Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—176

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords
Markey
Speier

□ 1329

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. BASS of California, Messrs. BACA, LABRADOR, BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. COURTNEY and MURPHY of Connecticut changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ADERHOLT, DUNCAN of Tennessee, BILBRAY, LoBIONDO, BARTLETT, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. CARDOZA, HELLER, JONES, BARLETTA, CRAVAACK, ROGERS of Alabama, RAHALL, BUCSHON, BILIRAKIS, GRIMM, FRELINGHUYSEN and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia). Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a) and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. SHIMKUS, Illinois.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 92 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1330

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 223, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 263, line 9.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 95 by Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 237 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 97 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 153 by Mr. MICHAUD of Maine.

Amendment No. 368 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 260 by Mr. LATTA of Ohio.

Amendment No. 125, as modified, by Mr. WEINER of New York.

Amendment No. 110 by Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 192 by Mrs. BIGGERT of Illinois.

Amendment No. 395 by Mr. INSLEE of Washington.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. TONKO of New York.

Amendment No. 259 by Mr. LATTA of Ohio.

Amendment No. 98 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 223 by Mr. PASCRELL of New Jersey.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 198, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

AYES—233

Ackerman
Adams
Altmire
Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Flores
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Hall
Hanabusa
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kind
King (NY)
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McKinley
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter

Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Ribble
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Sires
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Towns
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder

NOES—198

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brooks
Bucshon
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Cantor
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costello
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Davis (KY)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Emerson
Engel
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchey
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pence
Peters
Pitts
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Stutzman
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Visclosky
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Watt

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1349

Messrs. ENGEL and GRIMM changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas, ELLISON, Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 135, noes 294, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

AYES—135

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Goodlatte
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hurt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Mack
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Posey
Quigley
Rahall
Rehberg
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Upton
Visclosky
Waters
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—294

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hirono
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Cummings
Giffords
Latham
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1353

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 47, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 47, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

AMENDMENT NO. 237 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 299, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

AYES—133

Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NOES—299

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1358

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 296, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

AYES—136

Ackerman
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hanna
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Richardson
Richmond
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Velázquez
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—296

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Webster
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1402

Messrs. GARAMENDI, NEAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. MICHAUD

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 305, noes 127, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

AYES—305

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ross (AR)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—127

Adams
Amash
Bachmann
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Cravaack
Culberson
Davis (IL)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Flake
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gonzalez
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hall
Hartzler
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Huelskamp
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meehan
Moran
Napolitano
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Pence
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Schakowsky
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Smith (NE)

Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
West
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1407

Messrs. GOSAR, COLE, and HERGER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas and WU changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 368 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 262, noes 169, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—262

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—169

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Luján
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McIntyre
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schiff
Schilling
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Bishop (UT)
Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1410

Mr. LEWIS of California changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 260 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 247, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—184

Adams
Akin
Altmire
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cuellar
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts

Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rangel
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuler
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—247

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harman
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—2

Bishop (UT)
Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1413

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 125, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 203, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

AYES—228

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—203

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Benishek
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McKinley
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
West

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Bishop (UT)
Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1418

Messrs. KEATING, GRIFFIN of Arkansas and CANSECO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 259, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—171

Adams
Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—259

Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1422

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 192 OFFERED BY MRS. BIGGERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 262, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

AYES—170

Adams
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Holt
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Ribble
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—262

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunnelee
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1424

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 395 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 273, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—159

Andrews
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rogers (MI)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—273

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—1

Giffords

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1428

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 223, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—208

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

NOES—223

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

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
Miller (NC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1431

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 259 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 293, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

AYES—137

Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Paul
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—293

Ackerman
Adams
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell

Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Denham
Giffords
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1434

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 301, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

AYES—130

Amash
Baldwin
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
DeFazio
DeGette
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Filner
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Garrett
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Richardson
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shuler
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Upton
Velázquez
Westmoreland
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—301

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
Roybal-Allard

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1438

Mr. NADLER and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PASTOR of Arizona and LYNCH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 223 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 318, noes 113, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—318

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—113

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bilbray
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Huelskamp
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Labrador
Lamborn
Latta
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Markey
McClintock
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tipton
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
Herger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1442

Messrs. GARDNER and RIGELL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this deeply flawed Republican funding resolution.

The bill is a reckless and sweeping attack on the public health and environmental protections that keep our air safe to breathe and our water safe to drink.

One of the most egregious assaults on public health and the environment in the legislation is section 1746. This provision guts the Clean Air Act and bars the Environmental Protection Agency from addressing the grave threat to public health and the environment posed by carbon pollution, and it does so while destroying thousands of jobs.

The science is clear and the evidence is overwhelming. According to the National Academy of Sciences and the premier scientific organizations of all the world's major economies, carbon pollution is changing the climate and endangering the environment. But section 1746 prohibits EPA from taking commonsense, reasonable measures to address this threat.

The Clean Air Act currently requires that new source plants, new power plants, new oil refineries, and other major new sources of carbon emissions take steps to reduce their carbon emissions. This requirement makes sense because it is easier for facilities to plan for emission reductions before construction than to install retrofits afterwards. EPA says sources should be able to comply just by being energy efficient. Section 1746 would prevent EPA from implementing this commonsense requirement.

EPA has also indicated it plans to set minimum Federal standards for the two largest sources of carbon pollution: power plants and oil refineries. This section would prevent EPA from even proposing these standards.

Instead of gutting the Clean Air Act, the top priority for this Congress should be getting Americans back to work, but section 1746 does exactly the opposite. It imposes a de facto construction ban on many areas of the country. The Clean Air Act requires the largest new or expanding facilities to obtain carbon pollution permits before they begin construction. The Republican bill doesn't change this legal requirement to have a permit, but it does prevent EPA from actually issuing the needed permits. This affects every jurisdiction where EPA issues permits.

This construction ban would apply to all or part of 13 States, including my own State of California. It would block dozens of major projects, including power plants, refineries, cement kilns, and large manufacturing plants. The result would be the loss of thousands of construction jobs and permanent jobs at these facilities.

Members have different views about how to reduce carbon pollution, but we should all agree that a multi-State construction ban is a terrible idea.

The Republican bill has other damaging impacts. The bill blocks requirements to reduce carbon pollution emissions that Congress established in the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments and expanded a few years ago. The bill even blocks successful voluntary programs that partner with industry like Energy Star, and it blocks the renewable fuel standard that Congress established 4 years ago which aims to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

This is a sweeping, reckless, and irresponsible bill. I urge all my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word to enter into a colloquy with Mr. DENHAM of California.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I originally planned on offering an amendment to cut the General Services Administration's budget to force it to sell unneeded Federal properties. My purpose was to get GSA's attention and compel it to stop wasting billions of dollars on Federal buildings we no longer need or barely use. However, through this colloquy, I hope our committees can make a commitment to work together and accomplish this same goal.

Just last week, I held my subcommittee's first hearing in a freezing cold, vacant Federal building on Pennsylvania Avenue. The building sits on one of the most famous streets in America, within walking distance of the U.S. Capitol and the White House. Yet it has been empty for over a decade and loses over $6 million in taxpayer money each year. I am sad to say there are buildings like this across the entire Nation. According to GAO, Federal agencies reported over 45,000 underutilized buildings that cost $1.66 billion annually to operate and maintain.

□ 1450

At GSA's current rate of disposal, it will take over 800 years to get rid of excess and surplus properties.

Our Nation is facing financial distress, and this wasteful spending must stop. GSA needs to get serious about selling wasteful properties. To date, GSA has failed to provide my office with detailed information about the Federal Government's inventory of properties. Congress needs to see the list of properties so we can hold GSA's feet to the fire, sell wasteful properties and save taxpayer money.

Madam Chairman, I would greatly appreciate your commitment to work with our committee on the following items:

To compel GSA to provide detailed property lists of unneeded or money-losing properties to our committees, as well as an inclusive list of the entire asset inventory under its jurisdiction;

Second, to compel GSA to greatly increase the number of properties it sells or redevelops;

And, third, to work with the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on a legislative initiative to consolidate Federal employees into fewer Federal buildings.

Mrs. EMERSON. Let me thank the gentleman for calling attention to these important issues and offering to work with our subcommittee on your three initiatives. The Appropriations Committee shares your deep concerns about the number of wasteful properties in the government inventory, and I commit to working with you on the three items you mentioned so we can together save taxpayer money.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 1701. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources'' shall be $927,523,000: *Provided,* That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$927,523,000'' for ''$959,571,000'' the second place it appears.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 263, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 263, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I have talked to the leadership of the committee, and I think that this amendment is agreeable to them, and I don't think there is going to be a great deal of opposition to it.

What I want to do is I want to send a message to the Bureau of Land Management. This amendment only cuts about $2 million from the Bureau of Land Management's Management of Lands and Resources Account, and I know that is not much when you are talking about a $1.65 trillion deficit this year. But the problem I am addressing is the Wild Horse and Burro Management Program that they have. This program was started I believe in 1971, and since then the Secretary of the Interior has been charged with managing these mustangs that live on public lands out West primarily.

By any stretch of the imagination, this program may have been successful to a degree, but it is very, very costly. The cost has gone from $20.4 million in fiscal year 2000 to $64 million in 2010, and the President has asked for $75.7 million in this coming fiscal year. As far back as 2008, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office has warned that the cost of this program will get completely out of control unless we deal with it in an efficient way, and this has not happened.

What is going on right now is they are taking these mustangs and they are transporting them from their habitat where they live now as far as 1,000 miles. They are putting them in holding pens. They just recently rounded up I believe about 10,000 of these wild horses. They ship them to a holding pen halfway from, let's say, Nevada to Oklahoma, and then they transfer them the rest of the way, about 1,000 miles. It costs about $2,500 per horse to keep them in these pens, and there are other ways to handle this problem. So the Bureau of Land Management really needs to get on with the problem of dealing with these wild animals in a very efficient and humane way, and they are not doing that.

I have talked to the people over at the Bureau of Land Management, told them we were going to bring this up, and that it was very, very important that they come up with a program that is a responsible way to deal with these animals and do it in a humane way.

Now, they are talking about, in addition to corralling them, to killing many thousands of these horses through euthanasia, and a lot of people in this country, the Humane Society and animal lovers, think this is a very inhumane way to deal with this problem. The Bureau of Land Management needs to talk to people who are interested in this issue and come to a conclusion that is acceptable to people all across this country that believe in the mustangs that are out West.

So, as I said, my amendment only cuts $2 million. It is just a drop in the bucket when you are talking about this overall cost problem we are facing. But it is one that I hope will send a very strong message to the Bureau of Land Management, to treat mustangs in a humane way and to solve this problem in a way that is acceptable to the Congress of the United States and the people of this country across America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, we agree that there is a major problem

with the wild horse and burro policy. It is too expensive and problematic for multiple uses on public lands and conserving western rangelands. I would like to work with Mr. BURTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. BISHOP on this problem. The true problem is the law, not the funding of the law.

In recognition of the problems that Mr. BURTON raises, we will accept this amendment, but first I would like to make some important points about the wild horse and burro program.

The wild horse population is not native to North America and can double every 4 years. If horses aren't removed from the range, it can cause degradation and reduced foliage for wildlife and livestock. If this program isn't appropriately funded and horses aren't removed from the range, wild horses will continue to reproduce, over-graze and eventually have a population crash, which means starving horses.

I would also point out that it is already illegal to slaughter wild horses or burros, and the BLM spends no funds on slaughtering wild horses or burros. But I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana pointing out the problem, and I would like to work with him to find a reasonable solution to this that doesn't cost the kind of money that it currently costs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, we are going to hear some opposition to the intent of this legislation, so let me share some thoughts about it.

Despite so much public support for allowing wild horses to remain wild, despite multiple scientific studies of their management that exposed poor analysis, fiscal waste, and no use of preventative methods, the BLM continues to use helicopters to round up and remove horses from the range and place them in long-term holding facilities. There are about 40,600 horses in these pens currently.

The most recently completed fiscal year holding costs accounted for $37 million out of a total wild horse and burro budget of $64 million. The average lifespan of a wild horse in captivity is about 30 years. Holding and maintaining one wild horse in these long-term facilities costs about $500 a year.

Last year, BLM received a 30 percent increase in their budget. Instead of using that to fix this broken wild horse management problem, they permanently removed another 10,000 wild horses and burros and put them into tax funded long-term holding pens.

BLM's approach has been enormously wasteful and misguided. Instead of capturing wild horses and holding them in pens for life, BLM should have already fully implemented a less costly, preventative, and more humane option, that of controlling herd size through contraception.

According to a study by the U.S. Geological Survey, the BLM could save up to $8 million a year with the implementation of herd reduction through birth control. It plans to use birth control for approximately 1,000 horses this year but will still round up and remove nearly 10,000 others they feel are ''excessive,'' in their words. At the same time, we have private citizens who are willing to use their own money to form public-private partnerships that will preserve these horses in the wild, promote economic activity, and reduce the cost to the Federal Government.

Instead of embracing these opportunities, such as Mrs. Pickens' generous plan, BLM has relied on procedural arguments to block such initiatives and maintain the status quo. That is why this amendment is important.

As we expanded into the West two centuries ago, we found millions of wild horses thriving on the American prairies and high deserts. They became part of our American heritage, helping us reach the West and develop and thrive as a nation. They have been our companions and our inspiration, but we have already destroyed too many of them.

The small herds that still run free symbolize our growth as a great nation. That is why Congress declared them protected in 1971. We said that they are entitled to the greatest protection possible, as they were fast disappearing from the American landscape. But rather than maintaining them in their natural state and allowing them to be free, we captured them, often causing harm and even death, and we contained them in these long-term holding facilities.

□ 1500

We had millions of wild horses at one time, now reduced to only 30,000 still living on the range. We have more in captivity than we have on the range. The fact is, it's time for the Bureau of Land Management to wake up, take this issue seriously, work with all the stakeholders to fix an unsustainable situation.

Mr. BURTON's amendment is intended to make this point abundantly clear to the Bureau of Land Management, and that's why we accept this amendment.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, I rise to correct some of the statements that were just made. In my home State of Wyoming, we have more than 30,000 wild horses. The wild horses have no natural predators. And I have ridden BLM wild horses. My sister adopted two of them. I've ridden them. We've used them on our ranch, and I know whereof I speak.

Wild horses overgrazing our fragile ecosystems in the West on lands that were not conducive to the type of grazing that occurs when a hoofed animal that does not have a split hoof is grazing causes the soil to be tamped down. Horses are a solid-hoofed animal. When they run, they tamp the soil. When we have our sparse rains, it runs off, thereby causing soil erosion and causing difficult grazing situations.

The natural grazers on that land for millennia were split-hoofed animals such as elk and bison, and that is why sheep and cattle are more conducive to protecting the grazing of that sparse fragile resource than a solid-hoofed animal. When you put too many solid-hoofed animals tamping down that fragile grass with a very shallow reservoir of top soil, you cause overgrazing and you are loving horses in a way that causes the fragile grass ecosystem to the Western States to die.

It is this Congress that has caused the problems by saying that we cannot slaughter horses. Yet we're not supposed to keep them in pens. We're supposed to allow them to overgraze the West.

When the gentle people east of the Mississippi will take these excess horses into their backyards, I will support this amendment. Until then, I oppose efforts by those well-meaning people that measure animal unit months by the acre and we measure acres by the animal unit month.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise to discuss section 1746, which would eliminate EPA funding from going to implementation of the Clean Air Act.

Over the past 40 years, the bipartisan Clean Air Act has saved hundreds of thousands of lives and improved the health of Americans in every State. It protects the air we breathe. It protects our children from developing asthma and our seniors from developing emphysema. According to the American Lung Association, in 2010 alone the Clean Air Act saved over 160,000 lives. Even since 1990, the EPA estimates the Clean Air Act prevented an estimated 843,000 asthma attacks, 18 million cases of respiratory illness amongst children, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 21,000 cases of heart disease, and 200,000 premature deaths.

And yet in the irresponsible Republican spending bill, there's an attempt to eliminate all funding from the implementation of the Clean Air Act. It is clear that the Republican majority is doing all it can to stop EPA from carrying out its mission of protecting public health and protecting our environment.

Many will claim that the EPA is moving at a faster pace than any other administration in history. However, the EPA has proposed fewer Clean Air

Act rules under President Obama over the past 21 months than in the first 2 years of either President Bush or President Clinton. That is why in December of 2010, 280 groups, including the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, and others, sent a letter urging the Congress to ''reject any measure that would block or delay the United States Environmental Protection Agency from doing its job to protect all Americans from life-threatening air pollution.''

The irresponsible Republican spending bill is not the place to legislate these types of changes. These policy changes should not be made during this sort of process. The Clean Air Act is promoting innovation and breaking American oil dependence, but Republicans would give big polluters a loophole to roll back our clean energy process and continue our addiction to foreign oil.

The Clean Air Act is good for our economy. Many studies have shown the Clean Air Act's economic benefits to far exceed any costs associated with the law by as much as a 40-to-1 ratio. As President Obama so eloquently spoke of during his State of the Union address, we must out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build our global competitors and win the future. Rolling back a law that protects the air our children breathe to allow oil companies—companies that are already reaping record profits—the ability to spew chemicals, smog, soot, and pollution into the air just to please a lobbyist or a Big Oil corporation is irresponsible and extreme.

The Clean Air Act has been on the books for decades, with positive results for our economy, our environment, and our businesses. Rolling back these protections will only hurt our most vulnerable. We simply cannot afford to go backward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1702. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Construction'' shall be $2,590,000: *Provided*, That no less than $1,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 556 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 263, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,590,000)''.

On page 264, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,750,000)''.

On page 264, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,737,000)''.

On page 264, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,055,000)''.

On page 267, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $171,713,000)''.

On page 268, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $14,100,000)''.

On page 278, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,100,000)''.

SEC. None of the funds made available by this. Act may be used for the Land and

On page 359, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increases by $239,045,000)''.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment in the form at the desk.

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, I object to the modification.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, whenever a family is running behind on its obligations, the family begins to stop its investments and its purchases.

Madam Chair, I would draw the attention of our body to the chart in front of me. We're spending $3.5 trillion a year, and we bring in $2.2 trillion a year. That means that we have $1.3 trillion a year in deficit that goes into our debt barrel. Currently, our debt is around $15 trillion a year. That's on top of the $89 trillion unobligated funds that we have to pay in the future for Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

Madam Chair, it is time for us to live within our means as a Nation. So my amendment simply strikes the ability for BLM to purchase new land and buildings. It removes $15 million from fish and wildlife for land acquisitions.

□ 1510

It removes $14-plus million from national parks for land acquisitions. It removes $9 million from the Forest Service for land acquisitions. It removes $2.5 million from the OMB for new construction. It removes $23 million from the Fish and Wildlife Service for construction funds, and it removes $171 million from the National Park Service for construction funds.

As we look at the picture here of us as a Nation—and we are seeing that literally we are in the process of wrecking our economy, the same as a family would be wrecking its economy—it is time for us to not stop the purchases of land, but to simply put them off to a future time when we can get our economic house in order. We are not talking about stopping these programs forever, just for the rest of this fiscal year.

It is not the time for us to be spending money in this way. Our future is at risk. We are having to look at cutting significant funds from programs that matter. We are running a $1.3 trillion deficit this year. The President says in next year's budget he wants to run a $1.6 trillion deficit. CBO and OMB both have a chart here that shows our economy as simply discontinuous in the 2030 range.

When we are talking about the fiscal instability of our economy, when we are talking about this picture for our ability to pay our debts, when we are talking about this picture for the Nation, then it only makes sense for us to look and to prioritize our funding and to prioritize our expenditures the same way any family would.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Idaho continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment does not merely propose to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill, but also proposes language other than those amounts.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, in addition to its being a point of order, I think it should be noted that what we are talking about, nature and culture visitation, are huge industries, responsible for more than 3 million jobs.

The Park Service has a backlog in deferred maintenance of at least $6 billion. We can't be cutting construction. In fact, these funds enhance national parks, wildlife refuges, public lands, and create thousands of new jobs.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. MORAN. I would support, though, the motion that this is out of order and trust that it will be ruled as such.

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

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must propose only to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico proposes also another kind of change in the bill, namely, a new limitation on funds in the bill, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Chair, there is bipartisan

agreement that Congress needs to create jobs, grow our economy, and live within our means. The bill before us today, though, goes too far, with irresponsible and arbitrary cuts that will threaten the economy and cost us more than 800,000 private and public sector jobs. Included in today's bill is reckless language that will cost thousands of jobs in coastal communities in my district and in Oregon by destroying the recreational and commercial salmon fisheries.

Over the years, my district has been hit hard by politically motivated water management decisions that have resulted in dramatic declines in salmon stock. For example, in the Central Valley, we witnessed a peak of 768,000 fall-run salmon in 2002, followed by a collapse to a historic low of only 39,500 fish in 2009. These declines have led to an estimated $1.4 billion in lost economic activity in 2008, 2009 and 23,000 lost jobs.

In these 2 years, the commercial fishery was completely shut down. Last year, only 14,500 salmon were caught by the California salmon fishery, which is about 20 percent as many as were caught during the 2006 disaster. This only exacerbates the economic crisis facing fishing families in communities in my district. These fishing families have been put out of work in my district and up through and into Oregon. Some have lost their homes, their savings, and their livelihoods.

Water management decisions in the collapsing bay-delta ecosystem need to be based on science, not politics. In 2002, the science on minimum flows in the Klamath River was ignored, resulting in the death of some 80,000 salmon and the loss of countless fishing community jobs. Today's bill does the same thing by waiving Federal protections, which put at risk fishing industry jobs. By de-funding the biological opinions, this bill also threatens water supplies for southern California farmers and cities by placing the burden to comply with the California Endangered Species Act solely on the State Water Project.

We know that with the right tools and careful water management we can meet our water needs in a cost-effective way and restore salmon runs and coastal economies. We need to continue the ongoing negotiations aimed at reaching balanced solutions for California's water challenges. This bill undermines that effort.

For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this reckless piece of legislation that hurts jobs, hurts the economy, and hurts my district.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I am troubled to be on the floor this afternoon.

Americans still are facing staggering unemployment rates, and our economy has not yet fully recovered; but instead of talking about the many ways we can generate jobs, especially clean-energy jobs that can't be shipped overseas and about ways to improve the health of American families, we have an extreme piece of legislation before us.

Americans all agree that fiscal discipline is a must, but special interests giveaways and legislative earmarks to protect big polluters won't balance our checkbook. Putting health protection on the chopping block means dirtier air, dirtier water, and more children's lives at risk. One of the most egregious legislative earmarks in the bill would block the EPA from doing its job, which is to protect our health from air pollution.

Madam Chair, not allowing the EPA to address carbon pollution under the Clean Air Act is flat-out dangerous. Climate change is a serious problem. The scientific evidence is clear. The debate is over. Climate change is real. It is happening—and human beings are largely to blame.

2010 was the hottest year on record. In the last decade, the Earth experienced nine of the 10 hottest years since data has been recorded. We are also starting to see the irreversible damage to our economy and to our environment. Sea levels are rising. Acidification is happening in our oceans. The world is witnessing increased rainfall, floods, droughts, and wildfires; and our fresh water supplies and capacity to grow enough food will be severely challenged in the years ahead.

Madam Chair, the longer we delay taking action to address climate change, the more difficult and expensive the solutions will be. That is why the EPA is taking a cautious, flexible, and balanced approach to addressing carbon pollution. Each of the steps it has taken so far has followed the letter of the law. For four decades, the Clean Air Act has protected the health of millions of Americans, including our children, our seniors and the most vulnerable among us, from all kinds of dangerous air pollutants. The law also has a tremendous track record in providing certainty to businesses and delivering economic benefits.

Since the Clean Air Act was enacted, overall, air pollution has dropped while the U.S. GDP has risen 207 percent. We have also seen major health benefits, including asthma reduction, lower lung cancer rates, and much greater productivity. In fact, by 2020, the benefits of the Clean Air Act are expected to reach $2 trillion, exceeding any cost by more than 30 to 1.

All of these benefits, Madam Chair, are jeopardized by this dangerous rollback of the Clean Air Act included in the Republican omnibus spending bill.

□ 1520

And that's why groups, many groups ranging from the American Lung Association to the American Sustainable Business Council, have decried the harm of this proposal to people's health and our economy. And it's why I stand with them today in opposing the extreme earmarks to gut the Clean Air Act. This sweeping proposal has many impacts. It would block new construction. It tampers with the clean car agreement between the automakers, the States, and the Obama administration. And it would stop the renewable fuels standard in its track.

Madam Chair, our constituents want us to create jobs and to stand up for the health of our families. They don't want us to stand with the big polluters. This attack just doesn't make sense.

Last month, President Obama stood on the House floor and talked about ''winning the future'' through innovation, and he used clean energy as his central example. We know that clean energy will put Americans to work. It will help our economy grow, and it will help America compete in a global marketplace. Let's create jobs by investing in cleaner forms of energy. Let's not obstruct the EPA from doing its job of protecting the public's health and environment.

These are crucial issues, Madam Chair, for the public and the planet. It's our duty here in this place to ensure both are protected from harmful carbon pollution. Unfortunately, this extreme legislation does not meet this crucial test. Congress should be investing in America's future, not moving backwards.

So I urge my colleagues to say ''no'' to this irresponsible omnibus with all of its reckless spending cuts.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chairman, this spending bill is simply unacceptable on many levels. This is a bill drafted for a sound bite, not sound policy for the American people. Handcuffing the EPA is proof of that fact, and I have and will continue to oppose those attempts and propose amendments where possible.

This CR arbitrarily kills jobs, hurts the public health, and is a slap in the face to protecting our environment and clean air. This CR will set our country back decades by curtailing scientific research simply because Republicans don't like what the science says. Worse yet, it puts our children's health at risk by handcuffing the EPA's ability to simply police polluters. The American public needs real solutions and thoughtful policies, not sound bytes.

This bill is a backhanded way of achieving a policy objective. Just because the Republican Party doesn't like what the overwhelming science is telling us and they've stopped time and time again any meaningful reform, now they're attempting to legislate in a spending bill.

This bill simply continues the false logic often employed by Republicans: underfund an agency, then complain about its ineffectiveness, then call for

further cuts because the program didn't have the funds to work in the first place.

Madam Chairman, the EPA is working hard to protect us from pollution in a responsible way that spurs the economy. This CR prohibits any funding from being used to carry out the EPA's power plant pollution safeguards, the rules that target the largest power plants and prevent them from polluting our air.

The rules also spur economic growth. A recent study by MIT found that nearly 1.5 million jobs could be created by simply letting the EPA ensure that over time power companies move towards cleaner power plants. That's 1.5 million jobs cut by this CR. Furthermore, this provision only harms an industry by giving it increased uncertainty and not allowing them to plan for the future. In some cases, it might even lock up permits from going to companies that are a normal part of business. We don't need sound bites; we need sound policy.

The Clean Air Act guards the most vulnerable Americans, those with asthma and other lung disease, children, older adults, people with heart disease and diabetes, from the danger, the real danger of airborne pollutants, including threats from mercury, carbon dioxide and methane. Each year, the act prevents tens of thousands of ill health effects, including preventing asthma attacks, heart attacks and, yes, preventing premature death. This year alone, the Clean Air Act will save more than 160,000 lives, according to estimates by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Forty years of evidence shows that these health benefits come not only without harm to the economy but with benefits to the economy. Since 1970, the Clean Air Act has cut emissions by 60 percent. At the same time, the economy has grown by more than 200 percent.

Madam Chair, I implore the majority party to stop making grand gestures attempting to bully the EPA. Let it do its job of protecting your family and my family from dangerous pollution. Let it do its job to keep our air and our water clean.

This CR is a polluter's dream and a public health nightmare. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chair, we all recognize the need for us to reduce the deficit and curtail unreasonable spending, but this continuing resolution obviously goes far too in the extreme direction of harming our economy and harming many of the services that our citizens have come to rely on to finish and bring their lives together, whether they're working, whether they need health care, whether their children need education, and this resolution is harmful for that.

But I want to speak for the moment on section 1475, which is a rider that is added to this legislation that will harm the California economy, harm our ability to plan into the future for the use of water.

We have a water system in California that's dramatically oversubscribed, and we're in the process now of bringing that together to make sure that we can meet the future economic needs of our State and also the needs of the various sectors of that economy, whether they be the fishing sector, they be the energy producing sector, the farming sector or the settlement of our cities.

But with this rider—this rider, first of all, throws out 18 years of litigation successfully brought to an end, a long conflict on the San Joaquin River to provide for that settlement, a settlement that is agreed to by almost everyone. But more importantly, for the sake of the long-term water using, this amendment defunds the biological opinions that were going forward that are the cornerstone to provide for the final elements of the plan to provide California and the apportionment of that water for the protection of the fisheries and the economies in northern California, for the protection in the water supplies of the Central Valley's economy and the needs of the great urban areas of southern California. That planning must be completed.

This is as close as we've come. After decades and decades of water wars in the State of California, we finally have the opportunity now to bring the various parties together from all geographic regions, from all sectors of the economy, and plan the future of our State so that we will have the water that is necessary to secure our economy, to secure our families, to secure our agricultural areas of the State, and to provide for the great ecology of the State of California.

We've gone through some disasters, if you will, because of the droughts, because of water cycles, and my colleague from further north in the State, MIKE THOMPSON, laid out this. We saw thousands of jobs lost, the fisheries decimated because of political water decisions that were made over the last several years that decimated the salmon run, not only affecting just the San Francisco Bay delta but affecting the coastal regions of our State and the coastal regions of Oregon and Washington.

These are important fisheries. This is an important part of our economy. It's a renewable part of our economy if we take care of it, but if we have mindless riders that are put onto legislation like the one provided in section 1475, it will bring an end to these negotiations.

It's taken a long time to get the water parties from the south, the water parties from industry, the water parties from agriculture, from the environmental community and the government, the Federal Government and State government together. They are sitting at that table and they're working it through.

Just in the last couple of days, we see the delta planning organization put forth its first document to say what the requirements will be for the conservation habitat plan that all of these elements from north and south California working on. This amendment simply kicks that negotiating table over. It drives the parties away from the negotiation, and California goes back into water uncertainty, economic uncertainty, ecological uncertainty that our State cannot continue to have if we're going to grow our economy, if we're going to come out of this recession.

So I would hope that on passage the Members would vote against this continuing resolution, understanding the kind of damage that these kinds of riders that were inserted in the middle of the night on behalf of a few special interests have the opportunity to really destroy, destroy bipartisan geographical negotiations that are the most promising in the last 40 years in the history of our State.

The opposition from so many of the water users across the State, no matter where they reside, to this rider is well-known, to the fishing community, to so many parts of our economy in the San Joaquin-Sacramento Bay delta, and to the future of our ability to get a handle on these water issues that have plagued us for so many years in California. I would hope that we would reject this provision of this legislation.

□ 1530

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Chair, we all believe in economic growth and job creation and environmental stability, but this resolution goes in the wrong direction and affects my State and district adversely.

Madam Chair, water in California is never a dull subject. As we try to repair the delta and prepare our water system for the generations to come, it is imperative that we make progress and not take steps backwards. That means achieving a healthy delta and finding a way for water users throughout California to receive their water without harming the delta. The amendments to the continuing resolution that defund and cut funding from the San Joaquin River Restoration, the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, and the implementation of the biological opinion of the delta smelt and salmon are steps backwards.

The balance that we have been trying to achieve in California is a negotiation that must not be thrown off balance. Decades of work toward a more certain future for California water is only attainable when everyone works toward a solution rather than throw up

roadblocks that cost us precious time. That work started during the Bush administration and continues to this day. I urge you to oppose the language in the continuing resolution and allow the work by key stakeholders in California to continue.

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

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

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chair, I rise today to oppose section 1746 of H.R. 1 and to urge defeat of this bill.

In my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, and in communities all across the United States, a provision of H.R. 1, section 1746, will effectively ban new construction on power plants, refineries, and manufacturing facilities. By freezing the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to issue a mission-based construction permit, H.R. 1 would halt dozens of ongoing projects in communities like Louisville. Under this provision, thousands of jobs in construction, contracting, and manufacturing could be lost. In Louisville alone, plans to improve Ford's Kentucky truck plant could be derailed, jeopardizing the jobs of thousands of hardworking Kentuckians.

I know what you're thinking, what I'm saying can't possibly be true. But it is. You're thinking, this must be an unintended consequence of section 1746 or perhaps an error in drafting, but it's not. Apparently, this is exactly what the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee intended to do. They will let nothing stand in the way of their feverish rush to handcuff the EPA, not even American jobs. In their effort to slam through a package of irresponsible cuts and to thwart the work of the very agency charged with protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink, the casualties aren't just limited to our national environment but real people and real jobs. Republicans in the House are trying to shut down the EPA at all costs, except they aren't the ones paying the price.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1. It is reckless. It is irresponsible. And it is politics at their very worst.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Chair, the draconian cuts to EPA funding will negatively impact my congressional district which has one of the highest rates of asthma in the Nation. For many years, I have worked closely and been dependent on EPA's collaboration to address the impact that poor air quality has had on residents of my district. The funding limitation that stops the EPA from limiting greenhouse gases will negatively impact air quality not only in my congressional district but throughout the Nation. This would also cause the cancellation of numerous projects which would eliminate thousands of jobs.

The National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities are also facing severe cuts. What kind of society have we become if we cannot encourage and fund the arts and humanities? Are we focusing on jobs? We must remember that giving our young people the opportunity to experience the arts leads to a more qualified and educated workforce. The funding for the NEA and the NEH helps to provide an important investment in our local arts organizations.

Our national parks contribute to the standard of living that many Americans enjoy. Our national parks are one of our greatest treasures, available to all of us. We must continue to improve and protect this valuable resource. The cuts to the National Park Service will also negatively affect many historical and conservation projects. With cuts to the Drinking Water Fund, we will be eliminating communities' ability to provide clean and safe drinking water to their residents who we, as elected officials, are stewards of.

Now I know that we continue, over the last 24 and over the next 24 hours, to discuss these very serious cuts. All I would hope is that as we go forward and we deal with cuts that many of us agree have to be made, that we pay special attention to the future of our country. One thing is to simply say, cuts reduce the deficit. The other thing is to say, what are we going to do to parks, what are we going to do to drinking water, what are we going to do to the air we breathe, what are we going to do to all the good things we've done over the last 30, 40, 50 years to make our country even better? As we cut budgets, we must take that into consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chairman, I will not be offering my amendment No. 487 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would restore funding to the Assistance to Territories Account under U.S. Department of the Interior's Office of Insular Affairs to fiscal year 2008 levels. The 7 percent reduction in funding offered by the Republican majority would cut necessary assistance to the governments of Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The U.S. territories are provided assistance through the Office of Insular Affairs, and the financial assistance provided by the account to be cut has allowed our governments to fund disaster mitigation programs, coral reef conservation initiatives, infrastructure repairs, and environmental preservation. In fact, Madam Chairman, the Constitution under article IV, section 3, clause 2 gives this Congress explicit authority: ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

While this impacts all territories, on Guam, in particular, funding from the OIA has been critical to the mitigation of invasive species, management of coral reef conservation programs, technical assistance to modernize and develop our port which provides direct economic benefit as well as assistance in modernizing our tax collection and our auditing systems. If my colleagues on the other side want to help diversify and develop the economies of the territories, then it is essential that we continue to provide this technical assistance in a targeted fashion, as is done now, to jump-start that development process.

My colleagues from the U.S. territories, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SABLAN, all agree that this funding cut is yet another example of the majority's lack of concern for the over 4 million residents of the U.S. territories. While the majority's removal of our symbolic voting rights at the beginning of the 112th Congress did not affect the livelihoods of our constituents, this funding cut would tangibly result in a reduction of public service in each of our districts, and I oppose the Republicans' continued neglect of our local governments in the territories.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from American Samoa is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the goal to cut spending and reduce the deficit, which is projected to hit $1.6 trillion this year; and I am very pleased with the approach laid out by President Obama. In his budget proposal for FY 2012 and beyond, President Obama is making the case for selectively cutting spending while increasing resources in areas like education and clean-energy initiatives that hold the potential for long-term payoffs in economic growth.

□ 1540

This commonsense approach will help bring down annual deficits to more substantial levels, but not at the peril of programs that are vital to economic growth, job creation and the well-being of our fellow Americans.

