislation counter that the plan recognizes the need to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions to curb global warming—in the United States and beyond. Supporting ways to keep trees alive or plant new trees, wherever those trees are located, helps the effort, they say.

Under the program, the government would reward domestic and international companies that perform approved "green" actions with certificates, called permits.

Those companies could, in turn, sell the permits to other companies that emit greenhouse gases. The permits would be, in effect, licenses to pollute—and potentially very valuable.

The heart of the climate plan would require major polluters to purchase the permits if they want to pollute above a certain level, controlling overall emissions through a market that is called "cap-and-trade."

Under the provision to be voted on in the House, the "green" companies could sell their offset permits to companies that need them because they are unable to, reduce their own emissions as fast as the government would like.

But critics from both the political left and right see problems.

"You have to ask yourself, what is the purpose of this provision? Because it won't actually reduce emissions," said David Bookbinder, chief climate counsel to the Sierra Club, the environmental advocacy group.

Mr. Bookbinder said emissions could actually stay the same or increase domestically because companies could choose to buy permits instead of invest in technology to make their operations cleaner.

Kenneth P. Green, a climate specialist at the conservative American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, said keeping track of which projects would be eligible for inclusion is another flaw in the plan.

"Who is responsible if there's a fire that burns down a [green] project? Will those just be wasted offsets?" he asked.

Mr. Green and others say the bill's offset provisions, are too vague and leave unanswered too many questions about which projects will qualify for the offsets and how many offsets would be offered for a given project.

"The key with offsets is ensuring that they generate'credible' emission reductions," said Evan Juska, North America senior policy manager for the Climate Group, which advises governments and business how to move to a low-carbon economy.

Mr. Juska said the bill, as written, "leaves much of it to be determined by the administrator after the program is enacted."

While tree stands are a large absorber of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, they may not be the only projects that qualify for offsets. Companies that erect wind farms, install solar panels, invest in devices that trap the methane gas in landfills, use less fertilizer, or upgrade equipment at their refineries and power plants might also be eligible for offsets.

The bill would only allow 2 billion tons, or about 30 percent, of carbon-dioxide emissions to be offset a year through the so-called "green" actions.

Half of the qualifying projects must be domestic and half must be overseas, but the bill includes the option to award more offsets to international projects if not enough domestic projects are available.

The CBO projects that the thousands of firms subject to the cap-and-trade program would utilize 230 million tons of domestic offsets and 190 million tons of international offsets in 2012, the year the legislation is proposed to take effect, instead of reducing their emissions levels.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 2009]

BURIED CODE

The running joke in Washington is that nobody has read the 900–plus-page energy bill sponsored by Reps. Henry A. Waxman (D–Calif.) and Edward J. Markey (D–Mass.), which the House will consider in coming weeks. What you hear from its backers is that its cap-and-trade provisions would create a market-based program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions—which should mean that a simple, systemwide incentive encourages polluters to make the easiest reductions in greenhouse gases first, keeping the costs of fighting global warming to a minimum. In fact, the bill also contains regulations on everything from light bulb standards to the specs on hot tubs, and it will reshape America's economy in dozens of ways that many don't realize.

Here is just one: The bill would give the federal government power over local building codes. It requires that by 2012 codes must require that new buildings be 30 percent more efficient than they would have been under current regulations. By 2016, that figure rises to 50 percent, with increases scheduled for years after that. With those targets in mind, the bill expects organizations that develop model codes for states and localities to fall in the details, creating a national code. If they don't, the bill commands the Energy Department to draft a national code itself.

States, meanwhile, would have to adopt the national code or one that achieves the same efficiency targets. Those that refuse will see their codes overwritten automatically, and they will be docked federal funds and carbon "allowances"—valuable securities created elsewhere in the bill that give the holder the right to pollute and can be sold. The Energy Department also could enforce its code itself. Among other things, the policy would demonstrate the new leverage of allocation of allowances as a sort of carbon currency—leverage this bill would be giving to Congress to direct state behavior.

According to the bill's advocates, America's buildings account for perhaps 40 percent of U.S. greenhouse emissions, and technology is available for builders to meet the targets in ways that are economical for building owners. Much of the problem is old buildings that waste huge amounts of energy, which wouldn't necessarily be touched by the new code. But it would be good if builders met these efficiency goals with new construction.

Is the best way to achieve that, though, to federalize what has long been a matter of local concern? And if the point of cap-and-trade is to change market incentives, why does Congress, and not the market, need to dictate these changes? Those are a few questions that emerge when you begin to read through the 900 pages.

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today extremely disappointed with the Rule put before us.

Every day I hear the same message from my constituents—stop Washington's addiction to spending. Bailout after bailout, with no change in sight, the small business owners, farmers and hard working families in Missouri have grown weary and frustrated.

Instead of providing our taxpayers much needed relief, we are here today to ask for more of their money. H.R. 2454 is a thinly veiled attempt to address climate change, unsuccessfully I might add, while its actual goal is to direct more taxpayer dollars to the government coffers. The results are unacceptable:

an average tax increase of $3100 for families;

additional regulatory and administrative costs on small businesses;

higher energy expenses for all—especially those in rural areas;

and significant job loss.

When will enough be enough?

I offered two common sense amendments to H.R. 2454—rejected by the Rules Committee—which struck the cap and tax provisions in the underlying bill should the unemployment rate reach 8 percent or higher. I have financially strapped companies in my district, who instead of laying off their employees have chosen to keep them on payroll at reduced hours. These business owners and employees are making serious sacrifices. Should this cap and tax provision be implemented while these companies continue to struggle to survive this economic downturn, their strategic and innovative efforts will become null and void and their employees will join the already overextended unemployment line.

Today I strongly urge my colleagues to stand with me. It is irresponsible of Congress to use taxation as an answer to our challenges. Voting against this rule and the underlying legislation will demonstrate your willingness to work together towards real energy solutions for our future and our children's future.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

President Obama, in commenting on the American Clean Energy and Security Act earlier this week, cited that this legislation "will open the door to a better future for this nation."

I strongly agree with President Obama, but I must also stress our responsibility to ensure all individuals will be provided the opportunity to participate in the new green economy.

That is why I offered the Lee Amendment to this legislation, which would have authorized legislation I have introduced in the House entitled the Metro Economies Green Act, or

MEGA, in order to establish targeted grant programs to support green economic development, job training and creation.

Inclusion of the Lee Amendment to H.R. 2454 would have provided valuable opportunities for those who can benefit from good paying green collar jobs the most—urban youth of color, the unemployed, and those among our neighbors who have just faced incredible hardships in life.

Unfortunately the Lee Amendment was not made in order. However, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the future to expand access to high-paying, career-term green jobs that represent a much needed pathway out of poverty for millions of individuals across this country.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE, AND A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution:

S. CON. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, June 25, 2009 through Sunday, June 28, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 6, 2009, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, June 25, 2009, through Sunday, June 28, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 7, 2009, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

The question is on the concurrent Senate resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of S. Con. Res. 31 will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 587 and adoption of H. Res. 587, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

YEAS—243

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

NAYS—180

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

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman
Culberson
Flake
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Kennedy
Lewis (GA)
McHenry
Sullivan
Sutton

□ 1100

Messrs. SMITH of Texas, ALTMIRE, GERLACH, and Mrs. EMERSON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.