Madam Chairman, this spending bill, H.R. 1, which proposes to cut programs and funding under section 1729 and 1730 does not help our economically struggling fellow Americans through initiatives involving education, the environment and housing and employment. It

will cut critical programs and projects that are essential to economic development and job creation, not only in the 50 States, but also in the insular areas.

Madam Chairman, in particular, the proposed bill will cut approximately $6.6 million from the current budget outlays for the Department of the Interior's Office of Insular Affairs. These cuts also include an 8 percent reduction for technical assistance, and about 4 percent reduction of OIA salaries and expenses.

Madam Chairman, the OIA budget has maintained relatively constant funding levels since FY 1998, despite disproportionate need for improvements in the territories. For instance, the OIA Office General Technical Assistance program provides critical support not otherwise available to insular areas, combating deteriorating economic and fiscal conditions and to maintain momentum needed to make and sustain meaningful systematic changes.

Reduction in the OIA and the compact association funding will translate to cuts to the vital projects including, but are not limited to, these projects which foster development of the insular areas in accountability, financial management, tax systems and procedures, insular management controls, economic development, and also with regard to energy, public safety, health, immigration, the whole thing, Madam Chairman.

And, Madam Chairman, these projects are also critically needed funding for implementation of our obligations under the Compact of Free Association for the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to continue support for the needs of these insular areas and our obligations to our compact friends in the Pacific.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I rise in support of Ms. BORDALLO's amendment and to protest the gutting and slashing of more than $6 million for the insular areas. This will hurt American families and communities all across the country, from the Northern Mariana Islands to the northern border of Maine.

It hits our outlying territories particularly hard and the American citizens and families who live and work there. This bill takes more than 7 percent out of the Assistance to Territories Account which funds critical programs at the local level in Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. These communities have unique needs and this account helps them address those. It helps fund disaster mitigation programs, particularly important in low-lying islands susceptible to tropical storms. It helps ensure a strong and robust judiciary in American Samoa, a crucial program to ensure that the American Constitution and U.S. laws are upheld in every corner of our Nation. It helps these areas make needed infrastructure repairs, which creates jobs that are critical during this tough economic time.

This amendment would restore this funding; and just because these communities may be farther away does not mean that they are any less American and in any less need of the services this funding provides. Just because these communities are farther away does not mean that the slashing of programs will go unnoticed.

As chairwoman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I want to express my strong support for the amendment offered by Ms. BORDALLO and oppose the cuts to the Assistance to Territories Account offered by the Republican majority in H.R. 1.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Chair, people in the Northern Mariana Islands pay up to 40 cents per kilowatt hour for electricity. That's four times the national average because we're dependent on diesel oil shipped long distances.

A technical assistance grant for the Department of the Interior's Office of Insular Affairs, however, has helped identify a possible source of geothermal energy on one of the islands. Further exploration and more investments are needed to be sure that this alternative source will work for us; but without the technical assistance grant from Interior, we wouldn't even know that we have this possibility of getting off our dependence on expensive foreign oil.

And now, H.R. 1 proposes to cut the funds that Interior uses to help the Northern Marianas and the other insular areas in this way. That kind of thinking is penny wise and pound foolish.

But helping us get free of foreign oil is only one example of how this Interior Department funding helps us. These cuts threaten the brown tree snake program. I know this may sound like a joke to some, but on Guam there are literally 500,000 or more of these snakes. A few came in on military aircraft and spread quickly. They have caused millions of dollars in damage to electrical distribution systems and destroyed the rare indigenous bird life.

And we don't want to see these pests spread to the Northern Mariana Islands or Hawaii or mainland United States. And the Interior Department funding is keeping these snakes in check. Do away with this funding and these unwanted immigrants will break through our borders.

The Interior Department funding that H.R. 1 cuts supports training programs for high school and college students in the islands. It supports training for our professional people in financial management, accounting and auditing to help us manage our money to U.S. standards. Take away that training money and you will make it even more difficult for us to build capacity and become fully integrated into the American family.

Our economy is based on tourism. Tourists come to enjoy our warm oceans and beautiful coral reefs there, but these reefs are at risk. Run-off from development on land kills the coral. Funding that H.R. 1 cuts is helping us to protect the coral that underpins our tourism economy. Take away the funding and you hit our already fragile tourism industry.

We all know that the Federal Government has to cut spending. There is no disagreement there. We need to weed out wasteful programs. We have to get more efficient and effective with our own spending.

But the money that goes to the Interior Department to help the insular areas is not wasted. It is effective. It is targeted on precisely the problems that the insular areas confront. It will be a mistake, it is a mistake, to cut this tiny amount of money that has a large positive effect in the Northern Mariana Islands and all of the U.S. insular areas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Our Nation's unsustainable budget deficit is staring us in the face, but it is at critical moments like this when we must approach our Nation's greatest challenges with responsibility and prudence. Make no mistake that what's at stake here is grand in scope, and we could have grave consequences for our Nation's security, our infrastructure, and our economy.

Just this morning, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates called the Republicans' stopgap spending plan ''a crisis on our doorstep'' in terms of our national security, and these shortsighted budget cuts could lead to costlier and more tragic consequences later.

The approach we take must focus on responsible cuts which will have a lasting impact on our deficit, not arbitrary short-term cuts to programs to win a few votes back home.

We should be making decisions based on the best available science, not the worst possible politics. For example, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focused on de-funding the Mexican Wolf Recovery program, instead of protecting the critically important jobs at the National Nuclear Security Administration.

□ 1550

The NNSA is responsible for the management and security of our Nation's

nuclear weapons and nuclear nonproliferation, and provides crucial funding for the work being done at our national labs.

Our national labs, like Sandia National Lab in central New Mexico, have a tremendous impact on our local communities and our national defense. Last year, Sandia Labs hired a little over 700 people; 203 of these new hires graduated from a New Mexico university.

I am in favor of reducing government spending. In fact, this week I voted to cut $3 billion in unnecessary spending. But installations critical to our national security which are also successful private sector economic drivers like Sandia National Labs should not take the hit.

Elsewhere in their spending plans, Republicans want to gut the Land and Conservation Fund, a proven economic multiplier that has yielded $4 in economic activity around national parks for every dollar of Federal investment. They want to slash the Antiquities Act, which, since 1906, has provided an economic lifeline to rural communities surrounded by public land.

Madam Speaker, in the West, outdoor recreation and public lands means jobs. They mean hunting and fishing and camping and a western way of life.

Also on the chopping block is vital funding for women's health care and service agencies like AmeriCorps.

In regard to infrastructure, the Republicans' continuing resolution cuts key investments aimed at fixing our crumbling roads, energy grids, and clean water programs. Just this month, in my home State of New Mexico, we experienced a major gas outage emergency. On the coldest night of the year, with temperatures as low as negative 32 degrees, families were left without heat due to distribution infrastructure failures across the Southwest.

In an era of infrastructure failures which wreak havoc on communities, cutting key transportation and infrastructure investments would leave America dangerously vulnerable. At the same time, these cuts will result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs.

The middle class is still on a shaky path to recovery from the worst recession since the Great Depression. Let's not pull the rug out from underneath the hardworking people we came here to represent.

It has been 2 months since the Republicans took over the majority, and they still haven't introduced a jobs package. It was bad enough that the Republicans were ignoring jobs, but with this CR, they are now actively trying to cut jobs. I don't know about you, but a ''so be it'' attitude is simply not going to cut it when it comes to the families I represent back home.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to resist the temptation to politicize the very serious business of reducing our Nation's deficit. That is the only way we will ever rebuild the public's trust in government and grow our economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I am going to speak on the issue of water.

I represent an area where we have a Superfund site called the San Gabriel groundwater contaminated site. This resolution will risk the water supply of over 30 million people and directly affects the ability to continue the 20-year cleanup that has been in effect, with another 15 years to run on the contaminated site—the size of Connecticut—which undermines the agreement the local, the State, the Federal, and the potential responsible parties have come together on in doing the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

With regard to Klamath settlements, which helps secure a clean water supply, an adequate water supply to farmers and the environment in the San Joaquin Valley and the Klamath Basin, impacting the entire State of California, the settlement impacts an agreement developed by not only the farmers, the tribes, and the conservation groups, but the power companies and the States of California and Oregon, negotiated by no less than the Bush administration for voluntary removal of these privately owned dams. This will prevent fair congressional consideration of the Klamath agreements.

Madam Chair, the San Gabriel Restoration Fund, the Superfund list that I cited before, on H.R. 1, is the last line of defense against migrating groundwater contamination that has affected our basin for over 35 years, which was due to pesticides, fertilizer, and other contaminants. The fund has treated 24,000 acre feet of contaminated groundwater, helped fund the construction of 24 treatment facilities, and has removed thousands of volatile organic compounds, or VOCs, carcinogens, which threaten the health of some 40, 50 communities in the southern California area. With another decade or more to complete this cleanup, the funding to fight the spread of this contamination must not be eliminated.

In the Bay Delta, the further cuts would also abolish key elements of the San Joaquin River Restoration program and the implementation of two biological opinions on endangered species protecting wild California Bay-Delta fisheries, risking millions of people's water supply delivery. Fish are species. So is the human race another species.

Conservation and water recycling save jobs, save money, and talking about conservation and these cuts is not warranted. We need that water, our economy needs the water, and the jobs all of these will produce. Our communities need our support in developing local and sustainable water supplies through all the programs we can afford.

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES,
Sacramento, CA, February 15, 2011.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water & Power, House Natural Resources Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water & Power, House Natural Resources Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCLINTOCK AND RANKING MEMBER NAPOLITANO: The Association of California Water Agencies strongly supports the Bureau of Reclamation's Water Recycling and Reuse Program, known as Title XVI, and believes it should be funded in the continuing resolution. For this reason, ACWA opposes amendment 286 to HR 1. ACWA represents nearly 450 public water agencies in California that collectively supply over 90% of the water delivered in California for domestic, agricultural, and industrial uses.

As you are aware, managing water supplies in Western states is challenging. Title XVI projects provide a valuable source of water and help alleviate conflicts. In California alone, this program helps generate over 525,000 acre-feet of recycled water each year. It is strongly supported by local project sponsors who provide three local dollars for every one federal dollar invested in recycling and reuse projects.

Title XVI projects also create jobs and help local economies. As the projects are constructed, jobs are created in both the primary and secondary job market. As noted by Reclamation's Commissioner Mike Connor in his July 21, 2009 testimony to the House of Representatives Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water and Power, there is a $600 million unfunded backlog of authorized Title XVI projects. These projects are approved by Congress and have local support and funding. Instead of decreasing funding for this program, ACWA encourages Congress to provide more funding. The water reuse program creates jobs and provides near-term solutions to water supply challenges facing many Western states.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY QUINN,
Executive Director.

WATEREUSE ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, February 16, 2011.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR HONORABLE MCCLINTOCK AND NAPOLITANO: On behalf of the WateReuse Association, I am writing to oppose efforts to eliminate funding for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Title XVI program and WaterSmart grant program. The WateReuse Association opposes amendments 286 and 289 of the fiscal year 2011 continuing appropriations bill (H.R. 1) that would eliminate these vital water supply programs.

The Title XVI program of P.L. 102–575 allows local communities to reduce their reliance on imported water supplies. Communities throughout the West are able to supplement dwindling local water supplies, reduce energy consumption associated with

transporting water, and allow greater quantities of fresh water to be reserved for municipal water supply, irrigation or environmental needs. The Title XVI program allows local communities to leverage federal funds by a factor of three by obtaining additional financing to complete projects. These projects create jobs and new water. The Title XVI program is a necessary tool to meet the growing demands on western water resources. Eliminating the perennially underfunded program will only exacerbate the burden on local communities in the West.

The WaterSmart grant program is another critical program to conserve and maximize local water supplies. The WaterSmart grant program allows communities to compete for grant opportunities for conservation projects and projects that address the viability of using brackish groundwater, seawater, impaired waters, or otherwise creating new water supplies. This program addresses the most significant challenges facing our water supplies in the 21st Century, including population growth, climate change, rising energy demands, environmental needs and aging infrastructure.

Title XVI and the WaterSmart grants programs are important tools to conserve water supplies in the West. These programs need funding and should be funded through H.R. 1. I encourage you to join the WateReuse Association in supporting these programs.

Sincerely,

G. WADE MILLER,
Executive Director.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I am committed to cutting the deficit, and I sought a seat on the Budget Committee to do so. But I rise to express deep concerns over the congressional Republicans' irresponsible fiscal scheme that will harm communities and students back home that I represent.

We need a multiyear strategy to cut the debt and the deficit, but a strategy that ensures that America retains its superiority in education, innovation, and research.

We must cut waste and close the huge tax loopholes written by lobbyists, like the ones for oil companies. But congressional Republicans do not do this.

Instead of tackling the debt and deficit in a smart and strategic way, the congressional Republicans' scheme will result in job losses, and it will make economic recovery more difficult for American families and businesses. And here are some stark examples from the community I represent back in Florida in the Tampa Bay area.

First, on education and the Pell Grant. I represent an education community, with a large public research university, a private college, and many community colleges. When the Republicans propose cutting the Pell Grant and support to students, this harms our ability to maintain our superiority in education when we are competing with countries all across the globe.

You know, over 9 million students and families rely on the Pell Grant every year in America, and we have worked very hard through the economic recovery to help those students maintain that same level of Pell Grants. So don't take us backwards. You shouldn't be taking us backwards.

Do you know what it's like for a hardworking family to pay tuition right now? Is tuition going down? Is tuition being cut? Are books being cut? No. So let's not turn our backs on our students and families at this time.

The same thing for Head Start. In Tampa and Hillsborough Counties, we have an award-winning Head Start initiative. And the evidence that Head Start gives students a boost in life is very well known. Parents have to be involved. We wish all eligible kids could get that boost. Even now, before the congressional Republican cuts, we have 2,400 families on the waiting list and 1,000 infants and toddlers on the Early Start list. The Republican cuts again take us backwards. I hear from back home that 452 families will be told that there is no room for their child.

They will also lay off 123 teachers just in my home county alone, because in the State of Florida they predict that they will have to lay off almost 2,000 teachers under your cuts.

Schools and students. The Republicans again are off base in cutting my local schools, particularly the title I schools that serve kids that need a little extra attention. We estimate that Republicans will be eliminating 20 to 30 jobs in my home district that serve students that need that achievement gap boost. You are harming the high poverty middle and high school students also in the county across the Bay that recently was able to expand beyond elementary school.

□ 1600

Madam Chairman, rather than close the tax loophole for the oil companies that are making multi-billion dollar profits, the Republicans instead cut my local police and sheriff's departments, like the help we get under COPS for the anti-methamphetamine initiative and for our juvenile justice initiative to try to prevent gangs from forming in the counties. The youth initiatives have received national awards from the Attorney General, and it would be a real shame if we had to turn these back.

Also, in my home county, we rely on some very robust ports in the Tampa Bay area as our economic engine. You are going to cut that support for that economic engine to dredge the canals and ports so the ships can come in, and we rely on those for jobs.

You also are going to cut the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Now, after the Gulf of Mexico suffered the economic hit under the BP oil blowout, our coastal communities were hurt badly. The tourism industry, the seafood industry and our wildlife habitat suffered significant damage.

So, coming from Florida, when you all say that you are going to turn your backs on our ability to monitor our oceans, that is very harmful, because clean oceans and clean beaches mean a healthy economy. Certainly closing the oil company tax loophole would be a wiser course of action.

We all know how harsh it has been under the Great Recession with foreclosures. It has hit us especially hard, so hard that a local expert told me yesterday that the Republican budget cuts to the magnitude being considered would greatly and immediately increase homelessness, place more than 1,000 families at risk and put seniors on the street.

Vote ''no'' on this CR.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1703. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Land Acquisition'' shall be $2,750,000: *Provided*, That no less than $2,250,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division: *Provided further*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 193 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,750,000)''.

Page 264, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,250,000)''.

Page 264, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,055,000)''.

Page 264, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 278, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,100,000)''.

Page 278, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,400,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $35,055,000)''.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chairman, in December, I voted for that historic agreement between President Obama and Congress to keep American taxes low and to extend unemployment benefits. Now we are here to debate how to pay for that, and I have an idea about how to help pay for that.

My amendment, No. 193, would strike the remaining funding for this 6 months in this year totaling $35 million from the budgets of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the BLM and the Forest Service for the purpose of buying new Federal land. There are many alternatives to buying land with cash that would allow them to continue using Yankee ingenuity, and those include land exchanges.

In my own State, we have over half a million acres that have been designated for disposal by Federal agencies because these lands don't fit into

good land management, yet there are other lands that these same Federal agencies would like to acquire. They can do exchanges. They can do sales of this land that is designated for disposal and purchase other lands that work better for the fragmented land ownership patterns that we sometimes experience in the West. This is a much better alternative to using $35 million to pay cash to buy new land that adds to the management base and responsibility. At the same time, it would free up land that would be disposed of for people to buy and begin to earn a living on.

So this is a way to create jobs, not to burden the Federal Government, and to recognize that good stewardship and good conservation can be practiced by good Federal and private partnerships. Those are the opportunities that are available if we adopt this amendment. It saves the taxpayers money and it helps pay for those people receiving unemployment benefits, and this is a win-win amendment.

It is only a moratorium, and when we begin the next fiscal year, we would have an opportunity, from having reviewed projects between the Natural Resources Committee and the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and have a better understanding of the ultimate goal of our land acquisitions programs within these Federal agencies.

So, Madam Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, let me give this body the top 10 reasons to defeat this amendment.

Number one, these are not really taxpayer dollars. The money comes from oil drilling receipts.

Number two, this amendment represents a complete elimination of a bipartisan program that has existed for 45 years.

The third reason is that this amendment will eliminate all the land and water conservation funding, even the few dollars remaining under the continuing resolution for management of these programs.

The fourth reason is that this amendment would force land management agencies to end all the work on congressionally approved projects that are now underway using previous-year appropriations. It will hurt willing seller landowners by preventing agencies from finishing out commitments that are already in place.

The fifth reason is that many landowners, ranging from elderly widowers and family trusts to ranchers and forest owners, have pressing financial needs that now depend on completion of these ongoing land and water conservation projects.

The sixth reason is that by eviscerating the Land and Water Conservation Fund, you are going to cause severe impacts on many others as well, including schoolchildren in the State of Wyoming. The amendment will bring to an immediate halt the negotiated agreement between the State of Wyoming and the National Park Service to transfer $107 million of school trust lands to Grand Teton National Park. Without the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the State can't meet its mandate to sell those lands and generate revenue to support its educational system.

The seventh reason is that the amendment would frustrate land exchanges that are currently in process, many of which have been years in the making and are important for local private economic development and public land management.

The eighth reason, under this amendment, the staff wouldn't be in place to even accept and process donations of important natural historic and other properties from the public.

The ninth reason is that, without staff, right-of-way work to provide or maintain access for key public needs would be rendered impossible. The public would be unable to secure critically needed routes for fuel and wildfire management, watershed management, and access for sportsmen and other recreational use.

The tenth reason is that the amendment would exacerbate an already draconian cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a program that is already paid for using a very small percentage of oil drilling receipts.

This amendment should be rejected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. In every State of the United States, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been one of the most successful programs for preserving open space and our environment for future generations. It is important to note, as the ranking member has said, that the LWCF is not funded by taxpayer dollars but by fees charged to the industry for the extraction of oil and gas from public lands.

Congress created the LWCF 45 years ago on the principle that some funds garnered from extraction of resources should be devoted to the preservation of other resources, in fact protecting permanently important lands and waters and access to recreation for all Americans. The LWCF is the only environmental preservation program in the Federal Government that is fully offset, and under the LWCF, polluters, not taxpayers, pay to protect the environment.

□ 1610

So cutting this program doesn't save taxpayer dollars. It robs taxpayers of the returns. And, actually, as in so many things in this continuing resolution, it does away with jobs.

It's my belief that the LWCF should be fully funded at the authorized level of $900 million and the stateside program should receive at least $200 million to match State funds. This is what the President requested in his fiscal year 2012 budget—and I think that's a fair proposal. The draconian continuing resolution in front of us not only would zero out the stateside portion of the LWCF, it would cut the LWCF overall program to the lowest level in its history, ending much-needed balance between resource extraction and resource conservation. We should reject this amendment.

The budget before us and this continuing resolution would really turn back the clock on efforts to preserve open spaces. The stateside portion of LWCF, which I helped revive in one of my first acts when I came to this Congress, through its matching grants has saved over 73,000 acres in my State of New Jersey; and in our 12th District, which I have the privilege to represent, we've received tens of millions of dollars in stateside LWCF funding. Every family that visits Veterans Park in Mercer County, the Sickles recreation area in the Borough of Shrewsbury, or the Colonial Lake playground in Lawrence Township, to name a few of the hundreds of LWCF projects, have benefited directly from this successful program.

Preserving open space is more than an environmental issue. It really is a quality of life issue. It's not just about preserving beautiful vistas. It's about preserving nature's way of cleansing herself. It is about providing recreation and parks. It is particularly important for States east of the Mississippi, but it is no less important for all 50 States.

Every State has positive stories to tell about LWCF. Voters consistently have supported funding open space preservation. Recent polling found that 86 percent of Americans are supportive of reinvesting funds from offshore drilling fees to land and water protection.

President Johnson said, ''If future generations are to remember us more with gratitude than with sorrow, we must achieve more than just the miracles of technology. We must also leave them a glimpse of the world as it was created, not just as it looks when we get through with it.''

The Land and Water Conversation Fund is one of the few government programs that really benefits all Americans, does not use taxpayer dollars, and receives the overwhelming support of the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand and sympathize with the

amendment that the gentlelady from Wyoming is proposing. We in the West sometimes have a little bit different point of view. Regardless of where the funding comes from, whether it comes from money that comes from oil sales or other things, when you're buying additional land in the States with 64 percent of Federal land currently, that causes some concern to westerners. So I understand why sometimes people from New Jersey and Massachusetts and other places that don't have a lot of public lands sometimes don't understand the same concern that we share out there.

So I sympathize with what the gentlelady is saying in this amendment, but I would point out this started out in 2010. There was $450 million in the Land and Water Conversation Fund appropriated for this year. We have reduced that in this bill to $58 million. It already terminates funding for any new Federal land acquisition projects, an action we had to take in order to meet the subcommittee's allocation halfway through this fiscal year. All that remains is enough funding for managing projects funded in prior years and for emergencies and in-holdings for small acquisitions that make sense and save taxpayers money in the long run. So we've reduced this fund for any new land acquisition.

I can't tell you what's going to happen in the next bill, but this one would allow for those in-holdings to be purchased, those things that are ongoing and currently under negotiation. So I think it's the appropriate thing to do. Terminating these programs will pull the rug out from under private landowners that we've already made commitments to, many of whom have fallen on hard times in this economy, who need to sell their lands and who would want to conserve those lands for the benefit of all Americans.

So as much as I sympathize with what the gentlelady is trying to do, I think reducing all of the funds out of that account would be inappropriate. And I would oppose the amendment and urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a nearly 50-year-old promise to the American people that if we are going to allow giant oil companies like BP to deplete our ocean energy resources, we will take a small sliver of their massive profits and deposit it into a conservation fund.

Since its creation in 1965, the Land and Water Conversation Fund has allowed Federal acquisition of critical acres inside the national parks, vital wildlife habitats, conservation easements, and water rights, as well as construction of local recreational facilities through grants to States. The fund has served as one of the most important tools in building and protecting our national resources heritage.

The underlying bill devastates this revered program by slashing the amount to be paid out of the fund for conservation by almost 90 percent compared to current levels—almost 90 percent of a cut from current levels. The funding level contained in the underlying bill is the lowest proposed amount since the program was created in 1965. This is not a return to fiscal year 2008. This is not a return to fiscal year 2009. This is a return to fiscal year LBJ. That's their goal, to go back right to the very beginning, and if they could, to the year before when it did not exist at all. That's the real goal of what this debate is trying to accomplish from the Republican side. And now this amendment proposes a further reduction in the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

To be clear, this amendment does not save this money. Rather, it borrows this money from a trust fund and uses it to offset spending that has already occurred. This is diverting oil money from its intended conservation purpose in violation of a promise made to the American people. The Outdoor Industry Association points out that outdoor recreation contributes $730 billion annually to the United States economy and supports more than 6 million jobs. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is good for the environment, it's good for the economy, and it's a 50-year-old promise to every American.

The cuts contained in the underlying bill would cripple the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Further cuts could kill it. This amendment should be defeated, and it should be seen in the context of this massive attempt by the new Republican majority to take the EPA and to turn it into every polluter's ally; to take the clean air and the clean water laws and begin to undermine them systematically; to take each and every one of these environmental areas that we've made tremendous progress in over the last 30, 40, and 50 years and begin to roll back those gains as though America was not the beneficiary.

There's a good reason why America is the number one box office smash in the world, and that's because they look at us and they appreciate the commitment that we have made to the public health, to the public lands, to clean water, to clean air. And if we begin to undermine that image, then we will be hurting our country; we will be hurting our tourism; we will be hurting our ability to be able to pass on this planet in better condition than the way we found it. I urge that under no circumstances we support a provision that would accomplish all those goals.

□ 1620

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. I rise more in sorrow than in anger about the legislation now before us.

Mr. Chairman, all Members will agree we have to confront our budget deficit; but we have to do so, I think, in a sensible fashion. I grieve that that does not happen here. The cuts of the magnitude that we are making today and the places they are being made is destructive beyond belief. We risk a continuation or, indeed, a re-igniting of the recession which has plagued us, and we risk seeing to it that the great needs of our country are not met. We are looking at the strong possibility of a loss of jobs.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that 800,000 jobs will be lost, jobs that are not only important but that are, indeed, of major national priority, which are being put on the chopping block. Let us look at some of the things about which our Republican friends are dismissive.

The education of our children: the continuing resolution will eliminate or reduce aid for almost 1.5 million low- and middle-income students paying for college.

The safety of our food: these cuts here will hamstring the Food and Drug Administration's ability to implement critical food safety legislation, leaving us vulnerable to food-related illness and death.

Americans' health: the continuing resolution cuts billions from the Department of Health and Human Services, over $1 billion from the National Institutes of Health, and over $1 billion from community health centers.

The welfare of our homeless veterans: even housing vouchers for the homeless defenders of our country are eliminated. This is disgraceful, and indeed it is a dishonor to those who have served their country.

Job training: the continuing resolution cuts billions from job training for displaced workers, turning our backs on those hit hardest by the recession.

U.S. exports, which make jobs: even though both Democrats and Republicans have called for a reduction in the U.S. trade deficit, the continuing resolution severely cuts into our primary export promotion effort.

Security on our streets: millions will be cut from the funding for State and

local policing activities to fight drugs, gangs and terrorism. Moreover, the continuing resolution eliminates Federal grants that help police departments around the country hire or rehire police officers.

Critical conservation programs: the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, all of which are solid, bipartisan programs, would either be completely or effectively gutted. In addition, this legislation prevents the Environmental Protection Agency from taking important steps to protect the waters of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, with unemployment hovering around 9 percent nationally—and much higher in my own State—and with many Americans still struggling through this recession, we cannot pull the rug out from under them. Politics aside, cuts of this magnitude would be unhealthy, untimely, and would provide uncertainty for our Nation as we try to get back on our feet.

Instead of draconian cuts, we should be looking to see to it that we have wise and prudent cuts, while at the same time we have an investment in the future of our country and in our people. I do not see that in this proposal before us at this time.

As the President has said, we can and, indeed, we must out-educate, out-innovate and out-build our competitors. That is the only way that the United States can achieve the kind of hope for recovery and economic activity that will benefit our next generations. Contrary to H.R. 1, we need to balance investments that will help our economy recover while also committing to decreasing the Federal deficit.

It is clear that neither goal will be achieved overnight and that they certainly will not be achieved in this legislation. I stand ready to work with my colleagues and with the President to find responsible and effective ways to trim the budget, but I refuse to permit my Republican colleagues to gut vital government programs and bring our economic recovery to a standstill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I offer this motion to speak out against the blatant attack on clean water, which is contained in section 1747 of this Republican continuing resolution—a provision that does not save the taxpayer one single dollar.

As we know, the Clean Water Act became law in 1972 with the stated purpose of cleaning up America's waterways and wetlands. Since then, this landmark legislation has served as a framework for protecting our drinking water from deadly toxins and for preserving the ecological integrity of our waterways.

In my home State of New York, from the mighty waters of rivers like the Hudson to the many lakes of the Adirondacks, this legislation has been absolutely critical, where 95 percent of our population relies on public drinking water in some form. Unfortunately, in the last 10 years, millions of acres of wetlands and thousands of miles of streams have lost Clean Water Act protection.

Healthy streams and wetlands naturally filter and replenish our drinking water supplies. They absorb flood waters and protect coastlines and support local hunting, fishing, boating, and recreation industries. One-third of Americans get their drinking water from the types of streams that are vulnerable to pollution under recent rollbacks; and this bill includes a provision that would ban the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers from working within their legal authority to mitigate that threat.

This is an appropriations bill. According to my colleagues across the aisle, it is a bill with the sole purpose of reducing the deficit—a noble goal. However, the clean water rider in section 1747 of this bill does not save one dime of taxpayer money. It is not about funding. It is about restricting the legal authority of the EPA and the work of the Army Corps of Engineers in an underhanded ''politics as usual'' attack on our drinking water, on our environment, and on the thousands of recreational fishing, hunting and boating jobs that these water resources support.

We may have banned formal earmarks this year, but this rider amounts to a handout to big polluters at the expense of basic public health protections.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. The legislation before us, the continuing resolution, I believe is a full-throttled extremist assault on the environment, on the public health of the American people, and on the jobs and economic well-being of our Nation as a whole. In these difficult times that we are in, it is the economy and jobs that should be the top priorities for this Congress and for the Republican majority.

Mr. Chairman, this CR does irreparable harm to the environment, including to the air, water, our public lands, and to wildlife. The virtual elimination of public health protection by the reckless dismantling of the jurisdiction of the EPA and of the funding of the EPA will bring health crises to the American people and will endanger families and children.

□ 1630

Today, the President is announcing his great outdoors initiative, and at a time when he is asking for private, State, local, and Federal cooperation in the protection of public places in the enhancement of recreation and outdoor activities for the American people, this CR talks about the elimination of State and tribal wildlife grants which are essential in that coordination. It talks about reducing by 90 percent the land water conservation fund, which is essential to promoting that cooperation and promoting the joint planning and joint jurisdiction of many of our special places in this country.

And the upcoming punitive attempt to eliminate the national landscape conservation system will leave 800 public units abandoned without coordination and without the ability to plan for the future and to be coordinated in such a fashion that they save money and serve the American people the best.

This CR places our special public places and lands on the endangered list, with irrational cuts in ending the shared responsibility to protect and conserve. Big Oil and gas and mining do not own these public places and lands—the American people do—and to turn to extraction as the only goal for these public lands denies history, ignores science, and welcomes the exploitation of a shared resource by the American people.

If deficit reduction is the item on the agenda—and we all agree that we must confront that and be prudent, be pragmatic, and be realistic in cutting programs—then we also should put everything on the table because if it is indeed an issue of deficit reduction, then let's talk about some items that the majority did not put in their CR, some of the subsidies, some of the giveaways to industries that are part of the public land agenda and part of what happens within the Interior Department:

Expensing reforestation expenditures, $600 million under public land; excessive percentage over cost depletion for nonfuel minerals, $500 million; expensing exploration for nonfuel minerals, $400 million; intangible drilling costs, $8.9 billion; oil and gas royalty relief, $6.9 billion; domestic manufacturing and tax deduction for oil and gas companies, $6.2 billion. And if you keep going down that list with coal subsidies, nuclear industry subsidies, oil and gas subsidies, public land subsidies, you end up with a figure of $100 billion to $200 billion.

I'm not saying that all those cuts should be eliminated. I don't think we should take an axe to those areas. Some are productive and needed; but if we are going to scrutinize this budget, let's do it in a fair way that shares and balances what we're going through while we protect important things in our public lands and in our public health.

I urge all my colleagues to balance public health of families and children, the public lands we love, the shared responsibility we have to clean air, water, public health, and our national resources, balance that with the narrow agenda that is confronting us

today, an agenda that punishes taxpayers and the American people at the expense and for the profit of private oil and gas interests in this country.

As we confront this issue, I would suggest to my colleagues that the legacy of our public lands and our environment, the legacy of our clean air and water, the public health of our people should be the priority. And if cuts need to be made, then all cuts should be placed on the table, all cuts should be looked at, including subsidies and including giveaways and deductions that are not part of the norm with our public dollars. That would be good for the taxpayer, and it would be good for the environment, and it would be good in reducing the deficit.

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

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill.

I was an early and strong supporter of the President's bipartisan commission on the debt; and while I do not agree with all of the commission's recommendations, I recognize that their report to the President offered an important starting point for debate on an issue that affects the lives of every American, as well as future generations.

In the report, the commission warns against disrupting our fragile economic recovery: ''We need a comprehensive plan now to reduce the debt over the long term. But budget cuts should start gradually so they don't interfere with the ongoing economic recovery. Growth is essential to restoring fiscal strength and balance. We should cut red tape and unproductive government spending that hinders job creation and growth. But at the same time we must invest in education, infrastructure, and high-value research and development to help our economy grow, keep us globally competitive, and make it easier for businesses to create jobs.''

The bill before us fails to heed this sound advice, making shortsighted decisions that will sabotage our short-term recovery and undermine our long-term competitiveness. The reckless decisions made in this bill will lead to lost jobs in my district and throughout the Nation.

Some of these job losses are obvious. Deep cuts to COPS and SAFER funding will ensure that we will lose thousands of police officers and firefighters protecting our communities nationwide; but other losses may be less obvious but just as painful.

For instance, this legislation imposes deep cuts on the food Food and Drug Administration. Every single drug, vaccine, biologic and medical device must be approved by the FDA before it can ever be offered to patients. This means that not only do patients rely on the FDA but also American pharmaceutical and medical device companies that need an efficient and effective FDA to ensure that they can continue to innovate, grow, and create jobs.

We are lucky to have a medical device industry in this country that is on the cutting edge of technological advances in medicine. What we should be doing is modernizing the FDA to make it more efficient, transparent, predictable, and rigorous; and to do that, we need to ensure that the FDA has all the necessary resources to conduct proper and speedy review of life-saving devices that not only benefit patients but our innovative businesses so that many of them can get to work putting people to work.

For these private sector firms, cutting FDA resources means slowing down their approval process, driving some of them overseas, and losing many jobs here in our country as well. Likewise, cuts to local funding included in this bill will harm communities I represent, particularly the deep cuts to the Community Development Block Grant program. When I have asked leaders in the cities I represent how we can best help their recovery efforts, the answer has been unhesitating and unequivocal: CDBG funding.

Last week, the city manager in my hometown of Lowell wrote, saying, ''This is probably the most valuable tool that the Federal Government offers cities to address economic development, infrastructure, and community needs.''

What is most discouraging about the attack on CDBG funding is that it does just what my colleagues say they support: it provides local flexibility, allowing stakeholders to decide what makes sense for their communities, while ensuring an extremely efficient use of funds. For example, last year in the city of Lowell, every $1 in CDBG funding generated more than $16 in additional funding.

Over the years, Lowell has successfully used CDBG funds to redevelop a historic building into a much-needed senior center, turning a blight into a landmark and prompting the entry of private businesses nearby. It has used funds to spur the development of a mixed-use development that is bringing in millions of dollars in private development and restoring architectural treasures key to the city's identity. And it has provided seed money to nonprofits like the United Teen Equality Center, recognized nationally for the revolutionary work they're doing every day to curb gang violence in the city of Lowell.

All of these actions have improved the quality of life and created jobs for Lowell residents, and none might have been made possible without this modest Federal investment.

So I do not support the underlying bill, and I encourage its rejection.

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

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. I rise today to let the American people and all Minnesotans know that this continuing resolution is an unprecedented assault on our public health and environment.

We know that the Federal budget is in crisis, and we know we must make tough choices; but those choices must be prudent, wise, and invest in our future. It should not put the basic health of Americans at risk. The Republicans' plan before us proposes to cut $3 billion from the EPA's budget, the largest percentage cuts to this critical agency in 30 years.

□ 1640

The bill also proposes radical policy language to keep the EPA from carrying out its historic mission—a mission to protect the health of the American people—by limiting the EPA's ability to enforce the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act.

The EPA needs to be allowed to do its job, and it needs the resources to do this job. This bill would cause the EPA to lay off 80 percent of its employees who are responsible for protecting public health.

State clean water programs are gutted by $2 billion in the Republican budget. Our local communities are struggling with their own budgets, and these vital funds allow for communities to hire engineers, construction workers, to upgrade water plants and drinking water projects.

It is the EPA's investment in clean water that allows parents to know that if their child walks up to a drinking fountain anywhere in America, they can have the peace of mind that that water is safe for their child to drink. These irresponsible cuts jeopardize that peace of mind.

The EPA does important work, and the work that the EPA does saves lives. I strongly oppose these reckless Republican cuts and radical deregulation proposals that endanger our communities. Congress needs to make difficult choices. Mr. Chair, I believe that these are foolhardy choices to short-change clean air, clean water, and the health of our families.

On Monday, I received over 1,000 valentines from Minnesotans, and those valentines were dedicated to the EPA. My constituents understand the important work that the EPA has done to protect our water, our land, and their health over the past 40 years. And it's work that they feel must continue. This continuing resolution would turn back all the tremendous progress we have made in cleaning up our environment, and I firmly reject it and urge my colleagues to do as well.

Mr. Chair, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate Speaker BOEHNER and my Republican colleagues providing for an open discussion on this legislation, and

I appreciate the Speaker's request that we be respectful of the process. I think that is important. But I think it is also important to come to the floor at this point to make a couple of observations that are critical to the people I represent.

We are ready to move forward to actually deal with cutting the budget. We have already seen today a significant amendment adopted dealing with defense. There are opportunities for us to accelerate health care savings in Medicare. And from the beginning of my coming to this body, I have been working on a bipartisan basis to deal with reductions in unnecessary and wasteful agricultural subsidies.

There are several items that we are dealing with in the continuing resolution that have nothing to do with saving money. Indeed, they are actually going to cost money in economic impact in my community and around the country.

I note, for instance, the policy rider that would prevent the EPA and the Corps of Engineers from clarifying provisions of the Clean Water Act. As a result, millions of acres of wetlands and thousands of miles of streams will lose Clean Water Act protections. Because these affect so much of the headwater streams supply to public surface drinking water in my State, it could end up threatening drinking water quality for almost 2 million people.

The cut to the State revolving funds are extraordinarily imprudent. This money leverages a great deal of activity and helps us deal with the massive infrastructure deficit with water quality. The American Society of Civil Engineers backs this up. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars we need to be investing in the next 20 years. Cutting the revolving fund is a dramatic step backward.

In the area of air quality, there is a rider that attempts to prevent EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions. Now I will tell you, on its merits, dealing with greenhouse gases, that this will look foolish for the people who are proposing it to their children and grandchildren. They will wonder, What were you thinking?

But put aside for a moment the problem of greenhouse gas emissions and carbon pollution. The language will have far-reaching—and I hope unintended—consequences. It would hinder EPA's ability to relax requirements on biomass plants that matter, for example, to my friend from Idaho and others in the Northwest. Very important to us. In addition, because of the way it was drafted, to prevent the issuance of permits, the language would impose a de facto construction ban on new sources in many States, including Oregon. This could block not only new or expanding power plants but refineries and large manufacturing plants. With unemployment rates high in my State and around the country, this construction moratorium hardly seems to make sense.

The budget decimates the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This was a program that represented a commitment to offset some of the destructive effects of oil and gas production by preserving many of America's high-quality recreational opportunities and vital wildlife habitat.

This is violating a commitment that this body has made to finally allow these funds to flow. Unfortunately, future investments are going to be at risk if this CR passes with the existing funding level, missing opportunities to complete landscapes and protect watersheds and actually preventing agencies from meeting commitments already in place.

My final concern at this point deals with the assault on energy investments. The United States invests approximately 0.5 percent of the trillion-dollar energy sector. If anything, we should be ramping this up. We are losing our competitive edge around the world. We are losing economic opportunities and opportunities to preserve the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I have other concerns. There are other people who have things to say. But I hope that we can reject these provisions in the CR that actually make no difference in terms of reducing the budget and violate commitments that we have made.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1704. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management'' shall be $1,204,240,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$20,945,000'' for ''$22,103,000''; and by substituting ''$10,548,000'' for ''$11,632,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 295 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $7,537,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,537,000)''.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation is a government-established, government-financed, so-called private nonprofit set up to act as a conduit to funnel public dollars to private environmental advocacy groups. The authorization for these grants has expired. Let me repeat that. There is no congressional authorization for this program, and yet the money just keeps rolling on.

If we are actually serious about spending taxpayer money as carefully as they spend what they've got left after they've paid their taxes, then we ought to start by insisting that if Congress has not authorized a program, it should not be funded. If we ignore this principle, then why do we have any committees other than the Appropriations Committee?

When Ronald Reagan very reluctantly signed the original legislation, NFWF's budget was $100,000. It has grown to $7.5 million, 75-fold. Nor was Reagan's signing statement exactly a ringing endorsement. Here is what he said: ''I must convey my serious reservations about the bill. The statements in the bill to the effect that the foundation shall be a nonprofit, charitable corporation and that it shall not be an agency or establishment of the United States are contradicted by the facts. Establishment of the foundation under the terms of the bill is an unwise and dangerous precedent.'' Well, Reagan had ''serious reservations'' about an unwise and dangerous precedent.

□ 1650

Reagan's ''serious reservations'' were well founded, and, at the very least, there ought to be a full congressional review of this program and a decision made to reauthorize it before we throw more money at it, money, by the way, if you haven't checked the newspapers recently, that we don't have.

In this particular case, these are public dollars being funneled to private concerns, many of which have a disconcerting habit of then turning around and suing the government, that is, suing taxpayers over environmental issues. As we all know, all funds are fungible. So, in essence, through this agency, we are using taxpayer money to give to groups to sue taxpayers.

Not all of these private foundations are even domestic. These grants have gone to such foreign groups as the Prakratic Society of India, the Centre for Dolphin Studies of Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Central Mozambique, and to the San Lorenzo Public Outreach Program in Panama.

Mr. Chairman, with our Nation facing the worst peacetime fiscal crisis in our history, do we really need to continue these expenditures? And shouldn't we at least review the program and renew the authorization before we throw more money at it?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. MORAN. I oppose the gentleman's amendment that reduces the Fish and Wildlife Service by $7.5 million. The gentleman says that it is aimed at the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, although it doesn't say so. But whether it is or not, it's still a bad idea.

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation raises private funds with minimal Federal seed dollars. It should be

encouraged, not eliminated. Last year, the foundation leveraged $40 million in Federal funds into more than $180 million for on-the-ground conservation projects. That's a leverage ratio of 4½ times.

The Fish and Wildlife Foundation continues to be the best financial investment of public dollars to leverage private funds that pay for Federal priorities. In 1984, a quarter century ago, during challenging budget times, as well as we have today, the Foundation was created by a bipartisan group of Members of the House and Senate to leverage taxpayer dollars with private dollars.

This amendment would affect more than 400 conservation projects this year in most U.S. States and territories. These programs are nonregulatory, community driven; they promote working landscapes and foster innovation. In this critical time of constrained budgets, you would think we would want the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation more than ever.

So I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1705. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Construction'' shall be $23,737,000.

SEC. 1706. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Land Acquisition'' shall be $15,055,000: *Provided*, That no less than $2,500,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1707. Of the unobligated amounts under the heading ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Landowner Incentive Program'' from prior year appropriations, all remaining amounts are rescinded.

SEC. 1708. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund'' shall be $2,479,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$2,479,000'' for ''$29,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$5,145,706''; and by substituting ''$0'' for ''$56,000,000''.

SEC. 1709. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, North American Wetlands Conservation Fund'' shall be $0.

AMENDMENT NO. 338 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 265, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 274, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 274, line 25, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised that this continuing resolution eliminates all funding for the very successful, bipartisan-sponsored North American Wetlands Consersation Fund. It cuts $48 million.

My amendment simply adds $50 million for the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. The offset is the EPA Diesel Emissions Program which, in fact, has been eliminated in the budget just proposed by the President.

Now, both Houses unanimously reauthorized what's called NAWCA. That's the acronym for the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

We authorized it unanimously in 2006. The appropriation authorization for NAWCA was increased to $75 million for fiscal years 2007 through 2012. It's wildly popular with all sportsmen and those who value our wetlands. So I'm surprised that H.R. 1 would eliminate it. This, frankly, shows what a meat axe approach has been taken here today by some in the Republican majority.

The North American Wetlands Conservation Fund conserves our waterfowl, fish and wildlife resources while, at the same time, generating environmental and economic benefits. This is a successful partnership involving Federal, State and local governments and especially nonprofit organizations like Ducks Unlimited.

The current CEO of Ducks Unlimited, Dale Hall, who incidentally was President George Bush's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Director, wrote, and I quote, ''If these cuts and actions take place, waterfowl, waterfowl hunters and wetlands conservation would lose in a big way. In short, these actions would adversely affect all of us who care about and have funded wetlands and waterfowl conservation. We should remember, conservation in America pays for itself through the economic return from hunters, anglers and other outdoor enthusiasts.''

I could not have said it better than the spokesperson, the CEO of Ducks Unlimited, who served in the Bush administration as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Director.

Every Federal dollar provided by NAWCA must be matched by at least $1 from non-Federal sources. Because the program is so effective, NAWCA funds are usually tripled or quadrupled on the local level.

In short, this is both a highly popular and very successful program. Since its inception in 1989, more than 1,600 NAWCA projects have contributed to the conservation of more than 25 million acres of habitat across North America.

The offset we use, the Diesel Emissions grant program, is a good program. But sometimes we have to make hard choices. The President's fiscal year 2012 request also eliminates the Diesel grant program so as to encourage the truck industry to increase its own diesel R&D.

I ask the Members to support this amendment to protect our wetlands and wildlife and support the people who enjoy it.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I just want to rise in very strong support. This has been one of the most successful conservation programs. It brings in the private sector. They add two or three times to the contribution here. And I think this is a program that is very worthy and should be supported, and I hope the gentleman's amendment will be accepted.

Mr. MORAN. I greatly thank the Chair of the full committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The North American Wetlands Conservation Fund is a good program. I have no objections to that program. It's just a bad offset that the gentleman is choosing to move ahead with.

Mr. Chairman, the $50 million that's included in the continuing resolution to support Diesel Emissions Reduction Act grants is a good program. Because heavy diesel engines can operate for 20 to 30 years after they enter service, many of these engines operating today were manufactured years before the modern clean air standards. DERA grants support projects to retrofit over 20 million aging diesel engines currently in use with modern technologies to reduce toxic emissions and improve air quality.

This successful environmental program is supported by a unique broad coalition of environmentalists, industry, State and local governments. This program enjoys strong bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate and was reauthorized in the lame duck session last Congress.

□ 1700

Since 2008, the EPA has awarded over 500 DERA grants for projects nationwide. These grants leverage two State and local dollars for every one Federal dollar invested and provide $13 of economic benefit for every dollar spent. These leveraged dollars buy us cleaner air and more green jobs in every State in our Nation.

Perhaps most importantly, recent studies indicate that black carbon, like that emitted from diesel engines, is the worst kind of pollution. The retrofit technology supported by DERA reduces black carbon emissions by 90 percent.

The EPA's third ''National Assessment of Toxic Air Pollutants'' found that 2.2 million Americans now live in areas where the air they breathe increases their risk of cancer to levels deemed grossly unacceptable, one in 10,000. Given these findings, we owe it to our constituents to continue to support clean air technology.

Mr. Chairman, DERA is a win-win program. It supports green American jobs and improves the air quality for all Americans.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, section 1709; however, I want to state for the record I am completely supportive of the program that he spoke of today.

This particular amendment, however, seeks to eliminate funding for the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, a vital public health, environment and infrastructure program that was reauthorized with huge bipartisan support that Representative CALVERT referred to, through a bill I authored last year. That is the purpose of my standing, because I was an author of that bill this year.

DERA is a proven program that improves air quality by reducing diesel emissions. It has strong bipartisan support in both the House and Senate and from a diverse coalition of transportation, health, and environmental organizations.

I thank Congressman MORAN, and I applaud his leadership efforts to protect and preserve our environment and natural resources. He has been a stalwart advocate in the struggle to reduce harmful emissions from antiquated coal-fired power plants and protect green space and green infrastructure. However, today is a rare moment that he and I do not agree.

DERA is a voluntary national and State-level grant and loan program that reduces the diesel emissions by upgrading and modernizing older diesel engines and equipment. For someone like me and my district, this is important. It's the lives of my constituents. By design, it looks to reduce the emissions from 20 million existing diesel engines in use today by as much as 90 percent.

The $50 million designated for DERA is but half of the authorized level and already a 20 percent cut in the program from last year's funding. Although I would say, for the record, that it has not been terminated, it is merely a recommendation by the President at this time.

Eliminating funding entirely would be a huge mistake and cause substantial detriment to the economic health and environmental interests, particularly of communities that are along port areas.

Since DERA funding began in 2007, more than 3,000 projects nationwide have benefited from this program, creating considerable employment opportunities in the area of manufacturing, installation and servicing of emissions-related technology. The bill I authored this last year, which passed in December, will actually amplify job creation further by expanding the program and increasing the number of eligible beneficiaries.

Additionally, DERA is widely considered one of the most cost-effective Federal programs in the Nation. The EPA has estimated that in California alone the program averages more than $13 in health and economic benefits for every $1 that it receives in funding. Projections estimate that nearly 2,000 lives will be saved by 2017 in direct relation to DERA's impact on air quality.

In my district, the positive benefits of DERA are far reaching, home to the two busiest container ports in the United States, the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach. On average, 35,000 trucks commute to and from these ports daily. By the year 2030, this number will be expected to triple. Just imagine for a moment the pollution caused by these vehicles in a single day.

Now, think of those Americans who live along those freight corridors and are exposed to the pollutants on a daily basis. Would you want that for you and your family? In my district, these folks already suffer from asthma and cancer rates far above the national average, and it's documented. Air quality improvements and reductions in emissions are vital to the quality of life and health of these families and countless others throughout the Nation.

I would also like to add that DERA is often mentioned in association with the trucking industry and freight movement. There is another important area where diesel engines are most frequently utilized and where DERA will create a substantial necessary improvement in our public transportation and our school bus system.

These vehicles are vital to the millions of Americans who rely upon them every day to get to work or school. Many of these folks include young children whose lungs and immune systems are still developing and who are especially susceptible to health problems. We owe it to these young people and their families to give the DERA program our full support and see its funding maintained.

DERA has been endorsed by a large coalition of leading environmental health and transportation organizations who also believe in its effectiveness at protecting and creating jobs, promoting healthy economies and healthier citizens. At a time when our future is so heavily dependent upon economic growth, infrastructure investment, and improving the quality of life of average Americans, it seems counterintuitive to cut funding for a program that provides us with so many benefits.

For these reasons, I urge opposition to the amendment, but I seek to work with my colleagues to support other funding to support the program laid out.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to very strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment and associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from southern California.

Before going to that, though, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to express my deep appreciation to both the work of my chairman and his ranking member putting together what I consider to be overall a very, very fine bill. I know of MIKE SIMPSON's concern about those issues that relate to our environment and the interior especially. He is a fabulous chairman, assisted today by a very, very fine young person who is his staff director, not so young as he used to be, Dave LesStrang. But this fine bill also is put together by a cross-section of great staffers who are doing all they can to improve the conditions in which we live.

I rise to oppose this amendment in no small part because KEN CALVERT and I over the years have shared the same problem. We live in a region known as the Inland Empire, and it is surrounded by beautiful, beautiful mountains. It's a wonderful area; but during much of our lifetime, indeed for decades, for 250 days-plus a year you could not see the mountains. How come? It wasn't because of the fog. It was because of 7 million automobiles starting their engines in Los Angeles and that which was spewed out going up against the mountains crystallizing with sunlight creating a thing called air pollution or smog. Indeed, the battle against air quality problems began many, many years ago for us, efforts to create a new standard of regulatory enforcement that would make a difference in the region.

Today, you can see that beautiful valley almost every day of the year because of the progress that we have made in terms of cleaning the emissions from mobile sources. We are very proud of the fact that we've controlled stationary sources. It is easy to point a finger at the big smoke stack and say, Oh, my God, that's the problem. Indeed, we have solved 99 percent of all those emissions, and air quality still is a challenge.

When you come to this question today, we are talking about serious efforts to improve the emissions that come largely from trucks, but diesel-using engines and those emissions have a tremendous impact upon air quality as well.

Over the years, all of our efforts have saved I don't know how many tens of

thousands of lives because we have improved the conditions in which these people have to live and breathe. But to suggest that we ought to begin to break down the progress being made on these engines by way of this relatively easy but, I must say, simplistic kind of transfer is a very, very big mistake.

So, Mr. Chairman, in the strongest way I urge our members to vote ''no'' on this $50 million transfer and recognize it's a lot more important to save the lives of those breathing foul air than to give a pittance to a very important environmental problem.

□ 1710

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1710. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation'' shall be $4,430,000.

SEC. 1711. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Multinational Species Conservation Fund'' shall be $7,875,000.

SEC. 1712. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, State and Tribal Wildlife Grants'' shall be $0.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I was very disappointed that the committee zeroed out the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program. I think this has been a great program that has helped the States do plans on how they can use their habitat to protect endangered species. This is the kind of work that is necessary so that we don't get future listings.

I know my friend from Idaho and others are concerned about the Endangered Species Act and the number of listings, and we will talk more about that later, but this was a very important program and one that I as chairman strongly supported and actually created.

So I just want to mention that I hope in conference we can at least maintain some level of funding for this program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1713. Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this division, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on April 2, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 15123 et seq.) without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule. Such reissuance (including this section) shall not be subject to judicial review.

AMENDMENT NO. 194 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 266, strike line 12 and insert ''on February 27, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 10514 et seq.) without''.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank you personally, as well as your colleague from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and also Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS of Washington, for your work on this amendment.

The continuing resolution as written would reinstate a 2009 Fish and Wildlife determination that the gray wolf in Montana and Idaho should be removed from the endangered species list. This amendment would replace that 2009 determination with an earlier-approved Fish and Wildlife determination, the one made in 2008, and that expands the scope of delisting of the gray wolf to include the full range of the Northern Rockies wolf.

Mr. Chairman, after gray wolves were introduced in 1995 into Yellowstone National Park in my home State and placed on the endangered species list under section 10(j), which is the nonessential experimental population section of the Endangered Species Act, a list was determined about what it would take to recover the species, when would we consider it recovered, and it was determined by experts at the time that the recovery would be complete if the population of wolves grew to 300 wolves with at least 30 breeding pairs. That was the target, that was the goal, 300 wolves, 30 breeding pairs.

So how many wolves are there today, Mr. Chairman? Here we are, 16 years later. There are more than 1,600 wolves and 113 breeding pairs. By every reasonable definition, the wolf has recovered, and yet these wolves remain on the endangered species list. They remain protected, even as they overwhelm and decimate other wild game herds. For example, in the Grovont, the moose population in terms of young calves has declined 90 percent, 90 percent, and it is due to wolf depredation.

Wolves remain protected in each State because of court determinations, not because of science, and it is now time to be honest about the wolf and its recovery. Its continued inclusion on the endangered species list has everything to do with special interests and emotion and nothing to do with science. Organizations that repeatedly sue the government at taxpayer expense orchestrate these strategies and make people believe that the wolf is not recovered. The simple truth is the wolf is doing very well.

Lest anyone be confused, my amendment will not create an open season on wolves. It will return management of the wolf populations back to the States, and they are the ones who suffer the effects of the wolves. It will allow for appropriate management of wolf herds, wolf herds by any definition, that have fully recovered.

So it is time to be honest. It is time to delist.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, ''an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment imposes additional duties beyond what is legislatively authorized.

So I now ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there any other Member who wishes to speak to this point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment imposes new duties on the Secretary to reissue a different final rule than is required to be reissued by the pending section. The amendment therefore constitutes additional legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1714. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Operation of the National Park System'' shall be $2,237,674,000.

SEC. 1715. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Park Partnership Project Grants'' shall be $0 and the matters pertaining to such account in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1716. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Recreation and Preservation'' shall be $57,829,000, of which $0 shall be for projects authorized by section 7302 of Public Law 111–11.

SEC. 1717. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Historic Preservation Fund'' shall be $54,500,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$25,000,000'': *Provided further*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1718. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior,

National Park Service, Construction'' shall be $171,713,000: *Provided*, That the last proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 and in prior appropriation Acts, $1,000,000 is rescinded from amounts made available for the (now completed) project at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina, and $1,000,000 is rescinded from amounts made available for the (now completed) project at Blue Ridge Parkway, North Carolina, and such unobligated balances are reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That no less than $23,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1719. The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2011 by 16 U.S.C. 460l–10a is rescinded.

SEC. 1720. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Land Acquisition and State Assistance'' shall be $14,100,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$0'' for ''$40,000,000''; and by substituting ''$0'' for ''$9,000,000'': *Provided further*, That no less than $3,400,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division: *Provided further*, That section 113 of division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1721. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey, Surveys, Investigations, and Research'' shall be $1,086,163,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$53,500,000'' for ''$40,150,000''; and by substituting ''$4,807,000'' for ''$7,321,000''.

SEC. 1722. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Royalty and Offshore Minerals Management'' shall be $239,478,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$109,494,000'' for ''$89,374,000''; and by substituting ''$154,890,000'' for ''$156,730,000'' each place it appears.

SEC. 1723. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Oil Spill Research'' shall be $10,632,000.

SEC. 1724. During fiscal year 2011, the Secretary of the Interior, in order to implement a reorganization of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, may establish accounts and transfer funds among and between the offices and bureaus affected by the reorganization only in conformance with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations reprogramming guidelines described in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying Public Law 111–88.

□ 1720

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we're fortunate that the new Republican majority brought their proposal before this Congress the day after President Obama submitted his budget plan for next year. We are fortunate because it gives the American people the opportunity to compare very different approaches.

The President's budget is tough but it is responsible. It's tough because it cuts non-security discretionary spending by $400 billion over the next decade to the lowest share of the economy since the Eisenhower administration. It's responsible because it steadily reduces the deficit while making targeted investments in areas like education, clean energy, infrastructure, and scientific innovation—investments that will strengthen our economy and make sure America wins the future in a competitive global marketplace.

One of those key areas of investment the President has proposed is infrastructure. The American Society of Civil Engineers—hardly a left-wing group—issued a report card on the state of America's deteriorating infrastructure. They gave us practically failing grades—mostly Ds and D-minuses—for the state of our roads, schools, transit, and drinking water—not grades that we would want our kids to bring home from school.

So I'm very pleased that the President has announced that he wants to make critical investments in this area. As reported yesterday in USA Today, using the analysis of the Associated General Contractors—again, not a liberal group—his plan could create about 5.4 million construction jobs and 10 million more jobs in related industries in the broader economy. At a time when the construction industry is facing over 20 percent unemployment, those are exactly the kinds of smart investments that will help grow our economy. This proposal and this investment is supported by a diverse range of groups, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the AFL–CIO.

The President's tough and balanced approach stands in stark contrast to the proposal we're seeing on the floor today. The proposal that we're talking about today, with very immediate and deep cuts, is a reckless approach when too many families are struggling to make ends meet, and it will do virtually nothing to address our long-term structural deficit.

The Economic Policy Institute found that the proposal before this House today would likely put 800,000 Americans out of work. Indeed, that's why the bipartisan commission charged with reducing our deficits and debt, along with the bipartisan Domenici-Rivlin Commission, recommended against taking deep, immediate cuts. Yes, they're coming together now to put together a plan to reduce the deficit in a stable way. No, to immediate deep cuts that could hurt a very fragile economy.

Let me read you exactly what the bipartisan commission on deficit and debts reduction said. ''In order to avoid shocking the fragile economy, the Commission recommends waiting until 2012 to begin enacting programmatic spending cuts.'' In other words, below the CR level. And that's exactly what the President's budget does.

Why should we cut essential investments in Head Start and in education rather than eliminate huge taxpayer subsidies to the oil industry? In fact, just today, the GAO came out with a report talking about the huge bonanza oil companies are getting for lack of royalty payments on many of their lands.

Just yesterday, in the Budget Committee, we had the OMB director, Jack Lew, testify. Mr. Lew reminded us that the last time he had testified before the Budget Committee was when he had served as the OMB Director for President Clinton. When he left office, he left the country with a $45.6 trillion surplus and an economy that during that 8-year period added 20.8 million private sector jobs. Unfortunately, we know the end of the movie. Those huge surpluses were squandered. The previous administration to this one, the Bush administration, cut taxes for the very wealthy. And, through a number of other policy actions, turned a $5.6 trillion surplus into a sea of deficits. By the end of that 8-year period, 653,000 private sector jobs were eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will oppose this approach and accept the approach the President has presented.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1725. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian Programs'' shall be $2,336,865,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$220,000,000'' for ''$166,000,000''; by substituting ''$585,779,000'' for ''$568,702,000''; and by substituting ''$46,129,000'' for ''$43,373,000''.

SEC. 1726. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Construction'' shall be $216,100,000.

SEC. 1727. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians'' shall be $46,480,000, of which $0 shall be for the matter pertaining to Public Law 109–379.

SEC. 1728. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $117,336,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$10,636,000'' for ''$12,136,000''.

SEC. 1729. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Insular Affairs, Assistance to Territories'' shall be $78,516,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$69,590,000'' for ''$75,915,000''; and by substituting ''$8,926,000'' for ''$9,280,000''.

SEC. 1730. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior,

Departmental Offices, Insular Affairs, Compact of Free Association'' shall be $5,422,000: *Provided*, That $2,104,000 of such funds shall be available for section 122 of division A of Public Law 111–88.

SEC. 1731. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Office of the Solicitor, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $64,845,000.

SEC. 1732. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Office of Inspector General, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $48,389,000.

SEC. 1733. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Departmental Offices, Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, Federal Trust Programs'' shall be $168,115,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88, as amended by Public Law 111–212, shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$31,534,000'' for ''$47,536,000''.

SEC. 1734. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Department-wide Programs, Wildland Fire Management'' shall be $769,897,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$150,000,000'' for ''$125,000,000''.

SEC. 1735. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Department-wide Programs, Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund'' shall be $6,320,000.

SEC. 1736. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of the Interior, Department-wide Programs, Working Capital Fund'' shall be $80,119,000.

SEC. 1737. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, Science and Technology'' shall be $790,510,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 376 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 273, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $64,100,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $64,100,000)''.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to reduce the EPA's Science and Technology account by $64 million. It transfers the money into the Spending Reduction Account. Sixty-four million dollars is the level of the agency's astronomically expensive Science to Achieve Results, or STAR program, funded in fiscal year 2010. It's the intent of this amendment to zero out this costly program for the rest of the year, something that due to procedural limitations will be accomplished by supporting the cut to the account's top line for that purpose and the agency's operational plan that will come forth in 2011.

According to the EPA, the STAR program is the agency's primary grants program for funding extramural research in environmental science and engineering. In a recent press release, the EPA boasts that the taxpayer-backed awards ''ensure the best science is being used to protect the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land we build our communities on.'' What it doesn't mention is that these grants average 3 years and about $1 million.

□ 1730

This program was funded at roughly $60 million last year, and the President requested $87 million for it in fiscal year 2011. I believe the committee used $50 million as an assumed funding level based on this CR for the rest of the year.

Don't get me wrong. If we were printing money in a basement and if we had plenty of it, this may be something we'd want to spend some money on. I'm sure something good comes out of it, but we're not in that situation now. We have a debt of $14 trillion, and we have an annual deficit now of $1.5 trillion. When we're funding research like this, just out of an account to give to grad students, I think it's time to question whether or not this is the time we should do this or not.

Not all of the grants that are issued, obviously, are used for good research. It's not all above reproach. For example, here are just a couple of the reports that we've received for the research that was done on these topics:

Environmental Regulation and Productivity Benefits in the Paper Industry;

Estimating Ownership and Use of Older Cars;

Transforming Office Parks into Transit Villages;

Public Opinion on Environment and Water Quality Management in the New York City Watershed;

Ironically, there is a study on Experimental Programs to Stimulate Competitive Research.

I thought that's what this program does.

I've often talked about a lot of the earmarks we used to have that were just simply earmark incubators that begot more earmarks. It seems that some of the funding for studies like these are studies that beget further studies.

If we can't move in now and say, hey, maybe we ought to slim back a little and save a little money for the taxpayer—remember, the money saved here will go into the spending reduction account and can be applied against this year's deficit—then we have to ask ourselves:

How can we go back to our constituents and explain, ''Sorry, that $50 million was better spent giving out research dollars to study experimental programs to stimulate competitive research or to transform office parks into transit villages or for public opinion on the environment and water quality management in the New York City watershed or for environmental regulation and productivity benefits in the paper industry?''

Let's say to the taxpayer that we are serious here, that we are serious about this debt and this deficit. Let's vote for this amendment and put $50 million into the spending reduction account.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, the scale of this reduction to EPA science shuts down EPA's STAR research grants this year and next, affecting researchers in universities throughout the Nation. The Science to Achieve Results program, whose acronym is STAR, grants money to leverage innovative, cutting-edge research with universities across the Nation.

Now, I don't know about the way they have titled some of these grants, but I suspect that the gentleman doesn't know much more than I do about the specific grant itself, other than the title.

What I do know is that this amendment ends funding for the Children's Health Research Centers, which focus on the study of children's environmental health hazards, including asthma and exposure to chemicals.

It ends funding for research for four EPA air research centers that focus on the health effects of air pollutants on all ages of Americans, especially the most physically vulnerable and those in smog-laden communities.

It ends funding for EPA's groundbreaking computational toxicology research effort, which enables us to screen literally thousands of chemicals at one time. I've seen how this works, and it's extraordinarily productive and cost-efficient. It screens chemicals for environmental health hazards, and it saves millions of dollars in the process. These innovative and cost-saving tools also offer the potential to greatly reduce our dependence on animal testing.

The amendment ends funding for critical research to assess risks of nanotechnology and to develop approaches to ensure the safe development of nano materials.

The amendment also wipes out EPA's STAR academic research fellowships program, affecting 350 current and future fellows and creating real economic hardship in the midst of our depressed economy. Cutting funding for the STAR fellows program eliminates the opportunity to develop the future generation of the best scientific minds to address 21st century environmental problems with new and innovative scientific and technological solutions.

Now, it's not the end of the world, but it will be the end of a program that works very well—a program that recruits, trains, and integrates some of the very best minds in preserving and protecting our environment.

So, for those reasons, I would urge the rejection of this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the CR, we have already proposed deep cuts with tough choices. In the Interior and Environmental section, we have proposed to cut $4.4 billion and to eliminate 26 different programs.

The STAR program competitively funds research grants and graduate fellowships in numerous environmental science and engineering disciplines.

I would note, as the gentleman from Arizona knows, that this is competitively awarded in that they actually, as I said, compete for these.

The EPA receives approximately 2,000 to 2,500 proposals each year, and it funds about 150 research grants and 125 graduate fellowships.

I'd be a little leery about coming down here and just naming off the title of what a research project is and then saying that it's silly, because I don't know. I don't know exactly what they're trying to do with some of these things. You actually need to dig into it and find out what they're trying to find out with some of these research grants.

A few years ago, some people did this with, I think it was, the National Academy of Sciences research grants. I can remember some of my colleagues brought down amendments to defund this research grant or that research grant. One of them was to defund a research grant on studying brown fat in panda bears.

Of course, we all on the floor went, Wow, that sounds silly. Why are we studying brown fat in panda bears? Can't we actually study brown fat in American bears?

When I called the National Academy of Sciences, what I found is that who supported that research was NASA, because, if you're ever going to do deep space research, you need to know something about brown fat. Guess what animal has more brown fat than any other animal on Earth? Panda bears. That's why they were doing it.

So just to look at the title of a research project is kind of a silly way to propose eliminating it and making fun of the program. Some of them may be silly—I don't know—but I know these are peer-reviewed, that they actually are competitively granted, and that the gentleman from Arizona has always been concerned that we give earmarks that are not competitively granted. Here we have a program that is competitively granted, so that seems, to me, to be the right way to do it.

Like many other EPA programs, the CR reduces the STAR grant funding. We did so by applying a $10 million reduction to fund the grants at $51 million in the CR, which is $8 million below the 2008 level. Therefore, while we understand the intent of the amendment is to eliminate all funding for the STAR grants, there is no longer $61.4 million in the CR to reduce for STAR grants, and other research programs would need to be reduced based on the way the amendment has been drafted.

In addition, I believe we must maintain our scientific competitiveness as we work to bring our fiscal house in order, and zeroing out this program, I don't believe, is in the best interest of our country or that it is the right thing to do.

This is a program that we should—and will—discuss on the record with the EPA during the 2012 budget hearings, and we will either build the case for further reductions or an elimination of the program, or we will have a better understanding of why we should look elsewhere for additional cuts.

Therefore, I recommend my colleagues vote ''no'' on this amendment given that it would unintentionally cut the EPA's research by more than that which is in the CR for the STAR grants and given that we will be taking a look at this during our hearings. The gentleman sits on the committee, and will be, obviously, involved as we have the EPA before us for our oversight hearings.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1740

AMENDMENT NO. 407 OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 273, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1738. The Environmental Protection Agency is directed to enter into a contract, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, with the National Academy of Sciences to perform a comprehensive review of non-mercury hazardous air pollutants emitted by electric generating units and industrial boilers, and related health and economic data (including impacts on job creation and energy price, supply, and reliability) associated with potential regulation of such non-mercury hazardous air pollutants. The National Academy of Sciences shall prepare recommendations on appropriate regulatory standards for addressing non-mercury hazardous air pollutants and shall establish appropriate health-based exposure standards for such emissions. Upon completion of the study, the National Academy of Sciences shall report findings and recommendations to the Environmental Protection Agency and the Congress within 24 months of entering into the contract. The Environmental Protection Agency is discouraged from issuing any regulatory determination for non-mercury hazardous air pollutants, including a maximum achievable control technology standard for non-mercury hazardous air pollutants from electric generating units and industrial boilers, until the Environmental Protection Agency fully reviews the results and recommendations of such study.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment directing the United States Environmental Protection Agency to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to perform a comprehensive review of non-mercury hazardous air pollutants emitted by electric generating units and industrial boilers, recognizing the boiler maximum achievable control technology, called MACT, is moving toward the end of the rulemaking process while the utility MACT will debut soon.

My amendment requires that the review provide for health and economic data, including impacts on job creation, energy price, supply and reliability associated with the potential regulation of non-mercury hazardous air pollutants.

The Clean Air Act regulates two kinds of air emissions: criteria pollutants, which are high in volume; and hazardous air pollutants, which are low in volume but can be toxic.

Folks are familiar with the most noteworthy of the hazardous air pollutants for utilities and industrial boilers, mercury. Let me be clear, my amendment does nothing to affect mercury controls. The amendment focuses only on those hazardous air pollutants other than mercury. EPA simply fails to do all the necessary homework when it comes to potential regulation of hazardous air pollutants other than mercury.

This amendment asks the National Academy of Sciences to assist EPA in doing its homework and encourages EPA to listen and encourages EPA to learn. This will assist EPA in establishing a clear and direct administrative record for non-mercury hazardous air pollutants; and without adequate study, regulations in this area could place jobs and economic output at risk, while threatening household budgets.

The power sector faces an avalanche of regulations from EPA, and it's important to get each of them right and correct. A recent executive order laid out a new review process for regulations and asked that the agencies consider costs and how best to reduce burdens for American businesses and consumers.

The amendment echoes the need for responsible regulations that protect health and environment but also provide for reasonable rates and dates.

The EPA maximum achievable control technology rule for industrial commercial and institutional boilers and process heaters could impose tens of billions of dollars in capital costs at thousands of facilities across the country.

I, along with a large number of my colleagues, sent a letter to EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson expressing our concerns with the proposed rule. It's my understanding that although the boiler MACT rule will come out later this week, upon reconsideration of the rule, the information gathered by the review required under this amendment may be useful.

I remain concerned as EPA moves toward a utility MACT rule. Logically, I bring this amendment to the floor today to protect a simple way of thinking. The government should not regulate without sound science to back it up. Let's remind EPA to slow down and allow for reasoning along with regulation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern of the gentleman from Texas, and we pledge to work with him as the EPA comes before our committee to address this issue, but I must insist on my point of order.

I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law. This amendment gives affirmative action in effect.

I ask for a ruling by the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? Seeing none, the Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

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

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

Mr. LUJÁN. I rise today in opposition to the drastic cuts in this continuing resolution and the amendments that make further cuts that threaten to weaken our economy and destroy jobs.

It is critical that while we face growing budget constraints we do not shortchange investments that will create jobs or provide vital services that New Mexicans rely on.

Unfortunately, many of the cuts proposed in this bill and in a number of amendments would negatively impact our communities in New Mexico. For example, in the wake of the natural gas outages that left thousands of homes across the State without heat, this bill cuts the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program that helps working families, senior citizens, and disabled individuals heat their homes.

At a time when New Mexico needs critical investments in education so that we can prepare our children to be the next generation of leaders, the House Republican plan makes drastic cuts to education at all levels. Beginning with early education, Republicans cut the Head Start program, which helps build a strong foundation for New Mexico's children. The bill also cuts programs that help poor school districts. With more than one-third of New Mexico's students failing to graduate from high school, we must do more, not less, to ensure our children succeed. In addition, the Republican bill cuts Pell Grants that our young adults rely on to help make college more affordable.

Arbitrary cuts to New Mexico's national labs that are contained in this bill will hinder their ability to promote U.S. competitiveness and job creation.

We're ending our ability to win the race before we can even begin. Instead of making these cuts, we need to outpace the competition. We need to outeducate and out-innovate the rest of the world in order to grow our economy and put people back to work right here in New Mexico.

And as we debate the proposed amendments in this section of the bill, I am extremely concerned with amendments that will be proposed today that make cuts to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In New Mexico, we take pride in our beautiful landscapes and the protection of our water. The LWCF has helped to protect dozens of New Mexico icons, including Tent Rocks National Monument, Valles Caldera National Preserve, Rio Grande River Gorge, Santa Fe National Forest, and Petroglyphs National Monument, just to name a few.

These attacks on the Land and Water Conservation Fund would eliminate a bipartisan program that has existed for 45 years by preventing revenues deposited in the LWCF account from being used for their authorized purposes, such as protecting public lands and promoting recreation.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was established by Congress in 1964 as a bipartisan conservation offset for offshore oil and gas drilling. Under current law, Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases and royalty receipts are deposited in a dedicated LWCF account in the Treasury. However, only a fraction of the annual receipts deposited in the LWCF have been appropriated, despite a surplus of over $17 billion.

In New Mexico, outdoor recreation is an integral part of the economy, and I know when I visit with many of our colleagues here in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, everyone is eager to get out to New Mexico. The Outdoor Industry Association reports that recreation contributes about $730 billion annually to the U.S. economy, supports nearly 6.5 million jobs across the country, and generates $88 billion in annual State and national tax revenues.

A recent study by The Trust for Public Land found that every $1 invested in the LWCF returns $4 in economic value. Protecting the Land and Water Conservation Fund will expand opportunities for all Americans to have access to parks and natural areas for outdoor recreation and for hunting.

Protecting the Land and Water Conservation Fund has immediate relevance to our efforts to create jobs in this country, and it is critically important that we ensure funding for this important Federal program is protected, while also working together to find a permanent solution to LWCF funding shortfalls over the long term.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these amendments and vote ''no'' on this shortsighted spending bill that will hurt families and put more people out of work. While Republicans say, So be it, to chopping American jobs, the people of New Mexico deserve better.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1738. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Programs and Management'' shall be $2,571,099,000: *Provided*, That of the funds included under this heading $305,784,000 shall be for the Geographic Programs specified in the explanatory statement accompanying Public Law 111–88: *Provided further*, That of such amount for Geographic Programs, $225,000,000 shall be for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative; $40,000,000 shall be for Chesapeake Bay; and $20,000,000 shall be for Puget Sound.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 273, line 6, insert ''(reduced by $8,458,000)'' after the aggregate dollar amount.

On page 359, line 13, insert ''(increased by $8,458,000)'' after the dollar amount.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to return just under $8.5 million to the United States taxpayers by sending $8.5 million to the deficit reduction account.

□ 1750

In November, America elected a different set of leaders to this House of Representatives. They elected a set of leaders who understand job creation. But the EPA has not gotten the message. This Congress has refused to pass cap-and-trade and yet EPA continues down the road to try to implement cap-and-trade through regulations when there is no statutory authority to do so, and it's beyond its constitutional powers.

My amendment takes on only one very costly piece of the EPA's effort to destroy jobs, the Greenhouse Gas Registry. I'm not against bridal registries or even the registration of property

deeds, but forcing businesses to comply with these unnecessary and burdensome regulations will destroy jobs in Kansas and all across America. This registry drives up the cost of doing business all with the asserted mission of satisfying the left's obsession with regulating every nook and cranny of our existence.

Now EPA would, I'm sure, tell you that they are simply collecting a little bit of data on greenhouse gases, that this registry is just a very innocent effort to learn a little bit more about who is emitting greenhouse gases, who or what. But this data is the very foundation of the EPA's effort to pursue its radical anti-jobs agenda. Indeed, continuing the Greenhouse Gas Registry at currently funded levels will permit the EPA regulatory nose inside the job-destroying tent. We cannot head down this path.

The amendment I am proposing is very modest. In 2006, the registry had $3.2 million appropriated. That was increased to almost $16 million. I'm simply trying to roll back the amount of money that this registry has to 2008 already bloated levels.

Mr. Chairman, until about 45 days ago, I was in the private sector. I was running a small business. I can attest to you that this Greenhouse Gas Registry, an attempt to implement cap-and-tax, will destroy jobs in Kansas; it will increase the cost of manufacturing for every Kansas airplane manufacturer; it will increase the cost of energy for every Kansas farmer, and it will increase the cost of energy for every Kansas family.

With unemployment at record levels and energy prices already high, America cannot afford this additional government mandate, and our taxpayers would be well served by reducing the funding to this misguided Greenhouse Gas Registry. Please join me in rolling back to 2008 levels the amount of funds appropriated for the Greenhouse Gas Registry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in opposition to the Pompeo amendment which would basically strip all funding from EPA's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program. It's part of an effort to ignore what scientists tell us is the most serious environmental problem of our time—climate change.

Some Republicans have introduced legislation that would repeal a scientific finding that greenhouse gases pose a danger to human health. The underlying bill we're considering says that no stationary source no matter how large should ever have to reduce its carbon pollution. This amendment goes even further. It says that we should not even bother to find out how much pollution is being put into our air. I guess you could call it the ''ignorance is bliss'' amendment.

The Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program simply requires the largest sources of carbon pollution—power plants, refineries, and the very largest factories—to tell EPA and the public how much they pollute. If we are ever going to deal responsibly with this pollution, we need to know where it is coming from and have some idea of how much is being emitted.

This amendment is yet one more example of putting profits and pollution ahead of people and public health.

Americans understand that pollution is dangerous to their health. The scientists tell us that. We know it intuitively. It makes us sick. Let's allow EPA to fulfill its legal responsibility to collect this information.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose the Pompeo amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chair, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas, one of our new Members, Mr. POMPEO, for not only a thoughtful amendment but an amendment when he is jumping right into the fray some 45 days after he has assumed office here. I think I was here for about 2 years before I even gave my first floor speech. So congratulations to him.

Sadly, however, we have to oppose your amendment. This was an account that the committee and the staff looked at hard as the CR was being prepared. It has been reduced by $5 million in the continuing resolution. It was at $16 million. It's down to $11 million in the CR. The feeling continues to be that cutting it further would be irresponsible because cutting the funding does nothing to change the mandate that's in the law of March 31 of this year that the industry has to report their emissions by that date.

Since this is the first time through this reporting requirement, there are obviously a lot of questions that businesses and industries all across the country have, and they are calling the EPA for technical assistance on how to be in compliance. If the program is reduced, as the gentleman's amendment would suggest, it will leave companies high and dry with a reporting requirement with no one on the other end to answer the telephone to help them out to meet their obligations. Considering that, we have felt that we could achieve the $5 million in savings now.

And I can tell the gentleman that it's at least a majority of the committee's feeling that we will review and address this issue in a more comprehensive manner as we proceed with the 2012 budget. As such, I recommend that our colleagues vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1739. The matter pertaining to planning and design of a high-performance green building to consolidate the multiple offices and research facilities of the Environmental Protection Agency in Las Vegas, Nevada under the heading ''Environmental Protection Agency, Buildings and Facilities'' in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1740. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund'' shall be $1,273,765,000: *Provided*, That the matter under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$1,273,765,000'' for ''$1,306,541,000'' the second place it appears; by substituting ''September 30, 2010'' for ''September 30, 2009''; and by substituting ''$24,527,000'' for ''$26,834,000''.

SEC. 1741. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program'' shall be $106,101,000, of which $71,671,000 shall be for carrying out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6991b(h)).

SEC. 1742. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants'' shall be $2,716,446,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$690,000,000'' for ''$2,100,000,000''; by substituting ''$830,000,000'' for ''$1,387,000,000''; by substituting ''$10,000,000'' for ''$17,000,000''; by substituting ''$10,000,000'' for ''$13,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$156,777,000''; by substituting ''$70,000,000'' for ''$100,000,000''; by substituting ''$50,000,000'' for ''$60,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$20,000,000''; and by substituting ''$1,056,446,000'' for ''$1,116,446,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 379 OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 274, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 274, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment.

But before I talk about that, I want to say that I am proud to be a part of this process. Last night, I heard one of my colleagues say that what we should do is, because the President threatened to veto this process at the end of the

day, we should pack it up, go in the back room and try to resolve our differences there.

To me, this is what the process was all about, to have this debate on the floor of the House so that we can have an open and vigorous debate about these spending issues because, ladies and gentlemen, today we face a national crisis, and that national crisis is a national debt that is going to destroy us as a nation and destroy it for our children and our grandchildren. So I am proud today to stand up and say that we need to shine the light on every aspect of every dollar that is spent in our Federal budget.

And today I rise to ask that we rescind and amend the continuing resolution to remove $10 million of spending on a sewer project in Tijuana, Mexico. When we are borrowing 40 cents on every dollar on the backs of our children and our grandchildren, I ask the question: Why are we spending $10 million so that a sewer could be constructed in Tijuana, Mexico?

□ 1800

Now, I understand and I empathize with my friends from San Diego and that area where waste apparently washes on the shore from Tijuana because they're not acting responsibly with their matters.

But I say this: today it is to hold the country of Mexico accountable for the situation in Tijuana. And rather than use our dollars, our borrowed dollars that are being absorbed by our children and grandchildren, we hold them accountable. And I think this is exactly what we should be doing and standing and calling out this kind of wasteful spending, in my opinion.

And I am proud and ask that my colleagues join me in approving this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chair, again, as with Mr. POMPEO's amendment, the gentleman from Kansas, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) is also a new Member of the body, and I commend him for coming to the floor and offering this thoughtful amendment.

For those of us who have been here a little while, the seat which Mr. REED holds used to belong to our dear friend Amo Houghton, who was a friend and a champion for many issues for many years in this body.

And although we welcome Mr. REED to our company, we oppose his amendment. In the CR we have reduced the U.S.-Mexico border program by $7 million from $17 million in 2010 to $10 million in the continuing resolution. It's a 41 percent decrease. This action taken on behalf of the committee reduces the CR level to a level below the increase that was added in 2010 by the previous majority party, over and above President Obama's request.

This is a program that we plan to have active discussions on with the EPA during the 2012 budget hearings, and we'll either build the case for further reductions, or we will have a better understanding of why we should look elsewhere for additional cuts based upon programmatic needs.

Therefore, while I congratulate my friend and new colleague from New York, I recommend that our colleagues vote ''no'' on this amendment, given that we have achieved what we intended to achieve via the CR, and that is to take the necessary first step at past programmatic increases and allow for a deliberative process in 2012 to examine the true needs of this program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 415 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 275, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 274, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,816,446,000)''.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that a point of order is reserved and, of course, I have the amendment as modified with language that would ensure that the amendment is budget neutral. I would ask unanimous consent for the modified amendment that is at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the modification of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Idaho has reserved a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before you takes rescinded funds, increases the amount of State Trouble Assistance Grants to make sure that we can really fund our water and sewer infrastructure. The continuing resolution really deals a death low to our water and sewer infrastructure in this country. That means jobs all across the country in every single State.

I would ask support of the amendment and note that in April 2000, the Water Infrastructure Network released its first report, ''Clean and Safe Water for the 21st Century,'' and that report documented significant improvements in water quality and public health that was associated with America's investments in water and wastewater infrastructure.

But it also documented unprecedented financial problems. Over the next 20 years, America's water and wastewater systems will have to invest $23 billion a year more than current investments to meet the national environmental and public health priorities in the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act to replace aging and failing infrastructure.

The epidemic isn't isolated. Eroded infrastructure is prominent in every neighborhood across this country; and nationwide, wastewater infrastructure needs range from $300 billion to $400 billion over the next 20 years. My home State of Maryland has self-reported that it has an $8.4 billion deficit in water infrastructure needs.

Just last month, out in my district on a cold winter morning, not far from Capitol Hill, a 54-inch water main broke that created massive destruction, overturned cars, destroyed businesses, and left residents like me without safe drinking water for days. It stopped the traffic along the Nation's beltway. The trucks that travel up and down the eastern seaboard were stopped, stopping commerce along the way. This happens all across the country. We've had at least 278 water main breaks just since January 1 in the counties that I represent.

I would note that under the continuing resolution, States like Maryland would lose $33 million in funding, 937 jobs in States like Idaho, for example. In that State alone, there would be a loss of $6.9 million and 192 jobs, and this at a time when we need to do real job creation.

Overall, the continuing resolution would see a loss of about at least $1.4 billion in funds from wastewater and water treatment, to the tune of 39,253 jobs at a time when the economy is really staggering.

So I would strongly urge consideration of this amendment; and whether or not it's done in this continuing resolution, the fact is that our water infrastructure is failing. It's failing all across the country. We have needs that are unmet. Local communities cannot meet those needs, and it's really incumbent upon us to improve the Nation's water infrastructure so that we improve our competitiveness and we ensure that we have clean drinking water.

I would not like any other community across the country to have to do what I've done three times just during this last year, that is, boiling every single bit of water that I use because of our failing infrastructure. And this isn't just about my community in

Maryland. It's about communities across the country.

And I think if anything, in this continuing resolution we need to be thinking about economic development and job creation. And the resolution in front of us does exactly the opposite. It takes millions of dollars away from communities for wastewater and water infrastructure and ensures that we won't be competitive over this next century. So I would urge strong consideration of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I continue to reserve my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho continues to reserve a point of order.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to be on the record strongly agreeing with the concept of the gentlewoman's amendment, to add $200 million to State and local grants.

Our congressional districts are on either side of the Potomac River. We can also see the Blue Plains sewage treatment plant from Maryland and Virginia.

Now, we've made strides thanks to Federal funding in cleaning up the Potomac River, which all of us can see, and most of us cross every day; but much work still lies ahead.

This bill's cuts to State and local infrastructure grants will undermine the progress that we have made on this river and will cripple hundreds of State and local government efforts throughout the country.

The Republican bill slashes the clean water and safe drinking water State revolving funds by $2 billion, or 56 percent, reducing the number of wastewater and drinking water projects by about 750 nationwide.

□ 1810

The needs of our Nation's aging water infrastructure exceed $660 billion. This would also be a missed opportunity to add thousands of engineering, construction, and other support service jobs if we cut these programs. Additionally, the bill includes an undesignated $300 million rescission to EPA already that will most likely also impact these revolving funds.

So the gentlewoman's amendment does have great merit. Albeit technically it may be out of order, it should be offered because it addresses a very important problem with this continuing resolution. It should be accepted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on my point of order.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase a rescission to offset an increase in an appropriation. And I would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must propose only to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland proposes also another kind of change in the bill, namely, to increase the amount of a rescission, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment is out of order.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) would be willing to engage in a colloquy with me concerning the climate change provision in the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I want to ask the gentleman, first of all, if he could explain section 1746 of the bill to me.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to.

Section 1746 hits the pause button on the EPA's efforts to regulate greenhouse gas emissions because of what I think are unfounded fears about global climate change.

As the chairman knows, and as the gentleman from Kentucky knows, over the last 2 years, EPA Administrator Jackson has been very busy creating an enormous body of regulations on greenhouse gas emissions. These regulations will cost jobs, drive up energy costs, and further imperil the American economy.

EPA's greenhouse gas regulations need to be stopped in their tracks, and that's what section 1746 does. It provides a time-out for the balance of this fiscal year, during which time EPA will be prohibited from acting on them or enforcing them.

Section 1746 is intended to put a halt to the regulations that we feel will harm this economy. It is not intended to affect permitting or other matters unrelated to greenhouse gas emissions such as construction starts or permit approvals.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I thank the gentleman, and I do agree with you wholeheartedly.

I might add that Congress and the U.S. Senate have specifically addressed this issue on three separate occasions, and on every one of those three occasions have said ''no'' to EPA regulation.

I might also add that last week we had a hearing with Administrator Jackson, and Mr. GREEN, our colleague from Texas on the Democratic side, asked her a question. He said: My question is this. What happens if only the United States acts to reduce these emissions while major emitters like China or India do not take action, do not follow suit? Can we really address climate change without strong mandatory reductions by other major emitters around the world?

And Ms. Jackson, the Administrator of the EPA, said: We will not ultimately be able to change the amount of CO_2 that is accumulating in the atmosphere alone.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, that EPA's regulations will lead to higher costs for the coal industry, the oil industry, and natural gas industries that comprise 85 percent of America's energy mix, burdening both individuals and businesses and, most important of all, destroying jobs.

So let me ask the gentleman. Is this a debate about global warming science?

Mr. SIMPSON. No. It's not even necessary to be a climate change skeptic to be an EPA greenhouse gas regulations skeptic. These regulations are all economic pain for little, if any, environmental gain.

EPA can only regulate American companies, and we know that China already emits more carbon dioxide than we do. Its rate of emissions growth is many times faster than ours, and the Chinese Government has repeatedly made clear that they will never impose such job-destroying regulatory measures on themselves. Even Administrator Lisa Jackson, as you said, has concluded that unilateral action would have little or negligible impact on further temperatures.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

I do want to mention that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has released a discussion draft on exactly this same issue, called the Energy Tax Prevention Act, that would block EPA's global warming agenda under the Clean Air Act.

The bill does not weaken the Clean Air Act, however. It would have no effect on the agency's ongoing efforts to deal with smog, soot, lead, mercury, and all the other pollutants that have been addressed under the Clean Air Act. It is simply a bill to stop the agency and bureaucrats from issuing regulations absent congressional approval.

As our former chairman JOHN DINGELL said, avoiding the glorious mess is what we would be doing, because the Clean Air Act was never designed to regulate greenhouse gases.

As it is, EPA's global warming regulatory agenda, which is just beginning to roll out, is so open-ended that it is already having a chilling effect on investment and job creation. The longer it moves forward, the more domestic manufacturing jobs will be forced overseas to countries not similarly burdened.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. When do you expect Congress to act on the Energy Tax Prevention Act?

Mr. WHITFIELD. We have already had our first hearing, which was on February 9. We have heard from a wide range of industries about the job creation issue, and I expect that we will be moving this legislation within the next month and a half.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, in light of the last colloquy, I find it necessary to make a few points about this underlying bill.

It contains language that stops EPA from limiting greenhouse gas emissions for the term of the continuing resolution in other words, through the end of fiscal year 2011.

First, let me point out that this issue should not be included in an appropriations bill that has received zero days in the Appropriations Committee for debate. I do understand that the Energy and Commerce authorizers are working this issue through a regular order process, but this is anything but regular order. Not that we would necessarily agree on the language that they are working on. But the reason you don't deal with complicated policy issues in eight lines of bill text is because often the only thing you achieve is unintended bad consequences. In this instance, I believe that is exactly what has happened.

EPA has a new permitting program that is currently in place as of January. It is to be implemented by both the States and EPA. There would be serious implications from this CR language, since new and modified large facilities are now required by law to obtain greenhouse gas permits before construction, but this bill's language would prevent Federal and State permitting authorities to take action to issue the permits. This would subject large facilities to legal challenges from citizens for failing to obtain permits and will lead to construction delays effectively eliminating thousands of American jobs. This is going to be held up in the courts indefinitely because of this language.

We have heard the arguments that these regulations will stop power plants and refineries and other big industry from creating jobs, but EPA's regulations encourage companies to make major new investments and to find cleaner ways to do business. This language is an actual assault on jobs.

The chair of the Republican Energy and Commerce Committee stated last week at a hearing, I bring this up since in the last colloquy the Chinese Government was mentioned, and I quote the Republican Chairman, ''The Chinese Government and other competitors have no intention of burdening and raising the cost of doing business for their manufacturers and energy producers the way EPA plans to do here in America.''

□ 1930

Now, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that we should be taking our cues on public health and environmental policies from China, the People's Republic of China, exposes a majority party that is clearly on the side of industry, but not of their constituents, let alone being on the right side of history.

This language is not about deficit reduction. It is a free pass to allow certain industries to pollute at whatever damage to the public health, they choose. We know that pollution is dangerous to the public health, we know that EPA has a legislative responsibility to limit that pollution, and yet this language would gut EPA's legal responsibility to carry out that legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your attentiveness to this process. I know it is laborious.

I want to draw attention, I want to go back just a few steps here when we were listening to an amendment brought to us by my good friend from New York (Mr. REED).

As we are going through this process, there are those who have been working extremely hard, the Appropriations Committee and Members all across this House, and Mr. REED dug very deep and he found something I think all of us wanted to see, something that was exposed, that the American people pointed out clearly, that the Federal Government has been spending money where it does not need to be spending money.

Think about where we are as a nation: $14 trillion in debt; unemployment unacceptable; GDP dropping; $1.5 trillion of deficit, which is almost 150 percent of what the Federal Government takes in. Think about where we are. And then children, upon conception, you ask any economist, they will vary somewhere between $42,000 and $47,000 of debt inherited upon conception.

Yet Mr. REED, he points out here today a great find: That this government is funding a Tijuana sewer rehabilitation project. There is something about that that just stinks. And I would hope that this House, that Americans all across this country, that Members of this House would see that just $10 million is being funded for a rehabilitation project of a sewer facility in Mexico, yet we are in this position of this fiscal house being out of order and in disorder.

I would hope that this House would see and recognize that this simple amendment, only $10 million, a small amount compared to that $1.5 trillion deficit, is worthy of a ''yes'' vote of amending this out of this CR, and we would send a message to the American people: It doesn't matter if it is $1, $10 million, $1 billion, if it is unnecessary funding coming from this government, we are going to get it out and get this fiscal house back in order.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1743. The matter pertaining to competitive grants to communities to develop plans and demonstrate and implement projects which reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the second proviso under the heading ''Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants'' in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1744. Notwithstanding section 1101, the amounts authorized to transfer under the heading ''Environmental Protection Agency, Administrative Provisions, Environmental Protection Agency'' in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$225,000,000'' for ''$475,000,000''.

SEC. 1745. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Environmental Protection Agency'' $300,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a proposed allocation of amounts by account and program project to rescind 30 days prior to the rescission: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 1746. None of the funds made available to the Environmental Protection Agency by this division or any other Act may be expended for purposes of enforcing or promulgating any regulation (other than with respect to section 202 of the Clean Air Act) or order, taking action relating to, or denying approval of state implementation plans or permits because of the emissions of greenhouse gases due to concerns regarding possible climate change.

AMENDMENT NO. 521 OFFERED BY MR. BRALEY OF IOWA

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 276, line 11, after ''climate change'' insert '': *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from implementing or enforcing section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (relating to the renewable fuel program)''.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, all day we have been hearing a lot of talk about job-killing regulations, but, Mr. Chairman, section 1746 is a job-killing statute that would block implementation of the Renewable Fuel

Standard that was established just 4 years ago. The Braley amendment would allow the Renewable Fuel Standard to move forward and allow this burgeoning industry, which is reducing our dependence on foreign oil and creating thousands of jobs all over the country, to move forward.

The continuing resolution prevents the Renewable Fuel Standard from promoting clean, renewable home-grown fuel that reduces our dependence on foreign oil.

Prior to the RFS, my State of Iowa produced less than 1 billion gallons of ethanol annually, and in large part because of its implementation, we now produce more than 4.5 billion gallons per year. Ethanol and biodiesel support nearly 49,000 jobs throughout the Iowa economy. This accounts for nearly $550 million in State tax revenue. Without the Renewable Fuel Standard, we would take a huge step backwards, potentially having a devastating impact on rural economies across the country in every congressional district.

The RFS promotes biofuels by ensuring that transportation fuel sold in the United States contains certain volumes of renewable fuels, including advanced biofuels, cellulosic biofuels, and biomass-based diesel. That includes advanced biofuels, including ethanol from waste material, from crop residue, vegetative waste, animal waste, food waste, yard waste, biomass-based diesel, bio-gas, and butanol.

The RFS promotes biofuels and is supported by the American Coalition For Ethanol, Growth Energy, the National Corn Growers Association, and the Renewable Fuels Association, and this particular legislation was described by the American Advanced Ethanol Council as language that would defund efforts to implement the RFS.

The required volume of each type of fuel is established annually by the EPA, and this summer EPA needs to propose the volume requirements for calendar year 2012. But the Republican provision in this section would prevent EPA from doing so. If EPA can't set the volume requirement, then RFS won't function next year, and renewable fuel producers all across country are counting on these requirements.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, in your area, there are two plants, White Plains Energy in Plainview and Hereford Renewable Energy and White Energy in Hereford that will be affected if this provision becomes law.

In fact, the gentleman from Idaho has Pacific Ethanol in Burley, a 50 million gallon producer, and Idaho Sustainable Energy, which is on the front edge of biofuels with algal biodiesel, in Glenns Ferry, Idaho, which will be impacted if this provision becomes law.

So instead of investing in certainty that allows these producers to move forward, this provision would pull the rug from farmers and refiners all across the country. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this flawed funding language and support my amendment to ensure the Renewable Fuel Standard is allowed to move forward. It is a bad policy to have job-killing statutory provisions that are going to increase our dependence on foreign oil and move us backward, not forward, in the important area of bioenergy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Idaho continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the chairman, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern on section 1746 of the continuing resolution that some people think would negatively impact renewable fuel standards. That rider in the bill specifically prohibits the EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources. However, reports that this provision will also block EPA from setting standards for the 2012 Renewable Fuel Standard are totally unfounded. The Energy and Commerce Committee confirms this and everyone else. The gentleman, I know, used to be a member of that committee.

I think it is really important to clarify that the rider in the CR is narrowly focused on EPA's new stationary source permitting authority and does not affect EPA's renewable fuels program.

Under the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act, which was referred to, Congress expressly stated that the Renewable Fuel Standard does not, and I say not, constitute regulation of greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act. The fundamental purpose of the Renewable Fuel Standard is to ensure our Nation's energy security and to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil while providing a valuable incentive for the production of agriculture.

□ 1830

As an Iowan, I understand the vast importance of agriculture to our economy by creating thousands of good-paying jobs and contributing numerous economic benefits to our rural communities. I understand concerns that may have been expressed. However, it is very clear that the renewable fuel standard falls outside EPA's rulemaking authority addressing climate change. I want to assure my colleagues and the people of Iowa that this legislation will not affect the renewable fuel standard or bring an end to the program, as some have erroneously suggested.

Mr. Chairman, rules have already been written. Anything in this bill is prospective. We already have the standard in place, and this does not affect that anyway. In the Senate, Senator ROCKEFELLER, a Democrat over there—and I hate to see this be politicized because it should not be a political issue—but the Democrat Senator from West Virginia has this identical language and nobody has said anything about that. He wants to have a prohibition for 2 years. The Energy and Commerce Committee is having debates as to making permanent as far as the prohibition. And I have not heard any concerns about that.

So it is, I think, very unfortunate that some information is being put forth on the floor of the House here that is not true. The Energy and Commerce Committee has said over and over again that this does not affect renewable fuel standards. It will have no impact as far as ethanol is concerned.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The problem with the language as drafted, Mr. Chairman, is that it is so broad and poorly drafted that it does threaten the renewable fuel standard, which is why all of those renewable energy advocate groups that I mentioned in my remarks are in support of the amendment that I have offered. The RFS promotes biofuels by ensuring that transportation fuels sold in the United States contain the requisite number of volume for each type of fuel that's established annually.

This summer, the EPA has to make sure that those standards are identified for each one of the various categories; but if they don't have the required guidance available to them because of the confusing language that's currently in this provision, it's going to create confusion and those same industries that waited and waited and waited for the tax extenders package to be passed at the end of the last Congress are going to have the same type of uncertainty governing their investment decisions moving forward, which is why those groups that I mentioned earlier are so concerned about this matter and are in support of the Braley amendment.

They are Growth Energy, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Coalition for Ethanol, the Renewable Fuels Association, and the Advanced Ethanol Council. If the Advanced Ethanol Council believes that this language is so vague that it would de-fund efforts to implement the RFS, that's not me speaking. That's the very groups that would be subject of regulation by the EPA, and that's why this amendment is important to clarify that that is not within the scope of EPA's powers.

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

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

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

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

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman from Idaho.

If there are people concerned about this, why didn't they come to us and talk to us before? We talked about the different groups out there, and that's because they've been given bad information that's not true. It is clear from the 2007 bill—and if someone would read it around here, they would understand that the renewable fuel standard is not affected by this. It is specifically outside the jurisdiction of what we're talking about, and so to make any assertion otherwise is simply giving erroneous information purposely on the floor. And that's very, very unfortunate because you do have people that are being told something that is not true, and now they're getting all worked up about it. I think it's very, very unfortunate.

We had a meeting this last week with the Iowa delegation talking to each other. If you have concerns, why don't you bring it forth so we can take care of the problem? If you want to have the amendment, I would have supported it, but it's not needed. It is absolutely fictitious, this idea that this is somehow going to affect the renewable fuel standard. I think it's very unfortunate that this issue has become something that has been dreamt up for other reasons, I think. That's very, very unfortunate because we should need to work together for energy independence in this country and to lessen our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rules states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment gives direction in effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that section 1746 of the bill contains a legislative limitation on the use of funds. Such a provision may be properly amended by a non-legislative exception or by a germane, merely perfecting change.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, rather than merely excepting section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act from the terms of the limitation, seeks to impart direction to the EPA Administrator with regard to the application of that section of the Clean Air Act.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 193 by Mrs. LUMMIS of Wyoming.

Amendment No. 338 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 376 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 84 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment No. 379 by Mr. REED of New York.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 193 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 216, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—213

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

NOES—216

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Alexander
Clay
Giffords
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1902

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. BOREN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. COLE, MEEHAN, BONNER, LANDRY, and McKEON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 338 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 73, noes 352, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—73

Andrews
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Dicks
Dingell
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Gerlach
Griffith (VA)
Harman
Heinrich
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Landry
LoBiondo
Lowey
Marchant
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moran
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Pitts
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rigell
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scott (VA)
Shuler
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Welch
Wittman
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—352

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Amash
Paul

NOT VOTING—6

Giffords
Lummis
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Sullivan
Waters

□ 1906

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 376 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 230, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—199

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)

Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—230

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Crenshaw
Giffords
McCarthy (NY)
Sullivan

□ 1911

Messrs. COHEN and RAHALL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—239

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

NOES—185

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bachus
Capps
Carney
Fattah
Franks (AZ)
Giffords
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (NC)
Smith (NE)

□ 1914

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 379 OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 203, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

AYES—228

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

NOES—203

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flores
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—2

Giffords
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1919

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. INSLEE. I rise to ask, what happened to the party of Teddy Roosevelt? What happened to the party that helped us adopt, under Richard Nixon's leadership, the Clean Air Act? What happened to the Republican Party that used to be allied in the adoption of the clean air rules that have so helped the health of Americans? What happened to the party that adopted the Clean Air Act 40 years ago which has helped save over 200,000 lives? And I ask why today, in this continuing resolution, the Republican Party has abandoned any pretext whatsoever to stand for clean air when they eviscerate the clean air law in their continuing resolution.

This is a sad statement to think that a party that at one time helped us clean up the air, reducing cancer deaths and reducing respiratory illness and reducing heart attacks, has seen fit to go and leave with the polluting industries to gut the Clean Air Act.

I want to make it clear so people know what the Republican continuing resolution does. Even though the Clean Air Act today requires the Environmental Protection Agency to clean up our air against dangerous gases like carbon dioxide and ozone, even though the Supreme Court has ruled that Americans are entitled to this protection, the Republican Party has decided to make it illegal for the cops on the beat to do their job.

This bill, amazingly enough, the Republicans have passed a provision, or want to in this bill, that would make it illegal for the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the environment. Now, why would you want to make it illegal for the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the environment?

And I want to make clear how radical this action is. There is no fiscal reason for this. This is just an assault on clean air. The ''dirty air act'' is not going to revise any proposed rules of the Environmental Protection Agency. It isn't going to modify any clean air laws. It's going to eliminate them by saying that it is illegal for the EPA to enforce these clean air laws.

And the sad thing about this, Mr. Chairman, this is an assault on science. You read the specific scientific conclusions of the thousands of scientists who have reviewed this, and here is what the scientists and the physicians say. Mr. Chairman, not the politicians, the physicians. Here is what they say: Greenhouse gases are the primary driver of climate change, which can lead to hotter, longer heat waves that threaten the health of the sick, poor, or elderly, increases in ground level ozone pollution linked to asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as other threats to the health and welfare of America.

Now, why would the Republican Party want to make the air more dangerous for our kids who are using those inhalers to try to prevent asthma attacks?

In our Commerce Committee hearing, we had a young woman from North Carolina, and she talked about the fact that increasing ozone increases and aggravates her asthma. What reason on

this green earth do we have to increase the rates of asthma of our kids? And that's what the Republican Party wants to do in this continuing resolution.

Now, that's kind of a harsh statement. It's a harsh statement to say that one of our noble parties wants to increase the availability of ozone to damage our kids' health. But facts are stubborn things, and this is what the Republican Party is sentencing our kids to, which is more dangerous air. And it's a real sad statement when you consider the past history of the Republican Party which helped, under Richard Nixon and Teddy Roosevelt, to adopt these environmental laws.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that at some point we will get a little more bipartisanship here for clean air, we will abandon this commitment to the polluting industries that are running this effort, and reject this continuing resolution and these anti-clean air laws.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating amendments on a continuing resolution because the leadership of the 111th Congress failed to do one of their most basic jobs last year: Pass a budget to fund the Federal Government.

Left without a budget to work with and our financial house in shambles, it is clear that we are in a state of financial crisis. Our debt requires immediate action, and the CR is just the beginning.

I came to Congress because, like many other new Republican Members of the freshman class, I run a small business, sticking to my budget and trying to make plans for the future. All the while I was watching Washington politicians drive this country's economy into a ditch. I knew that something had to change.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are trying all the same worn-out tricks. But I am here to say to the American people, this is not about tricks or politics. This is about preserving the greatness of America.

No one in this Chamber finds joy in the tough decisions we have to make, but we can no longer ignore them. The American people have elected this Congress to be good stewards of their money.

Today is not a happy day. This is not a happy speech.

Government spending and burdensome regulations have driven the American people to anger and frustration with good reason. Sadly, our Nation stands on the edge of bankruptcy. Our love for future generations of Americans requires that we not ignore today's problem only to find them, years from now, in irreparable financial ruin.

Regardless of the program, today's deficit spending is tomorrow's tax increase. In my neighborhood, there have been three babies born recently. Each of those babies now owe $45,000 in Federal debt.

□ 1930

We are fighting for our very survival. At risk are the freedoms representative of a free market economy and free society; the freedom to choose, freedom of private industry to compete, freedom from burdensome taxation, and freedom from mandated government programs. Washington today is slowly smothering the personal liberty Americans so greatly esteem.

As the 112th Congress struggles to pass legislation that meets our Nation's current challenges, fundamental disagreement remains. Unfortunately for the American people, the debate is being framed by my colleagues on the other side as ''vicious cuts to vital programs by Republicans who simply don't care.'' Hear me now when I say this has never been farther from the truth.

Today we come to terms with the fact that we cannot spend money on everything we want, regardless of the good intentions. For years politicians have ignored these problems. Not this Congress. Not this Congresswoman. The people elected us to end the talks and take swift action, and we must.

As a small business owner, when finances get tight, we cut where necessary. Raising prices isn't always the option. As painful as it may be, you make tough decisions to cut waste, operations, production costs, and eventually jobs as a last resort. Why should the Federal Government be any different?

Today's debt crisis is a very real threat to our liberty. Liberty allows people to work hard and achieve what they want, be responsible for their own actions and be free. No one shackled by debt is free.

Today's budget crisis is dangerous and threatens our basic freedom. Free societies value every citizen equally, placing no preference one over another. I believe that no one should be entitled to another's hard-earned provisions, and that government should support its citizens, not burden them with insurmountable debt and obligations they cannot fulfill. Government spending is not the answer to our looming problem.

I know there will be those who argue that my rhetoric is too harsh and that the financial crisis is not as bad as it seems. This crisis is real; and without immediate action, America will continue spiraling toward financial disaster.

Today, I challenge my colleagues to let real leadership begin. No longer should we turn to China to finance that which we cannot afford. Let us have the courage to right our wrongs, the strength to see it through, and the vision to lead with the powers entrusted to us from the consent of the governed, rather than selfish ambition.

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this bill and the priorities and the values it represents.

Republicans repeat like robots the same talking points we have heard again and again tonight, that to get our debt under control, middle class families are going to have to suck it up. We face tough choices, harsh choices; but really there is no choice. We are going to have to cut public education drastically, along with Head Start for the children who otherwise would start kindergarten too far behind to ever catch up; job training for workers who have lost their jobs; Pell Grants so middle class kids can afford a college education; research at the National Science Foundation and Department of Energy, and on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we do have choices. We have this deficit because of choices we have made. Just a decade ago, the debate here was what to do with the surplus. Alan Greenspan, who was then the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, worried that it might unsettle the economy if we paid off the national debt too quickly. President Clinton urged that we use the surplus to shore up Social Security and Medicare so that my generation could live in dignity when we retire.

A Republican President and a Republican Congress decided instead to cut taxes sharply for the richest of the rich. The deficit we face now is because of that choice, and we saw just 2 months ago that protecting those tax cuts for the richest of the rich, even Americans making more than $1 million a year, was their first priority. So despite all of the weeping and wailing, the gnashing of teeth, the rending of garments about the deficit now, just 2 months ago they said not a word about the deficit when they were voting to cut taxes, to explode the deficit by cutting taxes on the very richest Americans.

So now Congress is voting to kick 200,000 kids out of Head Start so that Americans who worked and strived to be conceived to the right parents will pay little in inheritance taxes.

Now Congress is voting to fire 17,000 teachers and special educators so Americans making more than $1 million a year will not have to pay the income taxes that they paid in the nineties, which was hardly a confiscatory rate.

And much of the bill obviously has nothing to do with saving money or whether the government is too big or too small. It is about whose side the government is on. This bill cuts drastically the funding needed to protect middle class families from the gouging that has lurked in the legalese, the fine

print of financial contracts, the tricks and the traps written by banks' lawyers. That cut has nothing to do with saving money. It is all about putting government on the side of financial predators, not on the side of hard-working honest Americans trying to make an honest living.

We have seen clusters of rare cancers and birth defects that we know are the result of an environmental exposure to something, and this bill devastates environmental protection. Middle class children are facing life with lower IQs because of unchecked environmental exposure so polluters can have bigger profits and CEOs can reward themselves with bigger bonuses.

Many of my colleagues have argued that this bill is penny wise and pound foolish, it is shortsighted and will hurt the economy. All of that is true. But I am most disturbed that this bill represents values that are incompatible with values that I learned at my mother's knee, the values of generations of Americans, the values of the faith traditions of most Americans, including me, the values that have been the glue that has held our country together in tough times. I will vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I am totally opposed to this resolution. I knew back in December when Congress cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires that in February we would be cutting services for the working poor, children, and the disabled.

The House Republican CR in fact is very similar to the last December tax cut bill, which included billions of dollars in tax breaks for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans, while driving up the budget deficit an extra $700 billion. The proposed continuing resolution will be what I usually call reverse Robin Hood: it will rob from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich.

In my area of specialization, transportation and infrastructure, this bill would rescind $2.5 billion for high-speed rail projects already awarded, as well as cancellation of 76 transportation projects in 40 States, bringing about a loss of 25,000 new construction jobs. Pink slips.

While the unemployment rate is still 9 percent in our Nation, it is critical to invest in infrastructure at this time. As I always said, Federal transportation and infrastructure funds are essential to job creation, and for every $1 billion invested in infrastructure projects, over 42,000 well-paid, permanent jobs are created and over $2 billion in economic development.

This resolution also cuts programs to assist homeless vets. Over 130,000 of our Nation's 24 million veterans are homeless on any given night. In this time of foreclosures and uncertainty in the housing market, it is inconceivable that we would limit the help available to those who serve and protect our country's freedom that we hold so dear. So we are going to give pink slips to over 130,000 veterans. I want to say that that will not happen—but pink slips to the veterans.

In addition, over 200,000 children we are going to kick off of Head Start. A pink slip for the Head Start program. We are going to reduce the maximum Pell Grant $800 per student. It takes away over 20,000 researchers supported at the National Science Foundation. And a program that is near and dear to my heart, over 1,300 cops will be taken off the beat. This program was started under President Clinton, where we put an additional 100,000 cops on the beat and cut down crime.

□ 1940

We cut another 2,400 firefighters. Pink slips for the firefighters. And we cut $2.5 billion to the National Institutes of Health. Budget decisions by Congress and the President should prioritize the most vulnerable communities who are struggling to make ends meet at this difficult economic time, not the wealthy and the powerful.

Today's bill on the House floor does absolutely nothing to create jobs or improve our Nation's economy but is a direct assault on the most vulnerable by cutting the budget in every single area, from transportation to our Nation's veterans to our Nation's children to police on the beat protecting our citizens. Once again, the Republican Party is asking our seniors, our students, our children, and working families to make fiscal sacrifices while millionaires and billionaires and powerful special interest groups get to walk off without a scratch.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1747. None of the funds made available by this division or any other Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to implement, administer, or enforce a change to a rule or guidance document pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

SEC. 1748. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest and Rangeland Research'' shall be $297,252,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$61,939,000'' for ''$66,939,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 277, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,400,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,400,000)''.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will reduce spending for the International Forestry Program by $7.4 million. Some on the other side have said $7.4 million isn't very much money when we have a deficit of a little over $1.5 trillion. In Kansas, that's still a little bit of money.

This program started out a long time ago to provide funds for saving the Brazilian rainforest. But like so many programs that had good intentions, it's morphed, it's morphed into something terribly different. Just this past year, this program funded field trips for students in Mexico to follow the migration of monarch butterflies. It funded research in China to protect the Panda habitat and make sure that we didn't have the infestation of forest pests in China. I think the Chinese can fund themselves if someone thinks that's a worthy task. Last year, the International Forestry Program funded a study on the declining hummingbird populations in the western United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, there are difficult decisions to make when the country is at this point in its economic life, but this is not difficult. These are precisely the kind of programs that Americans sent a new Congress to take care of to make sure that we're not doing things that make no sense for America. So I would urge support for this amendment.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to Ms. MCCOLLUM from Minnesota to explain why the Democrats on the subcommittee are very strongly opposed to this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to make it clear that while the Congressman says the amendment eliminates the U.S. Forest Service's International Programs, it does not. The amendment only calls for a reduction in the budget of the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, State and private forests. Should this shortsighted amendment pass, the agency would decide what to cut within its budget. That being said, the gentleman from Kansas has unfairly maligned an important agency that's doing unsung work.

The U.S. Forest Service's International Programs plays a unique role as one of the few Federal agencies working with international governments and NGOs to, one, stop the flow of illegal wood that is undercutting our U.S. timber industry and costing us jobs. Another example, protecting western Canada's boreal forests in partnership with Ducks Unlimited to ensure future generations of hunters will have access to waterfowl habitats. This area is the second most productive breeding ground for ducks that migrate to the United States.

The examples of working with China and Russia are important, working

with China and Russia to address such invasive species as the emerald ash borer and the Asian gypsy moth, both of which currently are threatening millions of forest acres in my home State of Minnesota and have devastated parts of the eastern part of the United States.

Similarly, all wildlife salmon migrate from the rivers of the West Coast of North America to eastern Russia to the Pacific Ocean. The Forest Service is working with the Russians to improve the watershed management on these rivers in eastern Russia to preserve the wild stock of this important species for future generations.

One of the things that disturbs me most is the way that a program has been described that allows students to interact with one another and learn about forestry management, biology, and how we are interconnected in this world. There are no Mexican students that go on field trips here in the United States, but there is an exchange of classrooms in Canada and the United States and in Mexico where teachers online follow the migration of the monarch. Students learn about, yes, insects. They learn about the trees that are important to them, and they learn biology.

These are very, very important programs. They should not be maligned. And this amendment, while it does not eliminate the program, should still be opposed.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I would associate myself strongly with the remarks of the gentlelady from Minnesota, and strongly urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The International Forestry Program has already been reduced by 25 percent in this proposal. It's funded at $7.4 million in the CR. In FY10 it was funded at $9 million. The International Program brought in an additional $36 million in funds from State and USAID. The International Program brings in approximately $3 for every dollar invested. This program, regardless of the amount of money spent, is still a lot of money in Idaho, just as it is in Kansas.

But this program is critical to protecting forestry and the forest products industry in the United States. It's the only forestry entity representing the U.S. at trade summits. International Forestry is the only program working directly to counter the flow of illegally harvested forest products abroad. These materials compete with legally and sustainably harvested U.S. forest products.

The U.S. negotiators from the Department of State and the U.S. Trade Representatives rely on the International Program to provide technical input to effectively advocate for the domestic forest products industry. These agencies do not have this expertise.

The International Program also prevents the introduction of invasive and nonnative pests that would cause millions of dollars of damage to U.S. forests and the U.S. economy. The International Program, though funded through funding from USAID, plays a critical role in protecting U.S. security interests in conflict-prone areas. Unrelated, illegal resource extraction many times leads to unrest and corruption abroad.

So I would oppose this amendment, even though I understand that it's easy to go after international programs when we have such problems here. The fact is that they protect industry here in this country, in the U.S. forest products industry in this country, because, as I said, they're the only ones representing the U.S. forest products industry and forestry in general in international trade agreements.

I would oppose this amendment and hope that my colleagues would also.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1750. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, National Forest System'' shall be $1,525,339,000: *Provided*, That no less than $10,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1751. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Capital Improvement and Maintenance'' shall be $495,409,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$50,371,000'' for ''$90,000,000'': *Provided further*, That no less than $10,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1752. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Land Acquisition'' shall be $9,100,000: *Provided*, That no less than $3,400,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1753. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management'' shall be $1,978,737,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$200,000,000'' for ''$75,000,000'': *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available in the FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund for the Department of Agriculture created by section 502(b) of Public Law 111–88 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(b)), $250,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 1754. The authority provided by section 337 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 3102), as amended, shall remain in effect until September 30, 2011.

SEC. 1755. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service, Indian Health Services'' shall be $3,883,886,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$862,765,000'' for ''$779,347,000''; by substituting ''$53,000,000'' for ''$48,000,000''; and by substituting ''$444,332,000'' for ''$398,490,000'': *Provided further*, That of the funds included under this heading, $29,211,000 shall be for staffing and operating costs of newly constructed facilities.

SEC. 1756. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service, Indian Health Facilities'' shall be $255,497,000: *Provided*, That no less than $10,000,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1757. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences'' shall be $77,546,000.

SEC. 1758. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Toxic Substances and Environmental Public Health'' shall be $74,039,000.

SEC. 1759. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Executive Office of the President, Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality'' shall be $2,848,000.

SEC. 1760. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $10,799,000: *Provided*, That the matter pertaining to methyl isocyanate in the last proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1761. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Smithsonian Institution, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $634,661,000: *Provided*, That no less than $200,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1762. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Smithsonian Institution, Facilities Capital'' shall be $123,600,000: *Provided*, That no less than $1,400,000 in available, unobligated prior-year funds shall be used in addition to amounts provided by this division.

SEC. 1763. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Smithsonian Institution, Legacy Fund'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1764. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Gallery of Art, Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings'' shall be $48,221,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$42,250,000'' for ''$40,000,000''.

SEC. 1765. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Operations and Maintenance'' shall be $22,500,000: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1766. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Capital Repair and Restoration'' shall be $13,920,000.

SEC. 1767. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $9,844,000.

□ 1950

Mr. SIMPSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 281, line 17 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1768. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, Grants and Administration'' shall be $145,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 196 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 281, line 21, insert ''(reduced by $20,594,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 359, line 13, insert ''(increased by $20,594,000)'' before the period at the end.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, currently, the CR funds the National Endowment for the Arts at the approximate fiscal year 2008 level of $145 million. Amendment No. 196 takes the funding levels back to the fiscal year 2006 levels at $124.4 million. If accepted, this cut returns $20.6 million to the spending reduction account.

Though some would call for the full defunding of the NEA, I'm not doing that. You see, I believe in the true fine arts, and of course that's defined by individual standards, I understand. I found that to be a fact for a number of years when I was a finance chair of a symphony orchestra. People will support what they appreciate.

However, at a time when our government is in a position where it must cut Federal spending, I believe one of the main sources of the funding for the arts needs to be through philanthropy, but that only happens best in a sound and a growing economy. This budget crisis, this economy, continues to be frustrated by the spending of government, which frustrates individuals, who, indeed, would be willing to support and, in fact, still do support the arts as well.

The National Endowment for the Arts does provide benefits to our country, and helps fund some true fine arts. However, we are asking them to only fund their true priorities, priorities approved by the majority of taxpaying citizens, of sponsors and of patrons of the arts. Limiting resources sometimes refocuses and defines that focus.

We know that the public has had questions on some of the programs that the NEA has supported—major questions, major concerns. Attention to those concerns will gain the support of the taxpayer as well as of the philanthropist. Our country is in financial hardship, and we are not taking programs like the NEA off the table.

I refer to a letter I received last night from a very strong patron of the arts, of the symphony for which I served as a finance chair. He is the chairman of a major manufacturing corporation in my district, who is writing about what they have just gone through as a business. I will just read excerpts:

Until today, we have been operating under a forbearance agreement that began in 2008. It has been a struggle. Our leadership group accepted 15 to 50 percent cuts in salary, and our hourly staff accepted 10 percent wage reductions. Our salesmen continue to find new opportunities. We reduced our spending tremendously and only spent for essentials. Our belt was very tight. We did all we could to help ourselves, and we all made many sacrifices. Above all, we never stopped believing in our future.

That's the type of impact that happens in the private sector, even in programs we enjoy, benefit from and help out on, that we need to understand. Our country is in financial hardship, and we are not taking programs, even like the NEA, off the table.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The NEA has already been cut by $22 million in this continuing resolution. The NEA's contribution to deficit reduction is really infinitesimal, but its elimination would not be. It would be very costly.

Mr. Chairman, the NEA represents less than 1/100th of discretionary spending. The economic dividend this Nation receives from the Endowment for the Arts, however, far exceeds the investment we make.

It seems to me that, when there are too many issues that divide this Nation, and when there remains too much harshness and rancor, the arts have an even more important role to play because they remain a powerful medium through which we can all transcend our common differences, appreciate beauty, and empathize with all of humankind. This is what the arts are all about. This is what the NEA enables all Americans to more greatly appreciate. The NEA budget is small, but it is such an important catalyst in helping to create and sustain the arts.

Last year, actor Jeff Daniels spoke at an Interior Appropriations subcommittee hearing as to how the NEA had supported the revival of a theater in his hometown in Michigan. It was a small grant, but in his case, it restored the theater and its productions so that neighboring owners could then restore their homes and turn them into bed and breakfast places. Restaurants and antique shops saw boosts in their businesses. In fact, the State of Michigan just built an exit ramp off the State highway to serve the increasing numbers of cars that are flocking to his hometown, which otherwise would be a virtual ghost town.

The NEA is a magnet for businesses in every place to which they locate, and it searches out those opportunities. There are 668,000 businesses involved in the creation and distribution of art, and there are millions of jobs. I have two examples in Virginia. Actually, to save time, I'll just give one example:

Signature Theatre in Shirlington, Arlington, Virginia, received NEA grants for its nationally recognized artistic and education programs.

I would suggest that all of our Members go there some time. They will invariably see an extraordinary good performance, one that has generated economic activity throughout that community and one that could not have gotten on its feet without the help of the National Endowment for the Arts.

When you cut that budget, you will see a dramatic adverse impact on the national arts community and on specifically the arts education programs that are developing throughout community centers and in our schools.

□ 2000

We do need to invest in the cultural lives of our citizenry and in our children's future. I can't help but fathom how a Nation as rich and prosperous as ours could not find it in its heart to provide $167 million for the Endowment for the Arts.

The arts and humanities will survive, but they will not be accessible for the large majority of our citizens who couldn't otherwise afford the expensive tickets that too often are charged at those performing arts places where frankly the financially elite are only able to afford to go. What the NEA does is to expand artistic achievement, to give people an opportunity to fully appreciate and for us to appreciate their talent.

Denyce Graves, who grew up in Washington in the Anacostia area, said that The Kennedy Center could have been a world away. She never would have seen it had it not been for a National Endowment for the Arts grant. That enabled her to then pursue a career that ultimately resulted in one of the finest operatic performers in America, in the world.

The chair of the National Endowment for the Arts, Rocco Landesman, a Broadway producer, extraordinarily effective, active leader, he has suggested reform, that we probably have too

many arts venues. Let's consolidate them. Let's make sure that all of them are of the highest quality. It has started a discussion that needs to be done, but what shouldn't be done is to cut the National Endowment for the Arts even further than this continuing resolution does.

I would urge rejection of the amendment, Madam Chair.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. CAPITO). The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. First of all, I have been on the committee for a long time, the Interior Appropriations Committee, and I can remember when Sid Yates from Chicago was the chairman, and we had arts funding at about $180 million, then we had new Republican leadership come in in 1994 and 1995 and they cut the endowments in half. What we found out was that when the endowment had less money to give out in grants, the private sector started to give less money for grants and to help these institutions. I applaud the gentleman for being a leader in his local arts community.

Americans for the Arts did a major study 4 or 5 years ago about the economic impact of the arts, and the gentleman from Virginia is absolutely correct; the arts have exploded across the country. We have given grants now in almost every single congressional district, which has helped the proliferation of arts institutions. Consolidation, it doesn't scare me. I think that, in some areas, it might be a good idea. I've seen in the Puget Sound area, in Seattle, and in Tacoma how much this has meant to the local communities, and this is a relatively small amount of money.

When I was chairman of the committee, I did increase it, but I never increased it by an amount that the Republican ranking member could not also support. So Rocco Landesman said, well, why didn't you just put up the $250 million. We did this on a bipartisan basis. We also have an Arts Caucus in the Congress that operates on a bipartisan basis, and we've had on the floor over the years a multiple of votes, and we've had, you know, 40 or 50 enlightened Republicans who have joined with us and made a good majority in support of these programs.

The humanities is also extremely important in literature and in education and helping our teachers. So I think these are worthy programs. I think the committee made the right decision here. I wish it was still at $167.5 million, but they've reduced it down to about $145 million. I think that's good enough. I think going further than that will really do damage to both of these endowments that have been there since 1965 back in the Johnson administration, and I just think this would be a mistake.

I support what the committee did, and I think we should stay with that number.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. I rise in opposition to this amendment and want to state that the arts not only contribute to education and enlightenment, they're important job creators. The NEA contributes to the development and economic growth of communities nationwide, and each year, the arts industry generates $166 billion in economic activity and provides 5.7 million full-time jobs. In my district alone, nearly 120,000 people are employed in the museum, theater, art galleries, and other arts organizations that I'm proud to represent.

So this is not the moment for trying to score political points in the name of fiscal responsibility, and we should not be proposing deep cuts that will take effect right away and destroy jobs in the arts and other places at the very time we're trying like mad to create them. This CR threatens our recovery just as the economy is bouncing back from the worst recession in decades, and it proves that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are tone deaf to the American people's number one priority, which is jobs.

Earlier this week, President Obama laid out a budget that makes tough choices, a thoughtful budget that includes a 5-year freeze on non-defense discretionary spending and reduces the deficit by $1.1 trillion. It does all of this while making important investments in education, infrastructure, jobs, and our Nation's competitiveness, investments that will prepare us to compete now and in the future.

As the President said at his press conference on Tuesday, when it comes to this budget, we need to use a scalpel, not a machete. The Republicans, by contrast, are making deep, painful, and seemingly arbitrary cuts, cuts that would result in more than 200,000 children being dropped from Head Start. Thousands of teachers would lose their jobs and be forced to leave the classroom. Some $2.5 billion in NIH cuts would jeopardize critical cancer and other disease research, and 1,300 fewer cops would be on the beat as a result of eliminating the COPS hiring program, which we restored in a vote on this floor earlier tonight, thankfully. There will be 2,400 fewer firefighters through the elimination of SAFER grants, which again we fought to restore. Science and energy research, to help drive our clean energy economy, would be reduced, and the horrible list goes on and on, including this cut that is before us right now.

Let's be clear: Cutting education, the arts, letting our infrastructure deteriorate further, and failing to harness the power of innovation is a recipe for declining competitiveness in an increasingly competitive global economy. It's imperative that we must invest in the future, invest in creating jobs, and this grant to the National Endowment for the Arts is an important investment that will pay dividends years down the road.

I strongly support the program, and I'm opposed to the gentleman's proposal to cut it.

Sure—it's harder to be strategic—but it's required.

It's required that we recognize some investments make sense and some don't.

We need to do more of what's working and eliminate what's not.

The reality is that we have to keep growing the economy to bring down the deficit.

And we have to bring down our long-term deficits to sustain that growth.

But indiscriminate steep cuts—like the ones now being advocated by the Republicans—will jeopardize our recovery and make deficit reduction that much more difficult to achieve.

This CR is bad for the recovery, bad for jobs and will hamper efforts to get out our long-term deficit under control.

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

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

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 2010

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1769. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, National Endowment for the Humanities, Grants and Administration'' shall be $145,000,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$130,700,000'' for ''$153,200,000''.

SEC. 1770. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs'' shall be $4,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 249 OFFERED BY MR. CANSECO

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 282, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,500,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,500,000)''.

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

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would eliminate Federal funding for the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs grant program which the underlying continuing resolution funds at $4.5 million. This program provides noncompetitive grant funding for overhead costs to support artistic and cultural programs in the District of Columbia exclusively.

In his budget last year and this year, President Obama has requested that this program's funding be cut by 50 percent, which the underlying legislation does. In this year's budget, President Obama notes that ''in general, these institutions are also able to apply for Federal funding from other resources.''

I'm not here to debate the merits of the program. I'm not here to question whether or not the money has been used by the institutions to accomplish good things. What I'm here to do today is to debate and question why this program should be considered a priority and receive taxpayer funding when we're in a fiscal crisis. Make no mistake, we are in a fiscal crisis that threatens not only our economic security but our national security.

However, you don't have to take my word for it. Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said, ''I think the biggest threat we have to our national security is our debt.'' Dr. Alice Rivlin, a former Office of Management and Budget Director under President Clinton and member of the President's Deficit Commission, said in testimony before the Senate Budget Committee last February, ''On any reasonable set of economic assumptions, the U.S. budget is on an unsustainable track. There is no disagreement among the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, and leading private forecasters on where the budget is headed if we do not change course.'' And she continued, ''The growing deficit will be more and more difficult and expensive to finance. Ultimately, we will not be able to borrow enough to finance the widening gap between spending and revenues.''

Even before the government's spending spree began that occurred under President Obama, then-Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HARRY REID, our Nation was headed for a day of fiscal reckoning. They simply sped up the day our Nation will hurtle off the fiscal cliff, increasing non-defense discretionary spending by 84 percent in just 2 years. Under their leadership, Federal spending has risen to levels as a share of our economy not seen since World War II and resulted in the Federal Government borrowing approximately 40 cents out of every dollar we spend. Where is all this headed if we don't stop our spending?

If you followed the situation that occurred last year in Greece, you know that that nation had to make many painful choices very quickly because it had spent too much and investors were demanding higher interest rates to take on the risk associated with buying Greece's debt. If we don't get our fiscal house in order, what occurred in Greece is a preview of events to come to America. If we don't stop the spending and get our fiscal house in order, we will be the first generation of Americans to leave the next generation with a legacy of less freedom and prosperity. Do we want to leave our children and grandchildren a legacy of debt and limited opportunity?

We have two choices: we can either stop the spending that is driving our fiscal crisis, or we can continue the spending and one day become the next Greece.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman. This amendment would entirely eliminate funding for a successful, proven program. The National Capital Arts grant program was established in 1986 to fill a substantial funding gap affecting the major private arts groups in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital. It now funds 23 such groups. In every other major city in the United States, major private arts groups receive Federal funds from their State arts councils, which frequently have such a major institution's funding category.

That's not particularly important, but those who are involved in arts organizations understand that that's the money they depend upon. In D.C., they don't have that money to depend upon. No similar flow of government funds from any level is available to major arts groups in Washington, D.C.

The 23 groups that receive this money employ thousands of people. Outreach efforts to schoolchildren is one of the principal things that is funded through this National Capital Arts grant program. If we didn't have this, those outreach programs would be virtually eliminated. They constitute almost all of the arts outreach and arts educational programs that are available to children in the D.C. schools and schools in the suburbs. It's a program that has widespread popular support. It is not a lot of money for each organization, but it's essential money to enable them to continue functioning.

The fact that we are talking about such a small amount of money in the context of such an enormous deficit, it really seems wrong that children in our Nation's Capital would be denied outreach from these arts institutions that are proximate to where they live but wholly inaccessible without this program. So I would urge that we have a heart, particularly for the children in the schools in Washington, D.C. Reject this amendment and leave this very small amount of money in this interior appropriations bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the ranking member, Mr. MORAN. This is a program that was created because the arts institutions in the District of Columbia, many of them do not get any support from the District of Columbia government. And there's no State government. In New York, they get money from the city, from the boroughs, from the State government for their major arts institutions.

This program was a very modest program that helps 23 performing arts institutions which are extremely important, all of which have very solid educational programs that help inner city youth here. We have a very high population of inner city youth in the District of Columbia.

So I just think this has been a proven program. It is very modest. It's been cut in half. Last year I think we had it at about $9.5 million. It has been cut in half. I think we should leave that. I think the committee has made a decision; and to go further would just be, in my mind, punitive.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 2020

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1771. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Presidio Trust, Presidio Trust Fund'' shall be $15,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 381 OFFERED BY MR. REED

Mr. REED. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 282, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $15,000,000)''.

Page 359, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

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

Mr. REED. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment seeking to rescind $15 million of funds out of this continuing resolution.

As I've listened to the debate here this evening and yesterday and over the last few days, as a freshman Member of Congress, I've come to a realization that part of the problem is that many Members of this esteemed body look at our spending in terms of it's a relatively small amount of money; it's a small sum. But we're talking about millions of dollars. We're talking about $15 million in this situation.

Now, I proposed this amendment without any disrespect to any Member

of this House. But I proposed it in a time when we face a national crisis that goes to our very existence for generations to come, a nation that won't be here for our children and our grandchildren.

And when I look at the Presidio Trust fund and I look at the park—and it's a great park. I concede that point. But the plan for the park was to be self-sufficient. And upon researching, going through page by page of this budget and doing the hard work, my staff and I have uncovered that this park is at the point where it can be self-sufficient on its own.

They receive grants of $80,000 from the Cowell Foundation for three projects. They have a $15 million gift from the private sector from Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. LucasArts video games and Industrial Light & Magic are leasing portions of the park, and it's a private revenue stream. This is a success story. And at this point it's time for us to put all our cards on the table and say, Now that you are standing on your own two feet, when we face this fiscal crisis, this government now has to make a responsible decision. And to me, that responsible decision is to allow the park to stand on its own two feet—it has shown plenty of ability to do that—and save the children and grandchildren so that we can have a nation that they can be proud of and can have a nation that they can live in, because that's the point that we are in our Nation's history.

So I stand today and ask your support for this amendment. I think it is the responsible action to do. And I applaud this process, because this process is being conducted in the open and through a vigorous debate, and that's what the American people have called upon us to do. No line of our spending shall be left under stones. We shall uncover each stone.

I urge all my fellow Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment that would eliminate funding for the Presidio Trust.

The Presidio was in continuous use as a military post from 1776 until 1994. An Army installation, the post was closed in 1994 as part of the BRAC process and transferred to the National Park Service. In 1996, Congress established the Presidio Trust to govern this unique national park site and to ensure its preservation by making it financially self-sustaining. And that's exactly what has happened.

Over the past 12 years, appropriations as a percentage of the overall trust budget have been reduced from over 95 percent Federal funding in fiscal year 1998 to less than 20 percent in fiscal year 2010. The current ratio of private investment in the Presidio to Federal appropriations is already greater than 4:1. Appropriations, though, are authorized through fiscal year 2012. That was the deal. After 2012, the trust itself, by itself, alone, is responsible for long-term operations and maintenance of the Presidio.

Since it took over management of the Presidio in 1998, the trust has rehabilitated and leased 97 percent of the Presidio's housing units and rehabilitated 75 percent of the Presidio's 433 very historic buildings. I've been there. I've seen it. It's phenomenal what the trust has accomplished.

Eliminating funds just 1 year short of its goal violates the spirit of the 1996 law, and it undermines the trust's ability to achieve self-sufficiency. This would result in higher future obligations, as the Federal Government might have to assume full responsibility to maintain the historic properties.

It also sends a terrible signal to communities across the country that may also have innovative solutions in partnering with the Federal Government. They are time-controlled; in other words, it's not forever. But they say for a certain period of time, if you'll partner with us, we'll take this responsibility off your hands.

The $23 million appropriated for the trust in fiscal year 2010 has created 860 jobs. Federal appropriations in this current fiscal year will help expedite rehabilitation of historic buildings and take advantage of favorable construction costs that exist today.

At a recent oversight hearing, the members of our Appropriations subcommittee received assurances that the trust will accomplish its financial stewardship and public use goals. That was the deal. They said, We'll meet our part of the deal, assuming that the Federal Government will meet its obligation.

As one of the Nation's oldest and most important military posts, the trust has had some unique extraordinary challenges since the Defense Department closed out its installation, but the trust is well on its way toward meeting its legislative objectives. It should not be undermined by this amendment.

This has worked well. It's an example for the rest of the country. Let it serve as an example. One more year to go, and then it will be off our books. The trust will take over responsibility, and we will point out that this is the way to do it, in partnership, where we will not be perpetually responsible but, in fact, the private sector will come in, let the market work and have a national gem, really, a national asset for everyone to visit and appreciate and learn from.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time and strongly urge opposition to this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I rise in concurrence with the comments of my ranking member from Virginia. Funding for the Presidio in this CR is $8.2 million below the FY10 enacted level, and $7 million below the fiscal year 2008 level.

When the government closed down the Presidio Army base in 1994, it was transferred to the National Park Service as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. It could have been turned over to the National Park Service and run as a historic park, but that would have cost tens of millions of dollars per year to the taxpayers. Instead, Congress devised a unique management and funding model by creating the Presidio Trust to preserve the Presidio and help it become financially self-sufficient. The trust manages 80 percent of the Presidio lands, including most of the buildings and infrastructure. The Park Service manages the remaining 20 percent, including the coastal areas of the Presidio. The Presidio Trust receives Federal appropriations that are diminishing each year and, as was mentioned, will cease at the end of FY12, when it becomes self-sufficient.

This truly is a model of how we can do these things where they will become self-sufficient and off the roll of the taxpayer. But our part of this is we have to keep our end of the deal. And so through FY12 we need to make sure that we keep our word on what was agreed on in 1996 and let this Presidio Trust take over and become self-sufficient at the end of the next fiscal year.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment and would encourage my colleagues to vote against it.

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

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

Mr. REED. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 2030

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1772. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1773. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, Capital Construction'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1774. Section 409 of division A of Public Law 111–88 (123 Stat. 2957) is amended by striking ''and 111–8'' and inserting ''111–8, and 111–88'', and by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2010''.

SEC. 1775. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for section 415 of division A of Public Law 111–88 shall be $0.

SEC. 1776. Section 433 of division A of Public Law 111–88 (123 Stat. 2965) is amended by striking ''2010'' and ''2009'' and inserting ''2011'' and ''2010'', respectively.

SEC. 1777. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this division, each of the following departments and agencies shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a spending, expenditure, or operating plan for fiscal year 2011 at a level of detail below the account level:

(1) Department of the Interior.

(2) Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

(4) Indian Health Service.

(5) Council on Environmental Quality.

(6) Smithsonian Institution.

(7) National Gallery of Art.

(8) National Endowment for the Arts.

(9) National Endowment for the Humanities.

SEC. 1778. None of the funds made available by this division or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

TITLE VIII—LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 1801. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services'' shall be $221,699,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$0'' for each amount included in paragraph (1); by substituting ''$167,538,000'' for ''$470,038,000''; by substituting ''$29,160,000'' for ''$229,160,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$200,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$102,500,000''; by substituting ''$54,161,000'' for ''$389,043,000''; by substituting ''$44,561,000'' for ''$93,450,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$48,889,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$108,493,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$40,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$125,000,000''; and by substituting ''$0'' for ''$12,500,000'': *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for dislocated worker employment and training activities under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117, $65,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for dislocated worker employment and training activities under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117, up to 25 percent may be used for the period April 1, 2011, through September 30, 2011, for youth activities.

SEC. 1802. (a) Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Labor, Departmental Management, Office of Job Corps'', $300,000,000 is rescinded.

(b) None of the funds made available by this division or any prior Act may be used to initiate a competition for any new Job Corps center not previously approved by the Secretary of Labor as a Jobs Corps center through a competitive selection process.

SEC. 1803. Of the unobligated balances of the funds made available for ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services, Federally Administered Programs, Dislocated Workers Assistance National Reserve'' in division D of Public Law 111–117, $100,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 1804. Of the unobligated balances of the funds made available for ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services, National Activities, Evaluation'', $10,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 1805. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Community Service Employment for Older Americans'' shall be $300,425,000, and for purposes of funds appropriated by this division, the amounts under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied by substituting ''$0'' for ''$225,000,000'', and the first and second provisos under such heading in such division shall not apply.

SEC. 1806. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $355,843,000, of which up to $15,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Labor to be transferred to ''Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses'' for activities related to the Department of Labor's caseload before the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and the amounts included under the heading ''Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$1,450,000''.

SEC. 1807. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Departmental Management'' shall be $315,154,000, and the third proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1808. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Labor, Working Capital Fund'', $3,900,000 is permanently rescinded, to be derived solely from amounts available in the Investment in Reinvention Fund (other than amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

SEC. 1809. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services'' shall be $5,313,171,000, of which (1) not more than $100,000,000 shall be available until expended for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 104–73 and for expenses incurred by the Department of Health and Human Services pertaining to administrative claims made under such law; (2) no funds shall be for the program under title X of the Public Health Service Act (referred to in this title as the ''PHS Act''), to provide for voluntary family planning projects; and (3) $352,835,000 shall be available for health professions programs under titles VII and VIII and section 340G of the PHS Act.

(b) The eighteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-fifth provisos under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

(c) Sections 747(c)(2) and 751(j)(2) of the PHS Act, the proportional funding amounts in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 756(e) of such Act, and section 511(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 711(f)) shall not apply to funds made available by this division for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services''.

(d) For purposes of this section, section 10503(d) of Public Law 111–148 shall be applied as if '', over the fiscal year 2008 level,'' were stricken from such section.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. As I visit all the communities of my district, I am asked about high unemployment, how government can help promote job growth, and how we can get the economy working again for families trying to make ends meet. It is clear that the top priority in New York and across the country is creating jobs. But when I'm in Washington, I don't hear the House leadership answering that call.

Since the beginning of the year, we have yet to debate a single bill that would create a single job. There have been no attempts to make the targeted investments in innovation and education that will help us win the next century, as the President mentioned in the State of the Union.

In the last decade, unemployment has skyrocketed while the number of abortions has decreased. Yet today the majority is pursuing an extreme assault on women's health and reproductive rights by eliminating the cost-effective Family Planning Program.

My amendment would restore $317 million for title X family planning because it is a wise investment. Publicly supported family planning clinics save taxpayers nearly $4 for every $1 that is spent providing contraceptive care. In New York, more than 340,000 women are served by title X funding clinics and 66 percent have incomes at or below poverty level. Elimination of the program in the CR would only guarantee higher government health care costs for these low-income Americans in future years.

If our goal is to cut spending, it is reckless to eliminate this program that saves taxpayer dollars. It is unconscionable that those Americans who most need access to the affordable basic health care title X provides, like cancer screenings and contraceptives, have become victims of the extreme right's divisive partisan attempts to deny women a full range of legal health services.

Even as we consider this wrong-headed bill, they are simultaneously pursuing legislation and authorizing committees to roll back the clock on a woman's right to choose, women's services available to victims of rape and incest, and even allow hospitals to deny lifesaving treatments for women.

Not once have I heard a constituent say that it's important for the government to get to work on restricting women's health choices and denying basic care. At a time of high unemployment and enormous economic challenges, Congress should focus on job creation. The assault on women's health must stop now.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, in a breathtaking and a radical step, the Republican majority has proposed to eliminate title X funding which has connected millions of American women to health care since 1970.

In 2009, title X funding provided 2.3 million breast exams, 2.2 million Pap tests, and nearly 1 million HIV tests to

men and women both. This Republican Congress is trying to turn back the clock on women's health and turn back the clock on women's basic rights. They are taking us back to a day when family planning was not a given opportunity for women.

In Connecticut, more than 62,000 men and women benefit from care at title X-funded health centers each year. Over 70 percent of them have a family income of less than $16,245 a year. In other words, this is the only way they can afford health care. In fact, six of every 10 women who seek care at a title X-funded center consider it their main source of medical care. Yet the majority is trying to take these important services away.

It is argued that we need to cut title X services to reduce the deficit. This is simply not true. For every dollar invested in title X, taxpayers save just under $4. The fact of the matter is that vital preventive care and family planning services supported by title X save money and save lives.

Make no mistake, cutting title X funding is a breathtaking and a radical step. The majority is using the guise of budget cutting to launch an assault on title X, which would endanger women's health. Understanding their purpose has nothing to do with the deficit. They want to impose their traditional view of a woman's role.

Let's get real. This legislation is not about Federal funding for abortion. Federal funds, including title X, are already banned from going toward abortion services under the Hyde amendment. Rather, much like the repeal of health care reform, this is part of an agenda to force women back into traditional roles with limited opportunities. Under their proposal, more than 5 million people lose access to basic primary and preventive health care. As a cancer survivor myself, who is only here today because my cancer was found at stage I, I can tell you, losing access to screenings will cost lives.

It comes down to this: The proposal to eliminate title X is a bad policy. It will hurt women and do nothing for our economy. It costs money. Instead of making it harder for women to get health care, we should be standing up for these vital services.

The American public called for job creation and turning our economy around last November. I believe that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not heeded that call. This bill will do nothing to create jobs nor reduce the deficit.

On behalf of women, on behalf of middle class and working families we represent, I urge my colleagues to leave this extreme and divisive social agenda out of the picture of support. We should not be playing games with women's health and with basic rights.

□ 2040

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. ROBY. I oppose increased funding for title X. We should not allocate Federal funds to groups like Planned Parenthood that use the money for abortion.

Planned Parenthood has recently made plain the centrality of abortion to its mission, mandating that every affiliate have at least one clinic performing abortions within the next 2 years. Additionally, it is beyond shocking that Planned Parenthood employees were recently found on video aiding and abetting in the alleged sex trafficking of minors.

This is not the first time that Planned Parenthood has shown such shocking behavior. It happened in my home State of Alabama back in 2009. A Planned Parenthood counselor was caught on hidden camera telling an alleged 14-year-old statutory rape victim that the clinic ''does sometime bend the rules a little bit'' rather than report sexual abuse to State authorities. Two years later, we are still seeing this outrageous behavior by Planned Parenthood employees. It is time to stop funding such an organization with taxpayer dollars.

Planned Parenthood ignores statutory rape law reporting, pushes abortion procedures, and opposes any effort to elevate the legal status of a fetus at any stage of development. It is not a proud day that citizens learn that these activities have been continually funded by the Federal Government. It is an even worse day when we are told that our government has funded Planned Parenthood with more than $363 million in government grants and contracts.

Since fiscal year 1998, title X has seen increased funding for 10 of the 12 years. From fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 2010, title X funding has increased by over 56 percent. In appropriations for fiscal year 2010, title X saw a 3.3 percent increase in funding, which was a $10 million increase over 2009 funding. This is unacceptable spending at a time that we must cut Federal spending.

The continual action by Planned Parenthood and its employees is demeaning for women and a black eye on our society. Funding must be stopped. We should not spend any more taxpayer dollars to push Planned Parenthood's agenda to take away the rights of the unborn.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment to add money to title X.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1810. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for the first undesignated paragraph under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Disease Control, Research, and Training'' shall be $5,742,989,000, of which (1) $750,000,000 shall be derived from funds transferred, pursuant to section 4002(c) of Public Law 111–148, from amounts appropriated by section 4002(b) of such Public Law; (2) no funds shall be available for acquisition of real property, equipment, construction, and renovation of facilities; and (3) $523,533,000 shall remain available until expended for the Strategic National Stockpile under section 319F–2 of the PHS Act.

(b) The amount included before the first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Disease Control, Research, and Training'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$20,620,000''.

(c) Paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 2821(b) of the PHS Act shall not apply to funds made available by this division.

(d) For purposes of this section, section 4002(c) of Public Law 111–148 shall be applied as if '', over the fiscal year 2008 level,'' were stricken from such section.

SEC. 1811. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases'' shall be $4,214,275,000, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall transfer up to $256,627,000, on a pro rata basis, based on total funding levels, from the other Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within the National Institutes of Health Account to ''National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases'', and the requirement under ''National Institute of Allergy and Infection Diseases'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 for a transfer from Biodefense Countermeasures funds shall not apply.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1812. The amount provided by section 1101 for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'' is reduced by $260,000,000, through a pro rata reduction in all of the Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'', based on the total of the projected funding levels for the Non-competing Research Project Grants in fiscal year 2011 for each such Institute, Center, and Office of the Director account. In addition, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall ensure that the average of the total cost of Competing Research Project Grants for all of the Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'' during fiscal year 2011 shall not exceed $400,000.

SEC. 1813. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Buildings and Facilities'' shall be $22,700,000.

SEC. 1814. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services'' shall be $3,202,152,000.

(b) The amount included before the first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$14,518,000''.

(c) The second proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services,

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 565 OFFERED BY MR. BASS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 291, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $98,000,000)''.

Page 293, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 293, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Madam Chairman, my amendment very simply adds $50 million to the Low Energy Assistance Program, otherwise known as LIHEAP. Winters in the Northeast and elsewhere in America are long and hard, and especially this year it has been difficult. It has been a tough year. In January we saw more or less twice the average amount of snow. Temperatures have been well below average in some parts of the country; and there are similar stories not only in New Hampshire, but elsewhere in the Northeast and around the Nation.

The problem with reducing the contingency fund in the Low Income Energy Assistance Plan is we are in the middle of the winter right now, and what my amendment does is add $50 million to ensure that we have adequate resources to make it through March and into April. The amendment also reduces the substance abuse and mental health services by an equivalent amount, but that is only about 1 percent of the total funding for that line item.

Let me point out that what this amendment will do is ensure that low-income individuals in America have the necessary resources in order to ensure that they have adequate heat throughout the rest of the year.

This is a difficult process that we are going through here, and I recognize there are trade-offs; but this is a very small change in a safety net that provides an enormous resource very quickly. We can debate the rest of the Low Income Energy Assistance Plan later in the year. What this $50 million increase does is make it possible to get through the winter.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. REHBERG. We accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1815. The amount included under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Healthcare Research and Quality'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$372,053,000'' for ''397,053,000''.

SEC. 1816. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for amounts transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Program Management'' shall be $3,012,162,000, of which the level for the Research, Demonstration, and Evaluation program shall be $0.

(b) The amount under the third proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Program Management'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$9,120,000'' for ''$65,600,000''.

(c) The sixth proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Program Management'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1817. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Low Income Home Energy Assistance'' shall be $4,709,672,000, of which $4,509,672,000 shall be for payments under subsections (b) and (d) of section 2602 of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621); and of which $200,000,000 shall be for payments under subsection (e) of such Act, to be made notwithstanding the designation requirements of such subsection.

(b) The second proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Low Income Home Energy Assistance'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 293, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $390,328,000)''.

Page 293, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $390,328,000)''.

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

SEC. 4002. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''End Big Oil Tax Subsidies Act of 2011''.

SEC. 4003. AMORTIZATION OF GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''major integrated oil company'' and inserting ''covered large oil company''.

(b) COVERED LARGE OIL COMPANY.—Paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of such Act is amended by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) COVERED LARGE OIL COMPANY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'covered large oil company' means a taxpayer which—

''(i) is a major integrated oil company, or

''(ii) has gross receipts in excess of $50,000,000 for the taxable year.

For purposes of clause (ii), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of such Code is amended by inserting ''AND OTHER LARGE TAXPAYERS''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4004. PRODUCING OIL AND GAS FROM MARGINAL WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(2) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to credits determined for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4005. ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(2) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4006. INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 263 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is not a small, independent oil and gas company, determined by deeming all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 as 1 person.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4007. PERCENTAGE DEPLETION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section and section 611 shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(2) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 613A(c)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsections (d) and (f)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4008. TERTIARY INJECTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR QUALIFIED CARBON DIOXIDE DISPOSED IN SECURE GEOLOGICAL STORAGE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of any qualified tertiary injectant expense paid or incurred for any tertiary injectant is qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)) which is disposed of by the taxpayer in secure geological storage (as defined by section 45Q(d)).

''(3) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to expenses incurred after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4009. PASSIVE ACTIVITY LOSSES AND CREDITS LIMITED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 469(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any taxpayer which is not a small, independent oil and gas company for the taxable year.

''(ii) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of clause (i), all persons treated as a single employer under subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 shall be treated as 1 person.''.

SEC. 4010. INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS NOT SMALL, INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS COMPANY.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the income derived from the production, transportation, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof by any taxpayer which for the taxable year is an oil and gas company which is not a small, independent oil and gas company.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

SEC. 4011. PROHIBITION ON USING LAST-IN, FIRST-OUT ACCOUNTING FOR MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)) may not use the method provided in subsection (b) in inventorying of any goods.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer required by the amendment made by this section to change its method of accounting for its first taxable year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer,

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, and

(C) the net amount of the adjustments required to be taken into account by the taxpayer under section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be taken into account ratably over a period (not greater than 8 taxable years) beginning with such first taxable year.

SEC. 4012. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period with respect to combined foreign oil and gas income (as defined in section 907(b)(1)) shall not be considered a tax to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which would have been required to be paid if the taxpayer were not a dual capacity taxpayer.

''(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'dual capacity taxpayer' means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

''(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

''(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

Mr. REHBERG. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, we all recognize that we must make calculated decisions to drive down our deficit, but today we see the cold calculations of the Republican leadership, who are cutting hundreds of millions of dollars that would help our Nation's poorest families heat their homes while continuing the billions in taxpayer subsidies we send to big oil companies.

My amendment would fully restore LIHEAP funding and reduce the deficit by repealing these $40 billion in tax breaks for Big Oil. Oil companies don't need the 100-year-old tax breaks to sell $100-per-barrel oil while making $100 billion per year.

For millions of families across the country this year, heating bills have been piling up along with the snow, and so are the record numbers of people turning to LIHEAP to help them get through the winter.

□ 2050

In my State of Massachusetts alone, LIHEAP is projected to help 250,000 families this winter. But even as the mercury has dropped, House Republicans are now considering dropping this important safety net for millions of low-income families nationwide. The only way this bill is going to help families heat their homes would be if they tossed all 359 pages in the fireplace.

It takes a frigid heart for the Republican leadership to continue to defend tax breaks for oil and gas companies while putting heating fuel assistance for America's neediest on ice. But that's exactly what they are doing.

The majority spending bill presents us with a false choice. We shouldn't be cutting heating assistance for the poorest families before repealing the $40 billion in tax subsidies to big oil companies, the most profitable companies in the history of the world. The Republicans can continue to make their choices, but the American people will not stand with them. When they are faced with giving tax breaks to Exxon or fuel assistance to low-income Americans, they have chosen Exxon. When they are forced to choose between a free lunch for BP or lunch for hungry senior citizens, they make the choice for BP. We should not be balancing the budget on the backs of the poorest families. I urge support for this amendment to protect the neediest amongst us with a ''no'' vote on this cold-hearted funding bill.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part, ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' And the amendment directly amends existing law.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair finds that the amendment proposes directly to change existing law, to wit: the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

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

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the continuing resolution. Instead of fighting the war on cancer, this bill declares war on cancer research and those who undertake it. The National Cancer Institute Director, Dr. Harold Varmus, said it best in December when he warned that the proposed cuts would have dire and lethal consequences. He is right. The proposed $1.6 billion cut to the National Institutes of Health would undermine the most successful innovation model the world has ever seen. The classic view of innovation is that government funds basic science while industry comes up with new innovative products based on that science. This model has worked well.

Over the past 40 years, 153 new FDA-approved drugs and vaccines were discovered through research carried out at public institutions with Federal funds. In the last 20 years alone, one out of every five important medical advances approved by the FDA was invented in a federally funded lab. Those inventions, which included 40 new drugs for cancer, are currently generating more than $100 billion a year in sales for drug and biotechnology firms.

This includes drugs like Herceptin for breast cancer; Avastin for lung cancer; and Gleevec for gastrointestinal stromal tumors that inhibit and/or block cancer cell growth. This research in cancer alone supports over 1,300 clinical trials each year for promising new therapies for more than 200,000 cancer patients.

President Nixon, a Republican, recognized the importance of a sustained public commitment in basic research when he signed the National Cancer Act in 1971. Last year, under President Obama, $5 billion was provided to the National Cancer Institute to continue that mission.

This funding bill would take us back years, decreasing the National Institutes of Health budget by 5 percent, disrupting this tremendously successful innovation model. The only failure in cancer research is when you quit or you're forced to quit because of the lack of funding.

Our sustained commitment to biochemical research is vital to the community I serve in western New York, where approximately $100 billion in Federal funding supports research each year. Institutions like Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Hauptman Woodward Medical Research Institute, the University of Buffalo, and companies along the Buffalo campus all rely on this funding to conduct research and translate that research into new treatments and products to improve quality of life. The cuts proposed would not only hurt these institutions and small businesses, it will hurt the entire Buffalo community that is now beginning to realize the tremendous economic benefit of this research.

Alleviating suffering due to diseases like cancer in our lifetime should be Congress's goal. This continuing resolution falls dangerously short of that.

Mr. MARKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIGGINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Right now, 2010, we spent $172 billion on Alzheimer's patients—$172 billion, Medicare and Medicaid. You're cutting the budget for NIH to find a cure for Alzheimer's. By the time all the baby boomers have retired, the budget for each year is going to be $1 trillion to take care of the 15 million baby boomers that are going to have Alzheimer's in nursing homes.

So what are you guys doing? You're saying, We're going to cut the budget for Medicaid, which pays for Alzheimer's patients in nursing homes, and we're going to cut the budget for the cure for the funding for the NIH. You're having it both ways. No cure—and you're then going to cut the money for these poor families under the Medicaid and Medicare budget. You shouldn't do this.

The NIH are the National Institutes of Hope—researchers in medicine's field of dreams from which we harvest the findings that give hope to millions of families in our country. You are cutting this budget and you're not giving us an opportunity to make amendments in which we'll be able to put the funding in for the NIH budget. And that is just a very bad moral decision which you are making. And you're sending a false hope to people that you're actually solving the problem by cutting the NIH budget.

All of those people who are going to have Alzheimer's—and it's a demographic certainty—are going to cost $1 trillion by 2050. You are doing nothing about that right now. And, by the way; you won't have the courage to tell people you're not going to take care of them in nursing homes across the countries. That demographic is going be so strong. Put the money in NIH for Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, for all of these diseases. Please, God, let's at least agree on that as a bipartisan issue—that all our families are going to be equally struck by all of these diseases.

The gentleman from New York has put his finger right on this great moral and political dilemma for our country. A stitch in time will save nine. The money we put up now will save not 9 but 900 times the money that is ultimately going to have to be spent on all of these Alzheimer's and Parkinson's patients. It is a demographic certainty.

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

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

Mr. RUSH. Madam Chair, today I am rising to speak out on the severe lack of centers and facilities for Level 1 trauma centers throughout this Nation. I introduced an amendment, which I am withdrawing.

Madam Chair, in my home State of Illinois, our family members are dying due to the tragic lack of Level 1 trauma centers in close proximity to those who need it. Sadly, our newspaper headlines, including yesterday's Chicago Sun-Times, are filled with tragic stories of victims struck by bullets, stabbed, and other kinds of trauma visited upon them. Despite the best efforts of witnesses, bystanders, and paramedics, the lack of nearby Level 1 trauma centers dramatically reduces survival rates and drives up long-term acute care needs and costs.

Madam Chair, in 1999, my son, 29-year-old Huey, was shot two blocks from a hospital. But he couldn't go to that hospital because they didn't have a Level 1 trauma center. So they had to transport him some 10 miles away, where eventually he passed.

This is just one example of one of these sad stories. It is not only patently unfair, but it's an injustice that in a Nation as vast and prosperous as ours that we have a tragic lack of such misplaced priorities by not having Level 1 trauma centers close to the communities where people reside. The fact that a community that's home to about 750,000 people on the greater South Side of Chicago, an overwhelming portion of which sits in my congressional district, does not have one Level 1 trauma care center literally results in the needless loss of life for far too many of us.

□ 2100

Our Nation has seen time and time again the amazing work that gifted trauma surgeons and fully equipped trauma care facilities can deliver to pull patients back from almost certain death. What I want to ensure, Madam Chair, is that the same level of care that is available in the affluent communities in this Nation is also available to the men, women and children in low-income communities.

The aforementioned editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times reported on the tragic set of circumstances that befell an 18-year-old trauma victim, who, after being struck by a bullet in a drive-by shooting last August, could not go to the nearby University of Chicago Medical Center, which was only four blocks away, because that facility did not have a trauma center. The University of Chicago Medical Center, one of the major hospitals in this Nation, does not have a level 1 trauma center. Instead, at a time when every moment counts, when every minute counts to save a life, paramedics had to drive the victim 9 miles to the nearest level 1 trauma center, to Northwestern Memorial Hospital, where the victim later died.

Madam Chair, situations like this simply should not happen in America. As I stand here today, I am fully aware of the need to provide funding to trauma centers for the financial losses they

incur. The National Trauma Care Foundation has estimated that the economic loss to trauma centers due to their treatment of the uninsured and underinsured patients is $230 million per year.

In the same Sun-Times editorial that I mentioned before, they also reported on a study last year by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, which found that almost three-fourths of the Nation's emergency rooms are unable to provide round-the-clock specialty care and that almost one-fourth of hospitals cited this as a reason for the loss or downgrading of their trauma center designations.

It is time for us to address the nationwide shortage of trauma care, especially in underserved areas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIMM. I rise in support of Representative BASS's amendment, which supports the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. The continuing resolution cuts the LIHEAP program by almost $400 million.

Madam Chairwoman, this program is crucial to the homeowners of the Northeast, specifically in my district of Staten Island and Brooklyn, New York. LIHEAP helps low-income families and seniors remain healthy and secure from cold winters in the North and from hot summers in the South, as well as keeping them from having to face the impossible choice of paying their home energy bills or affording other necessities, such as prescription drugs and food.

I am cognizant of the fact that at a time of record deficits and of reduced spending, we must tighten our respective belts. However, it is imperative that we make smart spending choices. That being said, I believe, when given the choice between ensuring that our seniors have the ability to heat their homes during frigid New York winters or putting even more money into the catchall slush fund at NASA, there is no choice at all.

As I have stated numerous times, I absolutely believe that deep budget cuts are required to get our government back on a sound fiscal path. However, we must first look to cut spending that is truly wasteful. For that reason, I stand in support of Representative BASS's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I am really intrigued by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have made the determination to cut LIHEAP by $390 million, a decision that, in fact, wasn't important enough to consider the well-being of people, whether they are in the Northeast, whether they are in the Midwest, or whether they are in other parts of the country which have very tough winters. So now what they would want to do is take money from other worthy programs that, in fact, they have cut but would further cut.

In the instance of Mr. BASS's amendment, he would reduce the money from SAMHSA. That is the money for substance abuse and mental illness. What it does is help to reduce the impact of substance abuse and mental illness on America's communities by focusing its services on the people who are in most need. It translates research, and makes it useful and more effective so that we can get this into the general health care system.

How do you treat addiction? How do you treat mental illness? Very difficult issues.

So they would take that money, but they have cut LIHEAP, low-income energy assistance, which, for the most part, we are looking at low-income people. Then if it's applied to seniors, what they will do is they won't cook their food at the right temperature, which will put their health in jeopardy. They will buy space heaters, potentially, which will put their lives in jeopardy.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really cared about low-income energy assistance, they wouldn't have started to make their cuts there. They would have moved to the $40 billion in subsidies for oil and gas. They would have moved elsewhere to look for this funding. What they would have done is cut back on the subsidies for special interests to do that.

It is a bit disingenuous, and it robs Peter to pay Paul; but I believe that that's the nature of what this unfixable bill is all about.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I rise today to support the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from New York (Mrs. LOWEY). This amendment would restore vital funding to the title X family planning program.

Now, I am all for reducing our deficit and for getting our fiscal house in order, but let's be clear on something: this cut to title X will not save money.

The proponents of eliminating family planning funds want us to believe that cutting these funds is fiscally responsible and that it has to be done to balance our budget. What they don't want us to know is that investing in family planning actually saves money. For every public dollar invested in family planning, taxpayers saved nearly $4. So while cutting family planning appears to be a savings up front, over the long run it will cost us both in dollars and in the health and well-being of millions of women.

While we are being honest, let's also discuss the other motive of the proponents of cutting title X. They argue that cutting funds for family planning will reduce abortions. Once again, they are wrong. In fact, if they wanted to reduce abortions, they would increase funding for title X. Why? Because title X services prevent nearly 1 million unintended pregnancies each year, almost half of which would otherwise end in abortion.

If we want to get serious about cutting Federal spending and reducing abortions, a good start would be investing in title X, not eliminating it, which is exactly what this amendment will do. Of course, in addition to reducing unintended pregnancies and saving taxpayers' money, family planning providers, like Planned Parenthood, provide essential life-saving and preventative care.

In 2009, title X providers performed 2.3 million breast exams, 2.2 million Pap tests, over 6 million tests for STIs, and close to 1 million HIV tests. For six out of 10 women who receive care from women's health centers, this is their only source of health care. Eliminating all funds for family planning would cut millions of women off from their primary and, in many cases, their only source of health care.

To the millions of women out there who want comprehensive reproductive health care: this is what they think of you.

They think that women should not have access to basic reproductive health care, including birth control. Recent legislation revealed that they think you shouldn't be able to access care even if you are a victim of rape or incest.

□ 2110

This is what they think of you.

All these bills reveal the true mindset of the opponents of choice: women are not capable of making their own decisions about their own health and their own lives.

These cuts to family planning programs would have a devastating impact in my community. Ten Planned Parenthood health centers in Illinois that provide primary and preventive care, including flu vaccines, diabetes screening, and cholesterol screening would all be forced to close. This would affect approximately 30,000 low-income patients and eliminate the jobs of 200 health center workers. Not exactly the kind of job-stimulating legislation we should be focusing on.

The conversation we're having today is not about choice, but choices. With family planning, we can reduce abortions and save the Federal Government money; without, we only pretend to do either. With family planning we can embrace educating and providing health care to women; without, we abandon women when they need care the most. With family planning, we can empower the women of America; without, we undermine them.

We have the choice. And we must choose to stand up to these attacks and fight back against the mistruths because the health, well-being, and lives of millions of women and their families are at stake.

This amendment is a strike against these wrongheaded cuts to family planning. I encourage my colleagues to restore funding to title X family planning programs and vote ''yes'' on Mrs. LOWEY's amendment.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this continuing resolution because it ignores the needs of America's families and does nothing to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, or effectively lower the deficit.

The $1.3 billion cut to community health centers is astounding. In my district alone, if these cuts are enacted, over 112,000 individuals will suffer a significant loss in primary health services, and they will be forced to use costly hospital emergency care. Nationally, these cuts mean health centers will be unable to serve 11 million patients over the next year. It means 127 new health centers in underserved districts will lose their funds. And it means the loss of thousands of health care jobs.

Also on the chopping block is the title X program, which provides over 8,000 men and women in my district with reproductive health care and cancer screening. Nationally, the $317 million cut to title X will force many clinics to close, eliminating another primary care safety net for 5 million men and women.

Also unbelievable is the $210 million in proposed cuts to the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant program. This cut will devastate primary and preventive health services in California for an estimated 2.6 million pregnant women, infants, and special needs children.

The cuts also endanger other critical programs such as California's newborn screening program, which last year tested almost 550,000 newborns for treatable genetic and metabolic diseases, which if undetected could have become painful and life threatening. On the national level, these cuts in MCH grants will reduce or eliminate prenatal health services for 2 million women and primary health care for more than 17 million children. In a country that ranks far behind almost all other developed nations in maternal and infant outcomes, we can ill-afford to slash funding for the only Federal program that focuses solely on improving the health of mothers and their babies.

Madam Chair, this bill is a Trojan horse that pretends to address our Nation's deficit crisis at the expense of the most vulnerable among us. This bill is not worthy of this House, for it fails to honor the true priorities and values of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this irresponsible resolution.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I rise to speak in strong support of the Lowey amendment reinstating the funding for the title X program, which supports family planning services for all of our constituents. While we all agree on the need to reduce spending, it is just bad policy to eliminate a proven, successful program that saves the taxpayer money and provides critical health care services for our mothers, our sisters, our friends. This is bad policy.

The title X program, the only Federal program devoted to family planning, is the core of the public effort to ensure that all women, regardless of income, have the knowledge and health care they need to plan for their families. Its flexible grant funds not only help pay for direct client services but also help to ensure that State and local governments and nonprofit organizations across the country can place safety net clinics in the communities that need them the most. These clinics are the primary source of health care for millions of low-income American women.

By helping women and couples plan and space their pregnancies, family planning services have led to healthier mothers and children and have been instrumental in the long struggle for women's equality in education, the workforce, and society.

In light of the economic downturn, the freedom that the title X program has given to women in the workforce is particularly important. But this program hasn't just been successful for the over 4½ million Americans who use it every year. It has been successful for the American taxpayer, as every dollar spent on this program saves our Nation nearly $4 in return.

In light of the important role that family planning has played in health care and society, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has called family planning one of the top 10 greatest public health achievements of the 20th century, alongside other critical breakthroughs like vaccinations and the campaigns against smoking.

Over 40 years ago, title X family planning funding was enacted on a unanimous vote in the Senate and by an overwhelming majority in the House. When signed into law, then-President Richard Nixon said it fulfilled a promise that ''no American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition.''

How far we have come from that time to this day, when we have the research to prove that a program works, and yet the House Republican leadership has recklessly decided to cut it completely. Eliminating title X now would be a devastating blow to the health, the security, and the dreams of millions of American women and their families, denying 5 million women preventive care, including annual exams, lifesaving cancer screenings, contraceptive services, and testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infection.

If Members of Congress really want to reduce our Federal deficit, we would double funding for family planning, which studies have shown could save the taxpayers nearly $2 billion per year. And yet, for some reason, my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to believe that cutting this program, defunding a program that actually saves Americans money and improves the health, improves the health of millions of Americans, that somehow this is a good idea.

For those Members who oppose title X funding, I ask you: How do you plan to ensure that the women in your district and your State have access to lifesaving prevention services? This sham of a Republican omnibus spending bill contains no answers to these questions, just broken promises for the American people.

Let's be clear. A vote against title X is a vote for unintended pregnancies. A vote against title X is a vote for the spread of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV. A vote against title X is a vote for increased rate of cervical cancer and breast cancer if caught late or if at all. And a vote against title X is a vote for increased abortion rates.

While I would like to think of this as an oversight, it is not the first attack to women's access to health care that has been seen in the 112th Congress. Combined with the mean-spirited bills moving through House committees that reopen the culture wars, it is obvious that this extreme and reckless proposal by the Republican majority to defund title X clinics is just the next step in an all-out Republican assault on women's health.

This Congress should be focused on creating jobs for the millions of moms working to put food on the table, not attacking their rights and their health.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lowey amendment to add some common sense to this omnibus spending bill.

□ 2120

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, first let me just say, I am shocked and appalled at the comment yesterday by the Speaker when he said ''so be it'' in response to the likely job losses that will occur as a result of this continuing resolution.

An independent analysis by the nonpartisan Economic Policy Institute indicates that this bill will result in the

direct loss, mind you, of 800,000 private and public sector jobs. Instead of doing everything we can do to halt the loss of jobs and put people back to work, this bill takes the wrong approach, putting our economy and our country back on the path to recession.

For every job opening in this country, we have 4.7 unemployed people who are looking for work. Why would we want to add to their numbers? ''So be it'' cannot and should not be our response to this economic crisis, not with a 9 percent unemployment rate and over 15 percent in communities of color, and record layoffs and furloughs at the State level, and especially not when Republicans have the temerity to demand tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires paid for through borrowed money. This is just wrong, and it's immoral.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, I am in strong opposition to these cruel cuts. Budgets are moral documents, and they are a reflection of who we are and what we value. This spending bill makes it clear that the poor, the young, women, the elderly, teachers, firefighters, cops, and the communities that they protect and serve are not valued. Make no mistake, this bill will harm the most vulnerable among us, and it represents a wrongheaded approach to reducing the deficit or expanding job growth in our country.

Madam Chair, I am especially concerned about the proposed cuts to education and training programs. Among the range of cuts include Workforce Investment Act programs, which last year helped over 8.4 million job seekers find jobs. They got additional education and job training support. This is being cut.

All told, when counting rescissions of prior funding, elimination of the requested FY11 funding, and the advanced funding needed to run these employment and training programs, they will experience nearly a $5 billion cut. Republican cuts in job training will only prolong the recession, keep unemployment high, and keep more Americans collecting unemployment instead of training and getting ready for our 21st century job opportunities.

How can we justify cutting job training programs in the middle of an economic crisis? How will my Republican colleagues respond to the unemployed in their communities who come to them and ask them for help? Will they just say ''so be it''?

Pell Grants. Pell Grants provide vital funds for students who wish to attend 2- and 4-year colleges but who need help to pay their expenses. In my district alone, there are 16 institutions that provide Pell Grants to over 18,000 recipients. This proposal would cut Pell Grants by $845, making college less affordable and accessible for low- and moderate-income students. More than 8 million students benefit from Pell Grants, and many would be hurt by this cut, especially as schools are raising tuition fees to meet rising costs and to deal with tighter budgets.

The bill also entirely eliminates Federal funding for Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, which colleges and universities use to assist undergraduates who have the greatest financial need. That program assisted 1.3 million college students last year.

Head Start, under this proposal, is cut by nearly $1.1 billion. This will effectively knock out 200,000 children, mind you, in Republican and Democratic districts from participating in this critical early education program. This helps provide health, nutrition, and supportive services to prepare our children for school.

The Job Corps program, this program is cut by $891 million, which will result in 21,384 jobs lost in communities in every State, the majority of which are in the private sector. There will be $1.7 billion lost in economic activity as a result of this. And 36,000 at-risk young people will be turned away from Job Corps, costing the government and the economy as much as $17 billion over the course of their lifetimes. Additionally, the cuts will guarantee the closure, mind you, of 75 Job Corps centers across the Nation in your districts and in our districts. Slashing one of the most effective, accountable, and market-driven solutions for millions of youth who leave our schools unprepared is really the wrong move at the wrong time.

The majority has stated that they want to cut the deficit, but, in effect, they are cutting the social safety net lifeline for those who need it the most. This CR leads us down a path that will result in hopelessness, joblessness, and desperation, and it destroys the future for our young people.

I urge my colleagues to meet the challenge before us and reverse the potential harm that will be inevitable if this bill is enacted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, let me thank the former chair of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee and now the ranking member, Ms. DELAURO, and the manager and the chairman of the subcommittee.

I thought, Madam Chairwoman, that we lived in a country that was a land of the free and the brave. We had a sense of pride in the progress that America has made, and we have always said we would never want to go back, whether it has to do with actual equal rights for women, whether it is civil rights and the ability to be empowered to vote. But I stand on the floor today with a great deal of disappointment because it seems as if, with this continuing resolution, that will literally stop in its tracks the functioning of this government. We are really going back.

I rise to support the Lowey amendment because I really can't believe that this CR is eliminating $327 million in family planning. It just baffles the mind that this critical aspect of health care is now in jeopardy. It is now being part of turning the clock back. It is amazing that we would not acknowledge the fact that lives of women have been saved, lives of young girls have been saved because they've had access to family planning.

As much as we have fought to be able to ensure that around the world where indigent women who have lost their lives through the birthing process now have access to good medical care—and yes, family planning—so that they can have live births, now we come here to the soil of the United States, and to take $327 million out of the mouths and the hands of women and children—yes, children who can be born healthy. Children who are part of the health care process that these women are able to secure through the many clinics that are around this Nation and in this community.

I am disappointed in the games that are played with Planned Parenthood and to be able to demonize them with false and fraudulent tapings and a lot of bogus arguments about the fact that they are not in the business of helping people. I am disappointed in using those tactics because this is a very serious issue. Mrs. LOWEY's amendment addresses the seriousness of it because she realizes that if we were to go through with the elimination of $327 million, there would be many, many lives that are lost.

We have a Planned Parenthood office in my community. It is mostly focusing its attention on educating the community about healthy births, about ensuring that teenagers are not alone when decisions have to be made, decisions that will allow for the healthy birth or determination that is made by their faith leader with their family. They will not be left alone. In fact, family planning and Planned Parenthood extinguishes, I hope for good, the back alley procedures and, as well, the rusty hangers that were used in years past.

Just a day or two ago, we heard of a horrible abortion clinic that saw the lives lost of babies and their mothers because of the dastardly tactics that were being used. That is not what we speak of here today. We speak of the right of a woman to be able to choose but also to accept the good health care of family planning.

□ 2130

We speak of the rights of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence that really ensure that we all are created equal, with certain inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The Bill of Rights, which allows us due process, is what is being denied in this continuing resolution for, as we speak, if that money is eliminated, clinics around America will have their doors closed. Women will be standing outside, banging on

the door and asking for good health care.

So I ask my colleagues to support Congresswoman LOWEY's amendment, and I truly ask you to not take this Nation back and eliminate $327 million in family planning, benign but healthy and good health care and good policy for America and for America's women and for America's children.

Let us support the Lowey amendment and let us reject the elimination of $327 million in family planning and this continuing resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chairman, as we continue to work our way out of the recession towards the thriving economy that offers economic opportunity to all Americans, we must out-innovate, out-educate and out-build the rest of the world; but the House Republican continuing resolution will do none of that. What it accomplishes is nothing but irresponsible slashing of necessary programs just so they can go back home and say that they cut government spending.

Now, I'm not sure if our Republican colleagues realize that actions have consequences. House Republicans are going too far, and they're sacrificing Americans' health, safety and future in the process, all in order to protect special interests. And what makes it worse is they are offering no real plan to deal with the deficit or create jobs.

Madam Chairman, American competitiveness depends on our ability to innovate and keep America number one. But, instead, this bill holds $2.5 billion in cuts to the National Institutes of Health, representing a significant setback in cancer and other disease research. We have to properly fund the key agencies like NIH that are essential to disseminating medical research and assisting in the development of new drugs and devices. Declining or stagnant Federal funding for research and development has an impact on all sectors of our workforce. And I want to use my home State of New Jersey as an example.

A report that was released last year showed that the pharmaceutical and medical technology industries are the leaders in private sector capital construction in New Jersey. In fact, in 2008, that meant $1.4 billion to the State and almost 6,000 jobs for construction alone.

In addition, there's a new report, ''Research America,'' that notes that New Jersey is the third largest R&D employer in the United States with more than 211,000 jobs supported by health R&D, including 50,000 direct jobs in health R&D. The same report shows the economic impact in New Jersey is $60 billion.

And that's why I believe that we must provide R&D incentives, additional research grants and more technology funding. These investments will provide new jobs, not only in the research sector, but in the construction and maintenance of labs and research facilities.

So, Madam Chairman, the government must be responsible for facilitating an environment where Americans can continue to innovate. This is what President Obama talked about in his State of the Union speech. That is the key to creating new thriving industries that will produce millions of good jobs here at home and a better future for the next generation.

If government abandons its role in R&D, we run the real risk of squandering many, many opportunities. Oftentimes, government can support and advance initial research that is then developed by the private sector. Government can plant the seeds, often with modest investments relative to the long-term payoffs in new products, new discoveries, new jobs, and economic growth.

Government has limited resources in these tough times, but that doesn't mean we abandon our role. In fact, we have a responsibility to the future to make wise investments that can lead to so many innovative discoveries and so much in economic benefits.

Now, last Thursday, Speaker BOEHNER said, ''Everything's on the table. We're broke. Let's be honest with ourselves.''

But the Pentagon, in this CR, gets 99 percent of what they ask for. Now, defense spending makes up more than half of our discretionary budget. The non-defense discretionary spending in this CR is enduring brutal cuts. Why should defense spending remain so high when all this non-discretionary spending, including R&D, is cut so severely? It simply makes no sense.

And I would say, Madam Chairman, really this is all about priorities. The Republicans clearly have the wrong priorities. They're not making investments in the future. They're not creating jobs. They're not creating an environment where people can be educated for new jobs and be trained for new jobs. They simply have the wrong priorities here with their spending cuts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last words.

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

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer my strong support for the Lowey amendment, which would restore nearly $318 million in title X, and I rise to vehemently oppose the continuing resolution which completely eliminates title X funding.

Title X funding provides low-income women with access to contraceptive services; but it also provides coverage for primary care services, prevention services, including screenings for breast and cervical cancer, STD and HIV testing, screenings for high blood pressure, diabetes, anemia, pregnancy testing, health education and referral for other services. It has nothing to do with abortion. Title X, of course, prohibits recipients from expending these monies for abortions.

Madam Chair, I find this CR particularly troubling because I know that the overwhelming majority of title X patients are very, very poor. In fact, 70 percent of the these patients have incomes at or below the Federal poverty level, meaning that they earn less than $10,830 a year; 92 percent have incomes at or below 250 percent of the Federal poverty level, meaning that they earn less than $27,075 a year.

Now, you know what? We begrudge these patients Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, so that if they would become pregnant and have an unintended pregnancy, we would call them welfare queens and begrudge them welfare benefits. And these patients, who are disproportionately poor, women of color, would not be able to receive the economic support they need and, with this cruel continuing resolution, would not be able to receive the primary care that they deserve and that they need.

We talk about the need to have jobs in this tough economic time. How can women who have no family planning dollars sustain a job or get a job when there are unplanned pregnancies?

As a co-chair of the Women's Congressional Caucus, I want to take a final moment to note that access to family planning services has been nothing short of revolutionary for women in the United States. Women's ability to control their own reproductive destiny has changed the landscape at home, at work, and in the community. It's fundamentally altered women's role in society, and researchers tell us that it's helped to decrease infant mortality, child mortality, and maternal deaths. These are all incredibly worthy goals for women, men and families.

We've heard the cry of those who want our country back. We've heard the cries of those who want limited government. We've heard the cries of those who want to cut spending.

Well, I say, we want our bodies back. We want to govern our destinies, and we want to cut suspending our choices.

And so, therefore, I urge all of you to join me in supporting Congresswoman NITA LOWEY's amendment to restore title X funding.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I rise to support Mrs. LOWEY's amendment to restore title X funding.

At a time when we need to come together around jobs and the economy,

the Republicans are, instead, focusing on bills attacking women's health. The Republican gutting and slashing spending plan isn't about Federal funding; it's about undermining women.

□ 2140

This bill is an unprecedented display of disrespect for American women and shows no concern for their health. And all this raises the key question: Isn't the Republicans' real goal here just to end women's access to birth control?

Preventing unintended pregnancies and thus the need for abortion should be a goal on which both pro-choice and anti-choice lawmakers should agree. But the Republicans' anti-women continuing resolution includes language that dismantles Federal funding for family planning, attacks successful organizations that provide critical women's health care, and jeopardizes women's access to affordable birth control.

Now, this is a program that affects real people, and these drastic cuts will only hurt American women when they need help paying for these basic services the most.

Title X funding helped Shania, a woman who received care at Planned Parenthood in Los Angeles. She learned a terrible lesson when her mother broke her hip, was brought to the hospital, and then was discovered to have stage 5 cervical cancer, too late for a cure. But thanks to Planned Parenthood, her daughter is with us today, because after learning about her mother's illness, doctors urged Shania to get checked for the same diseases. Unemployed and without health insurance, she couldn't afford to go to a regular doctor. Instead, she walked into that clinic, which indeed did the testing and found her cervical cancer early enough to save her life.

Title X funding helped Beth, a volunteer soldier in our military who put her life on the line for our country. But in the military, they do not provide family planning services for our hardworking servicewomen, forcing them to look elsewhere for the care they need and deserve. When Beth needed help, Planned Parenthood and the title X fund was there for her even when the military wasn't, and she was able to get the help she needed for birth control.

This Federal money is a critical health care safety net for women around the country. It has helped improve the quality of women's health, given women free choice, and saved lives. What will Republicans tell Shania when she can no longer get the lifesaving checkups she needs? What will they tell Beth when she no longer has access to her reproductive choices despite serving her country?

It is clear that the real Republican agenda is to roll over women's health and steal away their rights. This Congress and this bill should be about creating jobs, not attacking American women.

Instead of working on the economy, Republicans are working to limit women's choices. Instead of doing the bidding of ideological extremists, let's address the true needs of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. BARLETTA

Mr. BARLETTA. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 321, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert

''(reduced by $42,676,000)''.

Page 293, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert

''(increased by $42,676,000)''.

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Madam Chair, I rise today to voice my concerns with a number of items listed in this continuing resolution.

I understand that the time has come for the government to tighten its belt, and I accept the fact that painful decisions must be made in order to get our economy on the right track. However, it is my belief that we have a responsibility to conduct our due diligence before defunding some of our most important programs.

For my district in Pennsylvania, that includes a thorough examination of alternatives to any cuts in clean coal technology research.

According to the National Mining Association, 52,000 Pennsylvanians are dependent on our coal industry for their jobs, jobs that may be put in danger without an investment in the future. And as the recent events overseas have demonstrated, we no longer have the luxury of time when it comes to our energy independence.

While clean coal research will prepare us for the future, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program invests in our most vulnerable. Last year, LIHEAP provided heat to 545,000 families in our country. And with an unemployment rate that's held over 9 percent for 21 consecutive months, we must remember that the cuts we debate here today will have a drastic effect on families who are already struggling to make ends meet.

The same can be said for the Community Service Employment for Older Americans. In 2008, this program helped nearly 90,000 older Americans prepare for the next phase of their careers, even assisting in their placement in the workforce.

Seniors constitute 16.5 percent of my district's population, and given the current nature of our economy, many of these hardworking men and women will be forced to prepare for changes in their future.

As a former mayor, Madam Chair, I understand how important the Community Development Fund is to supporting our local communities. It serves as a critical lifeline to towns, cities, and communities that are already struggling to pay their most basic bills.

It also supports revitalization programs in our communities and assists communities that have fallen victim to disasters.

And in a similar vein, State and local law enforcement assistance helps to keep our communities and neighborhoods safe. In particular, it supports communities that are forced to incarcerate illegal aliens for extended periods of time as well as programs that strive to protect our borders.

Madam Chair, I understand that we are broke, that programs such as those I have listed here today will be forced to bear the brunt of our new economic realities. Yet, I stand here today to reiterate my support of these important programs, and to remind my colleagues to remain ever cognizant of the fact that our cuts are again both necessary and painful.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. HIRONO. I rise today in strong support of the Lowey amendment and in strong opposition to cuts to the title X funds in this continuing resolution.

These cuts are a threat to women's health, as you have heard from so many of the previous speakers. For example, these cuts will prevent Planned Parenthood from receiving needed Federal funds. Much of the cuts in H.R. 1 target the most vulnerable among us, the poor, children, young adults, and women.

We are a diverse country, proud of it, with good people on all sides of an issue, including of course the issue of abortion. We know that cutting title X funds strikes at a favorite target of the anti-choice group, Planned Parenthood.

□ 2150

Sadly, in pursuing their anti-choice agenda, tens of thousands of women in our country will be denied health care services that have absolutely nothing to do with abortions. The vast majority of Planned Parenthood's medical services are related to contraception, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, cancer screening and other services, like pregnancy tests and infertility treatments. Abortion services comprise only 3 percent of the medical care Planned Parenthood provides. Federal law already prohibits title X funds from being used for abortion services. It is important to point out that there are no known violations of this law.

I would like to share with this body my views on how Planned Parenthood Hawaii has helped women and their families in my State. In Hawaii, there are three Planned Parenthood centers: one in Honolulu on the Island of Oahu, one in Kahului on the Island of Maui, and one in Kailua-Kona on the Island of Hawaii. Together, these three centers served over 7,800 patients. They provided 2,582 cervical cancer screenings that detected 321 abnormal results that required further diagnoses and treatment. These represent lives saved. They provided 2,705 breast exams. They conducted 3,346 tests for chlamydia, the leading cause of preventible infertility, that resulted in 172 positive results and follow-up treatment.

By cutting funding for title X family planning programs, the Planned Parenthood clinic in Kailua-Kona would have to close its doors. That center is one of the only dedicated sexual and reproductive health clinics on that island. The centers in Maui and Oahu would be forced to reduce their clinic hours. Cutting title X funds eliminates a safety net program that provides family planning services and lifesaving preventative care to 3 million Americans every year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 1, and I join my colleague, Mrs. LOWEY, in saying to the women of this country, we need to take our bodies back.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1, which cuts the heart out of safety net programs which sustain and help sustain the most economically challenged and most vulnerable individuals and families in our society.

Of particular concern to me are the maternal and child health programs, Community Development Block Grants, cuts to legal assistance services, education and training, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, known as LIHEAP, and others which sustain the most vulnerable, the most disadvantaged, the most disjointed, and, in many instances, the most helpless and the most hopeless members of our society.

I am obviously concerned about health services in a real sense, because if you have all of these other problems and then you are sick on top of it and have no way of taking care of yourself, then you have no way of addressing the other needs that you have.

I have been involved with health services for more than 40 years, and I have had a good look at what we call Community Health Centers, which have become to me the most effective way of providing quality health care to large numbers of low-income people in this country.

When we talk about cutting over $1 billion to Community Health Centers, we are talking about ending funding for 127 new centers in underserved areas across the country. It means ending funding of Increased Demand for Services, or IDS grants, which have allowed health centers to expand to serve 3.3 million new patients in the last year and a half.

These cuts would raise costs in the Medicaid program and overall general health care services to the country. As a result, patients would lose access to primary care, to a regular doctor, and seek care for nonemergency health situations by using hospital emergency rooms, which would cost the country billions of dollars and continue to increase high-cost health care to our economy.

If these cuts go through, it would have an additive effect to the States that are cutting nearly $90 million in financial support to health centers due to their own fiscal crises, therefore leaving health centers with no way to continue to serve their existing patients.

Community Health Centers provide high quality health care and they do it cost-effectively and efficiently. In the State of Illinois, in 2008, 40 of these centers operated over 350 sites, contributed almost $1 billion to the Illinois economy and directly employed almost 6,000 individuals. For every 10 people employed by an Illinois health center, an additional four jobs were created in their surrounding communities. These programs served over 1.1 million patients, nearly 80 percent of whom all fell below the Federal poverty level and 30 percent of whom had no health insurance at all. Without these cuts, these centers can continue to operate and provide services.

I say let's not be what my mother used to call penny wise and pound foolish. It might look like we are saving, but every time we take care of one's health, we are making an investment.

I urge that we reject these cuts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment that Mrs. LOWEY presented and in opposition to this continuing resolution, which would completely eliminate the national women's health and family planning programs known as title X.

The resolution we are considering would cut care to Americans who need it most. Title X funds ensure that millions of low-income and uninsured individuals have access to primary health care. For most of these individuals, this is the only medical care they receive. Without access to this health care, they are at risk of developing serious medical conditions. If title X funding is eliminated, it would remove the only access point to primary health care for millions of women and would increase the health care costs for all Americans.

Now, some of my colleagues would argue that title X is all about abortion. That statement is simply not true. These programs fund prevention, provide lifesaving care to millions of women each year, cancer detection, care provided, women and families treated with the dignity they deserve, and it is family planning.

I know these claims, and I know the work of these clinics and their importance to our society. Maybe the men who put together this continuing resolution don't know what these programs do. I assure you, I do. Cutting funding to these programs would be devastating for women's health, and I strongly oppose efforts to do so.

These programs prevent an estimated 1 million unintended pregnancies each year. For every dollar spent on family planning, several dollars are saved, saved, in Medicaid costs. These clinics provide lifesaving and preventive care to millions of women. In 2009 alone, providers performed millions of Pap tests, millions of breast exams, over 6 million tests for sexually transmitted infections and nearly 1 million HIV tests.

In my home State of New Jersey, it is estimated that the elimination of these programs would cause as many as 40,000 patients to lose their access to women's health care. I estimate that without these funds, 14 Community Health Centers would close their doors.

We need to take a careful look at whom we hurt by cutting these programs. In 2009, these funded health centers provided services to over 135,000 patients. Eliminating national family planning programs would result in millions of women across the country losing access to primary care and preventive health care.

□ 2200

I can't emphasize that too strongly. Simply put, without these programs, more women will experience unintended pregnancies, face potentially life-threatening cancer, and other disease—diseases that could have been prevented. This is unacceptable.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlewoman, Representative LOWEY's, amendment to restore funding for the title X family planning program. I also want to convey my strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana prohibiting Planned Parenthood from receiving any Federal funds, including any funds for cervical or breast cancer screening. These draconian proposals will end preventive and primary care for millions of American women—primary care services that are for so many women the only

medical care they receive throughout the year. In fact, six in 10 women who access care from a family planning center consider it to be their main source of health care.

What we are seeing here today is nothing less than an attack on access to women's health services. The real impact of these cuts is that 5 million women across this country will lose access to basic primary and preventive care services.

Let's be clear, Planned Parenthood does offer needed family planning services, and they also offer preventive health care services. In 2009, in the State of Ohio, Planned Parenthood served 97,574 patients by providing primary health services like cervical and breast cancer screenings, birth control, along with general services including smoking cessation, flu vaccinations, and screening for diabetes and anemia. Planned Parenthood in Ohio provided 32,532 cervical cancer screenings in 2009. Planned Parenthood in Ohio provided 32,717 breast exams in 2009—32,717 women given piece of mind that they are free from cancer or put on the path to necessary further treatment for breast cancer; 32,717 women given access to preventive care services that each and every American woman needs.

From the cuts to the Women, Infants, and Children program to these cuts targeted at women's health care, a pattern is quickly emerging. And it's unacceptable. It shows a disregard for women's health and safety. Rather than jeopardize the health of women and children across our country; rather than cutting heating assistance for those with low income; rather than cutting funding for Community Health Centers that help our most vulnerable; rather than cutting Community Development Block Grant funding that helps with economic development and job creation, this Congress can cut things like billions of dollars out of oil subsidies that go right to the profits of those oil companies. We can require the negotiations of lower drug prices to benefit our seniors and the bottom line.

We as a Congress, rather than focusing on these draconian cuts to jeopardize the health of women and children, we should focus on job number one, and that is making investments helping Americans get back to work. We need to be working to strengthen U.S. manufacturing, rebuilding our infrastructure, and stopping the outsourcing of American jobs. I urge my colleagues to join us in these efforts.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I think for over an hour we've been hearing people say, I rise in support of this amendment, over and over, speaker after speaker.

My parliamentary inquiry is: Is there an amendment before the floor right now?

The Acting CHAIR. No.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I stand strongly in support of Congresswoman LOWEY and her amendment and title X and its protections for women and family. What a shame we're here tonight defending a woman's reproductive rights—defending a woman's right to make choices that work for her, that work for her family, that work for their future. Instead, we should be debating how we can get our economy going, how to provide jobs. Instead, we're defending a woman's right to control her body, her right to good health care, her right to prevent a pregnancy, and her right to end a pregnancy.

This, my friends, is the 21st century. We are not in the Middle Ages. It is time to respect women and to respect their choices. It is past time to begin creating jobs here in the United States of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1818. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant'' shall be $2,088,081,000, of which no funds shall be for the Child Care Aware toll-free hotline.

SEC. 1819. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs'' shall be $7,796,499,000, of which $405,000,000 shall be for making payments under the Community Service Block Grant Act (''CSBG Act''), except that such level shall include $10,000,000 for section 680(a)(3)(B) of the CSBG Act and $6,151,783,000 shall be for making payments under the Head Start Act.

(b) The fourteenth and fifteenth provisos under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs'' of division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 457 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 293, line 25, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 294, line 1, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 359, line 15, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)'' before the period at the end.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the Administration for Children and Families programs by $100 million, with reductions specifically targeting the Community Service Block Grant program. Under this amendment, this reduction would be transferred to the savings reduction account and would save the taxpayers $100 million. The agency has already spent $295 million on this program for fiscal year 2011. This amount of money is already out the door, and an authorization requiring $10 million to be spent on discretionary activities is already out; but this amendment would essentially zero out funding for grants for the remainder of the fiscal year.

The program is administered through the Department of Health and Human Services. It provides Federal funds to States, territories, and tribes for distribution to local agencies to support a wide range of community-based activities. This program, however, has been flagged previously for its lack of accountability and oversight for the use of taxpayer dollars.

In 2006, GAO was asked to review the administration of the Community Service Block Grant program. GAO indicated in a letter to the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families on February 7, 2006, that ''the Office of Community Services does not have the policies, procedures, and internal controls in place needed to carry out its monitoring efforts.''

Later, GAO writes: ''By sending staff without sufficient expertise in financial management on monitoring visits, the Office of Community Services failed to ensure that States spend Federal dollars appropriately.''

We have a projected deficit, as we've said many times today. It's $1.5 trillion this year alone. Sobering reports say that the national debt may soon exceed our annual GDP. Simply put, the Federal Government does not have the resources to fund every grant program, particularly one that has little accountability over how taxpayer dollars are spent.

□ 2210

Beyond issues related to oversight, there have been concerns related to the effectiveness of taxpayer dollars spent on grants under this program.

In a New York Times article published on February 5, White House Office of Management and Budget Director Jacob Lew wrote about the CSBG program, stating: ''For the past 30 years, these grants have been allocated using a formula that does not consider how good a job the recipients are doing.''

In fact, presumably for this reason, President Obama cut funding for the Community Service Block Grant program by 50 percent in his FY 2012 budget request. Let me say that again: the President for the FY 2012 budget has cut this program in half, from $700 billion to $350 billion. I suppose it's likely because of these problems.

The President defended this reduction by stating: ''CSBG provides funding for the important work of Community Action Agencies, but does not hold

these agencies accountable for outcomes.''

On November 2, taxpayers sent a clear message to all of us here to spend money more wisely.

As I mentioned, we are borrowing 40 cents for every dollar we spend. So when you have programs we are told by GAO and other groups that simply aren't using taxpayer dollars wisely, it behooves us to cut the funding. If we don't cut this funding, we will actually be funding this program at a greater level than the President is asking for. Let me repeat that:

Unless we do this cut that we are talking about today, we will be funding for fiscal year 2011 this program at a greater level than the President is requesting for the following year.

I think that we ought to move now, when we have a deficit of $1.5 trillion and a debt nearing or over $14 trillion, to save money where we can for the taxpayers.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Has the gentleman given any consideration as to what the impact of this Federal cut is on State programs and as to the likelihood that States are to follow suit after the enactment of his proposed amendment?

Mr. FLAKE. I think any impact there will be is dwarfed by the impact of having a $1.5 trillion deficit and a $14 trillion debt and what happens to us as a country if we continue to run that kind of deficit and debt.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to the Flake amendment and to the Republican cuts of the Community Service Block Grant.

Mr. Chairman, there isn't any question that Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We believe we should start by ending the tax subsidies and special interest waste. We also must make sure that programs are accountable and that we end those that do not work.

But what we have here is a program that serves as nothing short of a lifeline. It provides assistance to our Nation's poorest families, families who are trying to meet the most basic of human needs. We have the latest Census data, which tells us that more than 43.7 million people are living in poverty in the United States. That number is growing.

A striking point is that many in this category are hardworking Americans who have, in fact, been making it; yet some may refer to them now as the ''new poor.'' In this Great Recession, life has changed very quickly for so many American families who have first lost their jobs and then lost their homes. The majority of Americans served by this program can be described as extremely poor, with incomes below 75 percent of the Federal poverty threshold. That's $9,735 for a family of three. That's the average size: $9,735.

Is that what we make in this institution here, $9,735? You know what, Mr. Chairman? We'd be hard-pressed to find a corner of our Nation that doesn't feel the impact of these severe cuts. The service areas of Community Action Agencies cover 96 percent of the Nation's counties.

I just might add that not so long ago this body voted for a tax increase for the richest 2 percent of the people in this Nation, providing them with $100,000 in tax cuts—the richest 2 percent of the people in this country as opposed to people who make $9,735. Now, if we really want to be serious about that deficit, let's start with several items.

Let's go to the oil subsidies of $40 billion over 5 years and eliminate 10 tax breaks for the oil companies. Let's start there. What about ending what they call ''treaty shopping,'' which would be a $7.4 billion savings over 10 years? Let's shut down the current practice that allows multinationals to avoid paying their taxes. I think that's a good idea that we ought to implement. That certainly is un-American if they're not going to pay their taxes.

As for other savings, why don't we cut agricultural subsidies in half and save almost $8 billion? We can do that. We could save $3 billion a year if we ended the licensing agreements in which pharmaceutical companies pay competitors to slow the introduction of cheaper generic drugs. That raises the cost of health care for all of us. Then we could immediately save $450 million and almost $3 billion if we stop spending on the alternate engine for the Joint Strike Fighter.

It's very interesting. Those total about $61 billion, which is the size of the cuts that the other side of this venerable House has proposed we cut: K–12 education for the neediest people in this Nation and the National Institutes of Health, which provide the opportunity to look for groundbreaking discoveries to cure disease.

One should really be opposed to this amendment for what it would do to the most vulnerable people of this Nation. It is effectively a 100 percent cut. It is again the example of how the Republican resolution hits those who can afford it least.

With 9 percent unemployment in our country, this is not the time to be cutting critical services. These are services in local communities to help low-income families get on their feet. The issues are child care, job training, nutrition. The money goes to nonprofit agencies, to the Boys and Girls Club, to Habitat for Humanity, to Feeding America, to hundreds of local faith-based churches and synagogues, to the United Way, and to Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

I urge defeat of the Flake amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the Community Service Block Grant program provides grants and other services to States to combat poverty and to increase self-sufficiency. The funding is directed to community organizers in poor neighborhoods. The range of services provided includes emergency services, housing, health care, food and nutrition, economic development, and education.

States award the funds to Community Action Agencies. I've got several of them in my congressional district, which are nonprofit, private and public organizations established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Today, there are approximately 1,000 Community Action Agencies serving the poor in every State.

Now, I know the gentleman from Arizona is basing part of his cut on what is in the President's budget. From my perspective, the President's budget is wrong on this subject. To cut this program in half and then say we're going to have competitive bidding for the other half is going to hurt thousands, if not millions, of poor people in this country. It is not the right thing to do. This is shredding the safety net. Then this last $100 million, because so much of this money has already been spent this year, would take this program down to zero. It would be a disaster. All of these agencies would have to close, and the people who are the poorest people would not have any place to go to get help.

So I just think it's despicable that we have finally gotten down to where we're going to go after the Community Service Block Grant, which helps the poorest people in each of our districts around the country.

□ 2220

It's indefensible, it's just not right, and I hope that the gentleman from Arizona will reconsider this amendment, and I would hope that the committee would reconsider this in conference committee. I don't think the other body should in any way embrace this. This is a bad amendment, a bad cut, and it's going to hurt people, the poorest people in this country.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the

Lowey amendment, I rise in strong opposition to the Flake amendment, and I want to begin by saying that my friend, Mr. FLAKE from Arizona, is a very nice man. He's a decent man. He's just dead wrong on this. He's just wrong, wrong, wrong. Before I get into the specifics of the amendment, I want to highlight the deep cuts my friends on the other side of the aisle want to make to the accounts in the Labor-Health and Human Services and Education bill.

This subcommittee not only funds the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, but programs that make vital investments in people. That's why the Labor-H bill is often referred to as ''the people's bill.'' It provides resources that train people for jobs; offers educational opportunities in early, secondary, and higher education; and expands social safety net programs to millions of Americans that need temporary assistance.

While some of my colleagues will argue that with our growing budget deficit and growing levels of spending that we need to make some cuts—and we must, by targeting wasteful and unnecessary spending—the legislation that has been brought to the floor by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle seeks to weaken some of the critical social safety nets for the most vulnerable amongst us: for working families, for children, for seniors, and for the poor.

Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to this debate for a couple of hours now, and as we get later and later into the night, I'd just like to take a moment to remind my friends that these cuts are not just about dollar amounts and percentage cuts over the last fiscal year, but cuts to real people. I think some of us often forget that. So the way this works is the Federal Government cuts these programs. Without matching funds available from the Federal Government, States then in turn cut the exact same programs, and suddenly, millions of Americans wake up without the Federal Government or without the State government providing them with any assistance. This isn't just about the Federal deficit and the Federal budget. The ramifications of this cut spiral, trickle all the way down to the States, and the ramifications for States' indebtedness continues to grow.

Under the Department of Labor, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle propose a $2.5 billion cut to programs to support job training opportunities for dislocated workers, the unemployed, and young Americans at a time when the unemployment rate remains at a historic 9 percent. That's nearly 14 million Americans. By some estimates, this number is even higher. This is a 40 percent cut to programs that help unemployed people get out of the unemployment office and get their feet in the door.

From Health and Human Services, this legislation cuts $1 billion for 1,250 community health centers. That does not include the ramifications of States that are not likely to fund the exact same health centers and even more. These health centers serve nearly 20 million low-income individuals by providing access to primary, dental, and preventative care.

The $1.8 billion cut from the Head Start program will threaten jobs of thousands of teachers and teachers' aides and will cut off access to an estimated 200,000 low-income children across this country.

And $694 million will be cut for grants to schools that serve disadvantaged students. Teachers, tutors, and teachers' aides are likely to lose their jobs, and after-school and supplemental programs will be cut. And the students that need the help the most will suffer. Nearly $558 million will be cut from special education programs that serve children with disabilities.

As the cost of tuition, textbooks, and living expenses continues to rise, the 8 million students in community colleges and universities that benefit from Pell grants will no longer be able to receive the current maximum award of $5,550 per year. My colleagues across the aisle believe that $4,705 is adequate.

I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman, with the detrimental cuts my colleagues plan to make to these social safety net programs. But the fact is that the legislation in front of us provides cuts to people in this country that can least afford it. These devastating cuts to health care, to education, to energy assistance, and other programs means the most vulnerable Americans will be left to fend for themselves, in the midst of the worst economy of our lifetime.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend my colleagues vote against any amendments that further cut any of these vital programs for Americans. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this irresponsible continuing resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. The spending bill that the Republicans have introduced is a threat to our economy, a threat to our competitiveness, and a threat to America's working families, and with this amendment, a threat to America's poor.

No one is in favor of wasteful spending and outdated government regulations that don't work or special spending for the powerful and the special interests. Instead of identifying real governmental waste, like subsidies to Big Oil and tax cuts to billionaires, the House Republicans have decided that all the cuts will fall on the backs of working people, on students, and on the poor in this country. The universe of cuts will be limited to those parts of our population, the most vulnerable parts of our population, those who struggle every day to keep their jobs and provide for their families, to hold on to their homes, or maybe to catch a break and get a job, or maybe to catch a break and have their child be put into Head Start, or to have mental health services for a member of their families.

They deny workers the basic rights and protections on the job, and they prevent unemployed Americans from getting job training that will give them a leg up in this economy because they zero out these programs. Simply put, the Republican spending bill eliminates hundreds of thousands of jobs and hundreds of thousands of job opportunities for Americans who are seeking to get back into the economy. This bill is reckless and irresponsible. The programs that are targeted in this bill are a lifeline to the future of our economy.

These cuts mean over 200,000 young children will lose their spots in a Head Start classroom. For the first time, as we celebrate the 100th birthday of President Reagan, we destroy Ron and Nancy's favorite program. Those children will not be allowed into the Head Start classroom, and we know exactly what that means. They will start school behind, they will continue behind, and if they graduate, they will graduate behind. That's what we cast them into. That's why it's called Head Start. These children need a head start. These quarter of a million children will not get a head start. They will go to the back of the line. It means that parents will have to choose between going to work and putting their children in a low-quality child care without an option for those Head Start classes.

It means that 2,400 disadvantaged schools that rely on title I, the funding that will provide quality education, will lose the funding for teachers and tutors and after-school programs. And again, the most vulnerable children, the children who start without that head start, the children who are the poorest in our Nation, they will receive the least resources available so that they could participate in an economy if they can get a good quality education, and have the opportunity to achieve it.

These cut means reduced support for students with disabilities. It will leave some 7,000 special education teachers and staff unemployed. And the services those students so desperately need—and they can prosper when they're given those services in our education programs and thrive in regular education programs—they will be denied that opportunity.

And of course, as has already been mentioned, it means that $845 that would have been available for the poorest students, middle-income students who are starting college, whether it's community or 4-year college or it's a proprietary school, that money won't be available for them. But mind you, the costs in the community colleges, the costs in the public institutions, the 4-year institutions, the proprietary

schools, they're all going up. These students' resources to pay for college are going down, and many of these students do not have the ability to replace those resources.

By eliminating the Corporation for National Community Services, we break the great bipartisan compact here that we would join together to provide people an opportunity to give back to this Nation, that we would organize services to serve our community and to volunteers in our community, whether they be senior citizens or whether they be young people starting out, and the people could earn an opportunity by serving their community to earn a scholarship, and grandparents could earn a scholarship to give to their children if they gave back to their community and volunteered in their community. Those programs are gone. They're eliminated. They're zeroed out in this legislation.

□ 2230

By eliminating critical job training opportunities offered through the Workforce Investment Act, some 200,000 unemployed Americans who need these skills to compete in the workplace will be denied their services, as will the returning vets from the vets program who use the One-Stop services. In April, 3,000 of them will be gone, closed down because of the budget cuts here.

Where will those veterans go? Where will those veterans go that are seeking opportunities? Where are we going to take these veterans who were harmed, who have suffered in combat, who are recovering from their injuries and trying to navigate the employment sector and our economy? They can go to a One-Stop shop. They can get special treatment as a veteran in that place. They can see the array of opportunities that they might have to bring to them. But no, now they can cruise the community. They can go from place to place, trying to find and knit together the services that are available today in those One-Stop centers.

So this legislation is devastating, devastating to millions of Americans. Millions of Americans with the slightest bit of help would be able to engage in our economy, be able to engage in our society, and be able to prosper for themselves and for their families. Tonight, the Republicans foreclose that future. They foreclose that future for millions of Americans who will not be able to fight back or hire lobbyists.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, for the last 5 weeks or so since the new majority has taken over the House, as 15 million people are unemployed in this country, as people are losing their homes, losing their businesses, the majority has focused like a laser beam on everything except job creation for the American people. They have found time to dabble in a variety of political issues while ignoring the essential purpose for which I believe we were all sent here, which is to foster an environment where businesses and entrepreneurs can create jobs for this country.

This week they have changed. They have gone from ignoring the jobs problem to making it worse. The legislation that's on the floor tonight does reflect a good faith and necessary goal of reducing spending in our country. I don't think there is anyone here who would disagree with the proposition that continuing to spend more than we take in eventually will cause even greater pain and harm to the U.S. economy than it has already caused, which is considerable, indeed.

But all spending cuts are not created equally, and all spending decisions don't have the same consequences. The prism through which we have to look at spending cuts is whether they are sensible or reckless, whether they help to create jobs or destroy jobs. And I would submit, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that the legislation before us is worsening the very deep economic crisis in our country in three ways.

First of all, you can't have economic growth if you don't have safe streets and a safe country. But the provisions of this bill will lead to the layoff of more than 10,000 police officers in cities and towns across our country. The provisions of this bill will lead to the dismissal or furlough of over 1,000 people whose job it is to check containers coming into this country to see if they have dirty bombs or chemical weapons in them. A country that isn't safe won't grow.

Ladies and gentlemen, the other cuts in this bill, let's talk about education. A country that can't learn won't grow. But this legislation will result in the elimination of 10,000 reading tutors and math coaches for the neediest students in this country. It will remove 7,000 teachers who teach autistic kids, children with a learning disability, from classrooms. For the single mom who is struggling to pay her bills, raise her children, and go to school, it will raise her tuition by up to $825 this year by eliminating the college scholarship on which she relies to go to school. A country that doesn't learn doesn't grow, and these cuts will lead us into a country that makes it very difficult in which to learn.

And finally, this country is fueled by research and development, inventing and creating new products, new cures, new solutions to the world's problems. Yet in this bill, in one of the most important areas, medical research, the majority has given us an unwelcomed surprise. There is a spending cut in excess of $600 million from the National Institutes of Health that is described, ladies and gentlemen, as further cuts to get to the 2008 levels. I don't know what that means. I don't think anyone on the majority side will tell us what that means. But I do know this: Thousands of Americans work doing medical research through the National Institutes of Health. Millions of Americans depend upon the miracles which grow out of that research, and this country's economy is stronger when that research continues. That research will be cut. The average cancer research grant in this country is about $500,000. Looking at the cut that's in here, it appears that over 500 cancer research grants will go by the wayside.

A country that isn't safe, a country that isn't learning and investing won't grow. This bill means America won't grow. This bill should be defeated.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1820. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs'' shall be $1,445,323,000.

(b) The first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

(c) None of the funds appropriated by this division for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs'' shall be used to carry out sections 1701 and 1703 of the PHS Act (with respect to chronic disease self-management activity grants), except that such funds may be used for necessary expenses associated with administering any such grants awarded prior to the date of the enactment of this division.

SEC. 1821. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management'' shall be $375,938,000: *Provided*, That amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ''$0'' for ''$5,789,000'': *Provided further*, that the third and seventh provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1822. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' shall be $708,510,000, of which $65,578,000 shall be for expenses necessary to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic, none of which shall be available past September 30, 2011, and $35,000,000 shall be for expenses necessary for fit-out and other costs related to a competitive lease procurement to renovate or replace the existing

headquarters building for Public Health Service agencies and other components of the Department of Health and Human Services: *Provided*, That in addition, $318,000,000 of the funds transferred to the account under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' in Public Law 111–117 under the fourth paragraph under such heading may be used to support advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the PHS Act and other administrative expenses of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be made available to the United States Postal Service for the delivery of medical countermeasures.

SEC. 1823. Of the funds made available for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' in Public Law 111–32, $1,397,439,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 1824. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Education for the Disadvantaged'' shall be $3,994,365,000, of which $3,944,530,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 (in addition to the $10,841,176,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $10,841,176,000 to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2011 for academic year 2011–2012: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for such heading (1) $6,405,844,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (''ESEA''); (2) $1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA; (3) $3,014,000,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA; (4) $3,014,000,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA.

(b) The tenth, eleventh and twelfth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Education for the Disadvantaged'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

(c) Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Education, Education for the Disadvantaged'' in division D of Public Law 111–117, $189,000,000 is rescinded, to be derived from the amounts specified under such heading for availability under section 1502 of the ESEA.

AMENDMENT NO. 276 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 296, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $336,550,000)''.

Page 296, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $336,550,000)''.

Page 297, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000,000)''.

Page 298, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000,000)''.

Page 299, line 20, after the first and second dollar amounts, insert ''(increased by $557,700,000)''.

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It increases funding for the part B program of IDEA, which provides educational grants to States for children with disabilities, by $557 million, restoring funding for the program to 2010 levels. The amendment is fully offset by reducing funding to the Teacher Quality State Grant program and the School Improvement Grant program, two programs that have received substantial funding increases since 2009.

Mr. Chairman, 35 years ago Congress recognized that too many special needs children were being denied an education and the opportunity to maximize their potential and contribution to our society, and 35 years ago severely disabled children who were confined to State institutions received no education. Special needs students did not attend school. They were kept out of classrooms, receiving little education.

□ 2240

Today, more than 6 million children receive an effective education because of IDEA. Special needs children are no longer confined to institutions. The number of special needs students who graduate high school with a diploma has increased. The number of children who go on to enroll in high school has more than tripled since IDEA's enactment. And through IDEA, we have increased our Nation's expectations of our children. But more can and must be done.

The McMorris Rodgers/Kline/Sessions/Harper amendment ensures that Congress keeps its promise. Too often IDEA is overlooked in our education debates. For example, Congress has yet to meet its commitment to cover 40 percent of a student's cost. Barriers to reliable research prevent effective teaching. Low expectations continue to plague our school systems. The reductions to IDEA in H.R. 1 are just another example of the challenges that IDEA experiences.

This amendment reaffirms that there is no greater priority in Congress than ensuring all children have access to an appropriate education.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Providing a quality education for all students, including those with disabilities, should be one of our highest priorities. So I agree with the goal of this amendment.

But, in fact, we are considering a Republican resolution, this continuing resolution this evening, and it's the majority party, to which the gentlewoman belongs, which cuts IDEA. It cuts special education by $558 million. So now we have an amendment that attempts to undo the damaging cuts to IDEA, but only by cutting other critical education programs. The damage done in this bill cannot be alleviated by robbing Peter to pay Paul. That's what this amendment is about.

Let me just mention to you that—and our colleague spoke about special education and what it does. But $558 million is where they come from with regard to education for special needs kids. What that means is almost 7,000 special education teachers and aides and other staff who serve these youngsters would not be there. And it is critical. Teachers and staff are critical to the education of these youngsters. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government mandates that local school districts have to provide this education. And when it was determined that that would be the case, it said that the States would do 60 percent, the Federal Government would do 40 percent.

What's happened now is we've been at about 17 percent in terms of Federal contribution. With the $558 million cut we go down to about 15 percent.

I would suggest that if there is such a great urgent need and a great burning desire to be able to provide education to special needs children, that we do not cut $558 million.

Now, where does the money come from? As I mentioned, we're talking about other critical education programs. School improvement grants. I venture to say that everybody is concerned about those schools that are failing, that there's got to be student achievement at these schools. And that's what the current Federal law requires, that there's demonstrable success in student achievement. The funds for the school improvement grants are appropriated precisely for those schools that fail the test and are seeking to implement a strategy for turning around our Nation's lowest-performing schools. That's where we would take money from in order to turn a potentially failing school, to turn around so that they can go from the lowest-performing to better-performing schools.

The other place that my colleague takes funds from is something called the Teacher Quality Grants, an approximately $3 billion program and a major piece of No Child Left Behind. This provides funds to States and school districts to develop and support a high quality teacher force.

Aren't we all about making sure that those people who teach our children are qualified to do that? These funds are distributed by formula to all States. They are relied upon tremendously to reduce class size, to ensure that classroom teachers have the proper training and credentials to be effective instructors.

There isn't a day that goes by that we aren't talking about school reform, and at the center of school reform is to develop quality teachers. And, in fact, we want to try to link merit pay to quality teachers, do everything we can, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to take the money for school improvement grants, teacher quality grants.

I suggest to you that what you do, if you are really truly interested in educating special needs children, that you

decide that a $558 million cut is just not the right thing to do to children who have these special needs and who are mandated by the Federal Government to States to get the kind of training that they need to achieve their level and realize their dreams and aspirations.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment, and I intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, budgeting is about making tough choices. Congress has a responsibility to outline a budget the country can afford that sets priorities to live within those means. Too often in recent years Congress failed in this basic duty. I'm pleased to see us beginning to move in a new direction.

The choice we face today is whether we will begin to uphold our commitments or continue to kick the can down the road for another debate another time. That's why I'm proud to support this amendment.

This amendment will move Congress closer to meeting its commitment to students with disabilities and help schools, all schools across the Nation. It adds to our effort to set the right priorities.

In 1971, a landmark decision was handed down by a Federal judge that ruled the U.S. Constitution prohibits schools from denying access to education based solely on a child's disabilities. While this represented the judgment of one court, states soon followed.

Four years later Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. That law, now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, was designed to help states meet their obligation to provide a quality education to students with disabilities. It is a law that has been improved over the years, most recently, in 2004.

We've worked to strengthen the law's focus on academic achievement, empowered parents to take greater responsibility for the direction of their child's education, and helped to improve the critical relationship between local school leaders and the parents and students they serve. Despite our efforts over the years, more work remains to strengthen the law to ensure students with disabilities receive the education they need. That's why we're here today.

Over the past 35 years, while states have worked to follow the letter of the law and serve these students, the Federal Government has failed to deliver on its promise to fund 40 percent of the additional costs of educating students with disabilities. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we've never funded 20 percent. We haven't made it halfway.

This amendment reallocates resources at the Department of Education to improve our commitment to meet this important need. It makes tough choices we were sent here to make. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. The suggestion has been made by the chairman of my committee that somehow if you vote for this amendment you're increasing the government's commitment to fully fund IDEA. No you're not. You're simply restoring the cut that the Republican caucus already made a decision about, and that was to cut $558 million. That would be admirable if you restored the cut.

But when you decide therefore to restore the cut, you're going to now have to make additional cuts, and those additional cuts will come out of the most difficult, hard-pressed failing schools in our country, many with increased populations of children with disabilities. Those will be the schools that we will target.

□ 2250

We will target those schools in the poorest neighborhoods with the poorest records where now, for the first time we have a proposal made, carried out by the Governors, by the local school districts to turn those schools around and to provide the quality education that those children are entitled to so they can take advantage of the opportunities that America presents.

But now money for those schools is going to be taken away on the theory that somehow you are doing a favor for students with disabilities. Don't do them such a favor. I don't think they would appreciate that you are taking the money from their poorest neighbors.

And then, on top of that, you are going to take the funds that we are speaking to. And you have all given the speeches, you have all told people, the most important thing outside of the family is the teacher. Well, this is the funding by which we have prepared teachers to be special education teachers, to be title I teachers, to teach math, to teach science. And now we're going to take that money in the name of somehow that this is a restorative amendment that will be good for IDEA.

Let us understand something. When we were doing No Child Left Behind, we circulated a petition signed by Republicans and Democrats. We had over 300 people sign that and said let's go for full funding. When we offered that amendment in the conference committee, the Republican Members voted it down. You signed the petition. You just didn't have the courage to stand up and put the funding into play, and you have been screwing around with this program ever since. You have tried to use funding for IDEA to batter some other portion of the education community. Little incremental parts were offered year after year, but it always came out of the hide of the less fortunate. You ought to stop it. You ought to stop it.

Poor children need access to high-quality education and students with disabilities need access to high-quality education. The kind of barbaric attitude that is being carried out here in terms of playing these two populations off against one another is simply outrageous. It's unfair to the students with disabilities because it is being done in their name, and we know how desperate they and their families are for education and for the resources to carry out that education. And in their name, we are stripping the resources from some of the poorest children, and also some of the poorest children with disabilities we're stripping the resources for them. That doesn't sound like a win-win. That doesn't sound like a plus for disabilities.

I have been at this a long time. I had the honor of writing this legislation with my colleagues back in 1975, 1976, and it's an honor and I have defended it my whole life and it's changed people's lives. And the nicest thing that has ever been said to me in public life is when a parent says, But for that law, my child would have never had an education.

But for that law. But I don't think they would have thought that we are now trading their child's education for somebody to deny another student an education. That's not the game that they wanted to play.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members that they must address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank the chairman for recognizing me. And I have great respect for my colleague from California and all the hard work that he has done now for generations, practically on this issue.

I would point out that from the late seventies through all of the eighties, special education was funded at 1, 2, 3, 4 percent. And it wasn't until 1995, 1996, 1997—actually '96, '97, '98, '99, into the 2000s that funding for special education began to increase significantly under the Republican-controlled Congress.

President Clinton's own Education Secretary said on a number of different occasions that full funding of special education had to take a second place to the new programs that the administration was offering at the time, which

was school construction, school improvement, and these other programs that my friend, the maker of the amendment, was proposing to reduce in order to fund special education.

I have felt for many years that IDEA funding should be the top priority for education funding in the Congress, and I am pleased that we have this amendment that will restore funding to the same level that it was in fiscal year 2010. I would certainly like to have it higher than that, but under the circumstances I believe that this is a good and justifiable improvement. It is especially important and it is different from SIP and teacher quality grants because we make the rules, when it comes to special education, here at the Federal level, and the school districts put out their individual service plans for students, which they have to pay for. So without this amendment and with a cut in funding for special education, it is a direct dollar-for-dollar cost shift to every school district in America.

So this is an amendment that is good. It should be bipartisan, and we should all support its passage so that we can get special education funding back to FY10 levels.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I offer this motion to speak out against the egregious cuts that are being addressed here to public education contained in this irresponsible Republican spending bill.

This spending bill cuts over $1.25 billion in education funding that goes directly to States and school districts to support educating disadvantaged students and special education students. Now is not the time to choke off funding to school districts when stimulus money is eroding and when States are cutting their own budgets. I fear we are leaving schools and our Nation's most vulnerable students behind.

These sections of the irresponsible Republican spending plan represent a nearly 5 percent cut in aid to school districts. For title I funding that supports school budgets and teacher jobs in low-income school districts, this means a $693.5 million cut. For Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the IDEA Act, special education funding that supports school districts educating children with special needs and disabilities, this means a $557.7 million cut.

Title I funding has helped school districts with high poverty levels meet State education standards and ensure equal access to quality education for all of their students. More than 50,000 public schools around this Nation depend on these Federal dollars to maintain their educational services.

This cut to title I funding alone would affect 2,400 schools that serve nearly 1 million disadvantaged students. These schools would lose funding for teachers, for tutors, and for after-school programs. It would mean that nearly 10,000 teachers and aides could lose their jobs. Children could see larger class sizes. And, yes, access to quality education would again be threatened.

Not only does this bill cut funding for education for low-income children, but it institutes painful cuts to special education programs funded with the IDEA dollars.

For 35 years, IDEA has supported special education, guaranteeing students with disabilities the right to a free, appropriate public education. Millions of students with disabilities have been able to go to public schools because of the IDEA funding school districts receive, allowing them to provide an individualized education for children with those special needs. This bill cuts over one-half billion dollars out of special education funding to school districts. Cuts of this proportion could force States and school districts to lay off almost 7,000 special education teachers and aides and other staff serving children with disabilities.

Just last week, I met with members of the New York State School Board Association who advocated for full funding for title I and especially for IDEA. They stressed the fact that special education funding has never been fully funded to the amount that was originally promised to our schools. These cuts are giant steps backwards after several years of quality investments in title I and IDEA funding.

Furthermore, these cuts would come at a time when States across this country are also slashing education funding. These cuts come at a time when supplemental stimulus aid is drying up. Cuts mean that school districts in local communities will have to make up the difference, potentially with teacher layoffs, larger class sizes, reduced programs, and higher—higher—property taxes. This is not responsible policymaking, especially while our economy is still in recovery.

The majority in this House is lauding the fact that this bill represents the largest spending cut in the history of our country. If they want to cut funding to satisfy their base, fine, but I will not stand for cutting education funding. I will not support budget cuts balanced on the backs of our Nation's students, our youngest citizens, and, indeed, our future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2300

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

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in strong support of the amendment to add funding back to title X from my colleagues Congresswoman LOWEY and Congresswoman DELAURO, who have always been fierce advocates for women's health, and I am thrilled to join them in this important fight.

Since 1970, the title X family planning program has been a key component of our Nation's health care infrastructure and an essential element in the winning strategy to reduce unintended pregnancies. Efforts to cut the title X program would take away funding from essential women's health care providers like Planned Parenthood.

Today, title X serves over 5 million low-income individuals every year. In every State, women and men rely on title X for basic primary and preventative health care, including annual exams, lifesaving cancer screenings, contraception, and testing and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases. In fact, in 2009 alone, title X providers performed 2.2 million Pap tests, 2.3 million breast exams, and over 6 million tests for sexually transmitted diseases, including nearly 1 million HIV tests. And preventative care isn't limited to cancer screenings and education on how to avoid STDs.

If Republicans truly wanted to reduce abortions in this country, they would vote for this amendment. Indeed, title X actually reduces the number of abortions. Title X services help to prevent nearly 1 million unintended pregnancies each year, almost half of which would otherwise end in abortion. So we can say for certain that title X funds play a vital role in helping to reduce the number of abortions in our Nation, working towards the goal of making abortions safe, legal, and rare.

But it goes further. The title X programs through providers like Planned Parenthood provide vital family planning services which help improve the life of the mother and the child. It has been proven time and again that family planning keeps women and children healthy. Studies have shown that when women have better access to family planning, it leads to healthier outcomes for both mother and child.

When women plan their pregnancies, they are more likely to seek prenatal care, improving their own health and the health of their children. In fact, access to family planning is directly linked to declines in maternal and infant mortality rates.

Eliminating the national family planning program will result in millions of women across the country losing access to basic primary and preventative health care and to the providers that offer these services. Without title X, more women will experience unintended pregnancies and face potentially life-threatening cancer and other diseases that could have been prevented.

In recent weeks, Republicans in this Congress have produced some of the most anti-choice, anti-woman, anti-family bills that we have ever seen, trying to redefine rape, raising taxes on women who have private insurance with comprehensive health care coverage, telling women who need our help the most that they are on their own.

But that just didn't just go far enough for them. Republican proposals to cut title X funding and completely shut down Planned Parenthood, where millions of women receive their only health care, is one of the most spiteful, egregious moves we have ever seen.

It is truly mind-boggling that the same Members who purport to be anti-choice can turn around and say in the same breath that they want to strike all Federal family planning funding. So now they don't just want to make abortions illegal, they also want to throw a huge obstacle in the path of those who want to prevent themselves from ending up in a situation where they might need one. This helps no one. It doesn't help women, it doesn't help families, and it certainly doesn't help reduce our deficit. That is because title X actually saves taxpayer dollars.

Since many of the patients served by title X are on Medicaid, preventive care like cancer screenings and contraceptive counseling actually means fewer costs to the taxpayer in the long run. Indeed, for every public dollar invested in family planning, $3.74 is saved in Medicaid-related costs. That is savings to both Federal and State governments.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support this amendment of my good friends that would reinstate title X funding in the continuing resolution. The decision by Republicans to defund title X was not only reckless, but thoroughly anti-woman, anti-child, and anti-taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help correct a massive injustice against American women and families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1825. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, School Improvement Programs'' shall be $3,066,967,000, of which $2,978,515,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 (in addition to the $1,681,441,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $1,681,441,000, to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2011 for academic year 2011–2012: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for such heading (1) $7,463,000 shall be available to carry out subpart 6 of part D of title V of the ESEA; and (2) no funds shall be available for activities authorized under part B of title II, part D of title II, subpart 9 of part D of title V, part B of title VII, or part C of title VII of the ESEA, or part Z of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(b) The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, twelfth and thirteenth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, School Improvement Programs'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

AMENDMENT NO. 532 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows.

Page 298, line 12, insert, ''or'' after ''title II,''.

Page 298, beginning on line 12, strike '', part B of title VII, or part C of title VII''.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will strike the language in H.R. 1 that prohibits the Department of Education from funding the Alaskan Native Education Equity Act and the Native Hawaiian Education Program. The amendment will not add money to the Department of Education budget but will allow the department to fund those programs as they see a need.

I yield at this time to the good lady from Hawaii for a very short statement.

(Ms. HIRONO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this amendment introduced by my colleague, Congressman Don YOUNG, to support Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian education. This amendment makes these worthwhile programs eligible for these education funds.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment introduced by my colleague Congressman Don YOUNG.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with him on this amendment. For many years, Congressman YOUNG has been a leader on issues of importance to the indigenous, aboriginal peoples of the United States. He understands that we have a special trust responsibility to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. And while we sit on different sides of the aisle, the bond between the native peoples of Alaska and Hawaii transcends political party.

The Native Hawaiian Education Act was enacted in 1988 and was last reauthorized in 2002 as a part of the No Child Left Behind Act. Native Hawaiians have historically experienced educational risk factors, such as high rates of poverty and low academic achievement. The modest appropriations provided under the Native Hawaiian Education Act have helped to improve educational opportunities for Native Hawaiian children and remain necessary in reversing low achievement trends.

One of the successes of the program has been the flourishing of the Hawaiian language. Following the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii in 1893, use of the Hawaiian language in public classrooms was banned. This decline in the use of the language paralleled declines in other aspects of a once vibrant culture and community. We know that loss of one's language is part and parcel of the loss of one's culture. Like all too many native languages, Hawaiian was on the brink of extinction. It was only in 1986 that the ban on Hawaiian language in schools was removed. Now, with funds from the Native Hawaiian Education Act, Hawaiian language is taught through immersion schools, beginning in kindergarten and continuing through high school.

We now have a growing cadre of young people who are fluent in the Hawaiian language—thanks in great part to the existence of the Native Hawaiian Education Program. Several tribes have looked to the success of the Hawaiian language program as a model for how they can ensure the survival of their language.

I met with a student named Kuulei last week. She grew up in a Hawaiian homestead community where attending college was not thought possible. She attended a Native Hawaiian immersion school and through hard work and perseverance is now a student at the University of Hawaii at Hilo. After graduation, she plans to become a teacher so she can inspire the next generation of Native Hawaiian students.

The school that Kuulei attends, the University of Hawaii at Hilo is home to the Ka Haka Ula O Keelikolani College of Hawaiian Language. In December 2010, the College awarded its first two doctorates in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization. The honors went to Katarina Edmonds, a Maori educator from New Zealand, and Kauanoe Kamana, the first of Native Hawaiian ancestry to receive a Ph.D. in Hawaiian Language from UH Hilo.

The amendment before your today does not increase funding for Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian education programs. All this amendment does is make these worthwhile and successful programs eligible for funds from the Department of Education School Improvement account.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the current definition of an earmark as defined by this body, the two programs that the gentleman is seeking to restore are both earmarks.

Alaskan native education and native Hawaiian education programs are worthy programs, there is no doubt in my mind, and I believe the overall purpose of both is to ensure that the unique educational needs of Alaskan and Hawaiian natives are met. Clearly we all

want the same for our constituents. But I think we have to be clear about what these programs are. They are earmarks with a pricetag that approaches $70 million.

Now, this majority has been very proud of their policy to ban all earmarks. If I might, I would like to just read from the comments of the chair of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS, in his summary for the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution.

''The continuing resolution includes no earmark funding and eliminates all previous earmark funding from fiscal year 2010, saving the taxpayers approximately $8.5 billion. In addition, the bill includes language specifically negating any and all earmarks as defined by House rules.''

Again, as I say, this majority has been very, very proud of their policy to ban all earmarks. That is why, really, the decision by my Republican colleague from Alaska is therefore hard to understand, and the support that the majority is providing for this amendment is hard to understand. But I think it is clear evidence that the status quo remains when it comes to special favors and when it comes to special interests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am deeply disappointed in the lady from Connecticut. This is a program that has been in existence since 1994, and you voted for it every time. This is not an earmark. This is an existing program. And I've heard you rail all night about restoring money, which are all earmarks. You're dead wrong.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, doesn't the gentleman have to address the Chair?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Well, all right. I'll address the Chair, but I'll look over there.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am going to say respectfully, this is an existing program, and the reason it was started is because Alaskan natives and the Hawaiian natives do not receive money from the BIA. It was started to recognize an inequity of those people that live in both of our States. It is not a new program, and this language as written is at the discretion of the Department as they see a need.

Like I say, I thought we were going to start a little bit of a bipartisan effort on this side, and I don't see it when those people will take away from some of the most impoverished people who have not had that opportunity.

So I am urging my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment. And I say to those that oppose it, shame on you. I have heard the bleeding hearts all night, and it deeply disturbs me that they would say this is something different when it is an existing program.

□ 2310

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my colleague and friend, I might add, and my friends here, that this in fact is in the same category of a program as Teach for America, the National Writing Project, and other projects, just to name a couple, that have been designated by the majority as earmarks. This is the same category of programs. We cannot be talking about a series of programs on the one hand which are categorized as earmarks and then the other the same, in the same breath, then say these, because they are of specific interest to me or anyone else, that in fact then they are not.

If the majority is going to be true to it's principle—and it has been a very, very defined principle. It's one which I quoted specifically the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who made a special point of letting not only us but the country know that earmarks were not going to be a part of this continuing resolution. I did not say that. I have not stood here and made a claim that the problem with spending in this country is about earmarks and they should all be gone.

Now you either have to define the earmarks, stick to your definition and your principle, or don't. And then let's talk about Teach for America, the Writing Project, and the others that have been categorized as earmarks. Let's have a level playing field.

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

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1826. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Innovation and Improvement'' shall be $885,786,000, and no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 5 of part A of title II, part D of title II, part D of title V, or section 1504 of the ESEA, or part F of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(b) The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, seventeenth and eighteenth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Innovation and Improvement'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1827. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education'' shall be $191,341,000, of which no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 3 of part C of title II or subpart 2, 3, or 10 of part D of title V of the ESEA.

(b) The first, second, and third provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1828. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Special Education'' shall be $3,414,870,000, of which $3,168,654,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 (in addition to the $8,592,383,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $8,592,383,000, to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2011 for academic year 2011–2012.

(b) The first and second provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Special Education'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1829. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research'' shall be $3,453,388,000.

(b) The second proviso under the heading ''Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1830. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Career, Technical, and Adult Education'' shall be $1,017,338,000, to become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 (in addition to the $791,000,000 previously appropriated under such heading that became available on October 1, 2010), and an additional $791,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 2012, shall be available on October 1, 2011 for academic year 2011–2012: *Provided*, That of the amounts available for such heading, no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 4 of part D of title V of the ESEA, or part D of title VIII of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

(b) The first, second, third, seventh and eighth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Career, Technical, and Adult Education'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1831. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Student Financial Assistance'' shall be $18,475,492,000, of which $17,495,000,000 shall be available to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and $980,492,000 shall be available to carry out part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The maximum Pell grant for which a student shall be eligible during award year 2011–2012 shall be $4,015.

AMENDMENT NO. 490 OFFERED BY MS. CHU

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 301, line 16, strike ''$4,015'' and insert ''$4,860''.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlelady's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved by the gentleman from Montana.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chair, I rise today to strongly support investing in America's future. I rise to present the Chu-Moore-Jackson Lee amendment to restore full funding to the Pell Grant program.

With this CR, the Republicans slashed the very funding that ensures every American has the opportunity to go to college. H.R. 1 does something that is shocking, especially in these tough economic times. It deprives millions of students of the financial support that they need to go to college. At a time when people are losing jobs, when people can't find jobs, when people are scared about whether they have a future, Republicans are cutting Pell Grant financial aid by 15 percent for students across the board. This is an astounding number.

If the Republicans gut this program, there will be 9 million students who will have cuts in their financial aid, endangering their ability to go to college. It is the largest cut in student financial aid in history. This will hit the neediest students hardest. In California, my home State, one-third of undergraduates—nearly 65,000 students—get this money for college. And most come from families making less than $30,000 a year.

But this is about more than just numbers and statistics. This is about real people and real students, whose real futures are at stake. Students like Chris Hamm who attends the University of Cincinnati. Chris' Pell Grant pays for a quarter of his college tuition. Without this money, Chris doesn't think he will be able to afford school and will be forced to drop out, leaving him few options in this tough economy.

Today, we know we are no longer in an arms race. Today, we are in a brains race. Every year, we are falling further and further behind other countries. Fewer Americans are getting a college degree compared to those from other countries. We don't have all the science, math, and talent we need to compete. America's ability to remain competitive in a global modern economy hinges on our ability to encourage and grow a highly educated workforce.

Gutting Pell Grants in this bill will only compound our future economic challenges and undermine the dream that we have for our young people to join the middle class. Pell Grants aren't just an investment in an individual student but an investment in the future of our Nation.

We need a comprehensive approach that makes strategic cuts in investments with an eye to the future. Instead, the Republicans are taking a meat ax to programs that are crucial to American competitiveness. This strategy is senseless and it is tragic. It is tantamount to telling our young people, You will not have a future.

Instead, we must win the future by out-innovating, out-building, and out-educating the world. We must train all Americans from every class and background to succeed in the economy of tomorrow. We must give them the financial aid that they need. So I ask Members to support this amendment and restore Pell Grant funding to our students.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states: ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I think that the point of order should not be considered in order because this continuing resolution looks at striking waste, fraud, and fat out of our budget. And I would argue that amendment No. 490 is in fact the bone, the nerve, the blood, and the sinew of our economy.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will confine her remarks to the point of order.

□ 2320

Ms. MOORE. I am, Mr. Chair, making the point that this amendment is in order because it deals with the continuing resolution which would slash the Pell Grant funding by $845 and that the purpose of this continuing resolution is to slash funding that is unnecessary in our budget. I would argue that this amendment should be made in order because the Pell Grant is the cornerstone of our Federal financial aid programs.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would again remind the gentlewoman to confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentleman restate his point of order?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized to restate his point of order.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 239 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 301, at the end of line 16, strike ''$4,015'' and insert ''$4,860.''

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I respect the gentleman, but there were individuals who wanted to debate on the amendment of Ms. CHU, and I think we are allowed to do that except that the gentleman rose on his point of order and started speaking to it before we could strike the last word.

Will others be allowed to debate before the gentleman pursues his point of order?

The Acting CHAIR. The Members may offer pro forma amendments. But when an amendment is offered, there is no requirement that any point of order be reserved rather than pressed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. So, if Members are on their feet, you would be kind enough to recognize them before the gentleman from Montana pursues a point of order, which he has already reserved?

The Acting CHAIR. A pro forma amendment may not be offered while a point of order is pending.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me say that I rise to join with the Chu-Moore-Jackson Lee amendment and that I now rise to introduce the Jackson Lee amendment, which also addresses the question of the Pell Grant. I would hope that my colleagues would be allowed to debate it. I consider this an emergency, and I will make this point as the gentleman makes his point of order.

Mr. Chair, let me just refer to where we are today because we are needing to be engaged in creating jobs. I am not sure what my colleagues heard in the last election, but what I heard was that we needed jobs.

It is clear—and I hope that we can see this—we have been here for 5 weeks plus, and the number of jobs that have been created by the Republicans is zero. So here we are now with a 15 percent cut on Pell Grants.

What does that mean?

It means that schools all around the Nation will not be able to provide Pell Grants to the individual students who need them. In fact, in my own district, with this 15 percent cut, this 5,550 going down to 4,705 will drastically impact students in my constituency.

For example, the cuts will jeopardize education and the future of 16,570 students who are currently dependent on Pell Grants in order to finance their education. 5,726 are currently studying at Texas Southern University and 10,847 at the University of Houston—16,570 in my district alone. Those from the State of Montana will lose their Pell Grants. Those from the State of Alabama, from the State of Connecticut, and from the State of Wisconsin will lose their Pell Grants. But the real insult is that this will stop the education of thousands upon thousands of students in the middle of their education.

Again, how many jobs have the Republicans created?—zero.

I always want to bring this chart, which is very hard to see, but we can see how many jobs we lost in the last administration. We are on the rise of creating jobs. In fact, the CBO said that our future is great. It will not be great with a misguided plan to eliminate $600 million from the Pell Grant program. It is absolutely absurd. For example, let me share with you thoughts from The New York Times:

> This CR is ideologically driven. We started with a $74 billion cut, but because the Republicans decided that it is preferable to abide by polls, they decided to move to a draconian and ludicrous $100 billion.

That means that $600 million was cut from Pell Grants.

In addition to an amendment that I did not offer, the NIH, we see that those grants that were competitive for fellowships and research have also been drastically cut at Texas Southern University and at the University of Houston, and many State institutions in Texas are impacted by the cuts of the NIH grants.

But this is the greatest sin: In a meeting that I had with my community colleges and my school districts, they were in complete panic about losing Pell Grants that will then impact on the wonderful upsurge of jobs from what we had lost in the last administration.

I would simply ask my colleagues: Why are we going down a pathway that would take away the growth that we have provided?

So I would ask, as we look to the future, that this be restored. My amendment and Ms. CHU's amendment—the one that I joined and the one that I intended to speak on—was, in fact, to restore these dollars.

A new Wall Street Journal survey of economists shows they expect the economy to expand at the fastest pace since 2003 but not with these draconian cuts. Why wouldn't they do as the President's budget has done, which is to get rid of the 2 percent tax cuts for the billionaires? We might be able to provide $600 million for students. But no. We want to, I guess, stand with ideological viewpoints and with individuals who say, I was sent here to budget cut.

You were sent here to govern. You were sent here to protect the American people. Students who will create the workforce of the 21st century, you are now telling them they can't get an education.

Let me say this: The Constitution reminds us of what a wonderful country we live in—a country that believes we all are created equal. We don't have the same economic opportunities, meaning the same wealth, but we do have the ability to access education through wonderful programs like the Pell Grant program. Now you're telling poor and low-income students the door is closed; the lights are out; you're not equal, and you don't deserve an education.

I would say that this is an abomination. Support the amendments that will provide for $600 million restored to the Pell Grants. I ask my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

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

H.R. 1, the Continuing Resolution making appropriations to fund the federal government through September 20, 2011 contains some very deep cuts that will be very hurtful to many Americans, especially those who are the most vulnerable—disadvantaged women and families, children, minorities, the elderly, and our nation's university students. The proposed cuts in the CR will have a disproportionate effect on the low-income and minority portions of our population.

As we face a large deficit and growing debt, we know that cuts will have to be made. And yes, some of those cuts will be painful. However, we must be careful not to place added burdens and cause greater harms to those Americans who are the most vulnerable and in need of our support the most.

The proposed CR calls for a 15 percent reduction in funding for Pell grants. Such a cut will reduce the maximum Pell grant award from its current level of $5,550 to $4,705. This would present a serious problem for institutions of higher learning, but more importantly, it creates a major hardship on students.

Current students who receive Pell grants would have to figure out a way to come up with nearly an additional $1,000 in order to continue their education. Students who have been accepted to school and have received their financial aid packages are also put in a position that would force them to find and secure additional funds for their schooling. Pell Grants provide the basic foundation of federal student aid and help more than 8 million students afford to attend college.

To some of us, $800–$1,000 may not seem significant. However, to a student who qualifies for Pell grant assistance, and relies on those funds, this would be a great hardship, potentially forcing students to take time off from their schooling.

In my district in Houston, TX, these cuts will jeopardize the education and future of 16,570 students who are currently dependent on Pell grants in order to finance their education—5,726 currently studying at Texas Southern University and 10,847 at University of Houston. 16,570 students in one Congressional District alone will be unfairly affected by these cuts.

In the entire state of Texas, 650,790 students currently enrolled in school will be forced to deal with unexpected financial hardships under this provision. In other words, in my state alone, the number of students negatively impacted by this drastic cut to Pell grant funding is more than the entire population of Washington, DC. Nationwide, more than 9 million students would potentially be impacted.

Mr. Chair, these cuts are an unnecessary and unfair hardship that will be forced on college students. These young men and women represent the future labor force of our country, and in these trying economic times, I believe it is extremely appalling for Members of Congress to purposefully jeopardize the educational and economic future of our country.

ESTIMATED STATE-BY-STATE IMPACT ON FEDERAL PELL GRANT PROGRAM

State or Area	AY 2011–12 $5,550 Maximum Grant			AY 2011–12 Difference at $4,705 Maximum Grant		
	Aid Available	Recipients	Avg. Award	Aid Available	Recipients	Avg. Award
Alabama	$772,900,000	178,348	$4,334	($127,700,000)	(184)	($713)
Alaska	$32,700,000	8,434	$3,877	($5,400,000)	(8)	($637)
Arizona	$2,221,700,000	601,345	$3,695	($356,500,000)	(337)	($592)
Arkansas	$416,200,000	94,780	$4,391	($68,800,000)	(97)	($722)
California	$4,330,700,000	1,038,137	$4,172	($704,000,000)	(980)	($675)
Colorado	$594,400,000	150,699	$3,944	($98,200,000)	(156)	($648)
Connecticut	$281,300,000	72,492	$3,880	($46,400,000)	(75)	($636)

ESTIMATED STATE-BY-STATE IMPACT ON FEDERAL PELL GRANT PROGRAM—Continued

State or Area	AY 2011–12 $5,550 Maximum Grant			AY 2011–12 Difference at $4,705 Maximum Grant		
	Aid Available	Recipients	Avg. Award	Aid Available	Recipients	Avg. Award
Delaware	$65,500,000	16,594	$3,947	($10,800,000)	(17)	($647)
District of Columbia	$165,600,000	44,606	$3,713	($27,400,000)	(46)	($612)
Florida	$2,563,500,000	587,309	$4,365	($416,200,000)	(388)	($706)
Georgia	$1,365,500,000	314,859	$4,337	($223,000,000)	(241)	($706)
Hawaii	$80,700,000	18,859	$4,279	($13,300,000)	(19)	($702)
Idaho	$211,600,000	48,803	$4,336	($35,000,000)	(50)	($714)
Illinois	$1,693,800,000	395,672	$4,281	($277,500,000)	(282)	($699)
Indiana	$802,900,000	204,045	$3,935	($132,700,000)	(210)	($647)
Iowa	$809,200,000	205,546	$3,937	($133,700,000)	(212)	($647)
Kansas	$316,500,000	76,782	$4,122	($52,300,000)	(79)	($678)
Kentucky	$593,300,000	138,742	$4,276	($98,000,000)	(143)	($702)
Louisiana	$578,200,000	130,187	$4,441	($95,600,000)	(134)	($730)
Maine	$133,000,000	31,503	$4,222	($22,000,000)	(32)	($695)
Maryland	$492,600,000	123,070	$4,003	($81,400,000)	(128)	($658)
Massachusetts	$575,600,000	136,517	$4,216	($95,100,000)	(141)	($693)
Michigan	$1,404,800,000	346,109	$4,059	($231,700,000)	(461)	($665)
Minnesota	$583,000,000	148,629	$3,923	($96,300,000)	(153)	($645)
Mississippi	$566,100,000	120,540	$4,696	($93,500,000)	(125)	($771)
Missouri	$736,600,000	179,451	$4,105	($121,700,000)	(185)	($675)
Montana	$104,700,000	23,896	$4,381	($17,300,000)	(25)	($720)
Nebraska	$171,400,000	43,355	$3,953	($28,300,000)	(45)	($649)
Nevada	$129,600,000	32,896	$3,940	($21,400,000)	(34)	($647)
New Hampshire	$86,100,000	21,354	$4,032	($14,200,000)	(23)	($661)
New Jersey	$804,000,000	185,446	$4,335	($132,800,000)	(192)	($712)
New Mexico	$274,000,000	66,784	$4,103	($45,300,000)	(69)	($675)
New York	$2,832,900,000	536,983	$5,276	($466,200,000)	(713)	($863)
North Carolina	$993,900,000	249,958	$3,976	($165,700,000)	(312)	($659)
North Dakota	$81,000,000	18,821	$4,304	($13,400,000)	(20)	($708)
Ohio	$1,499,800,000	366,549	$4,092	($247,900,000)	(705)	($670)
Oklahoma	$455,400,000	107,109	$4,252	($75,200,000)	(110)	($699)
Oregon	$459,600,000	111,109	$4,136	($76,000,000)	(115)	($680)
Pennsylvania	$1,226,500,000	302,255	$4,058	($209,900,000)	(804)	($686)
Rhode Island	$151,600,000	36,251	$4,182	($25,000,000)	(38)	($686)
South Carolina	$541,300,000	128,126	$4,225	($89,400,000)	(132)	($694)
South Dakota	$109,800,000	26,634	$4,123	($18,100,000)	(28)	($676)
Tennessee	$778,500,000	184,299	$4,224	($128,700,000)	(190)	($695)
Texas	$2,723,000,000	650,790	$4,184	($444,800,000)	(805)	($679)
Utah	$390,800,000	96,550	$4,048	($64,600,000)	(100)	($666)
Vermont	$55,200,000	13,301	$4,150	($9,100,000)	(14)	($680)
Virginia	$746,300,000	180,219	$4,141	($123,300,000)	(186)	($681)
Washington	$574,000,000	139,500	$4,115	($94,800,000)	(144)	($676)
West Virginia	$274,800,000	61,818	$4,445	($45,400,000)	(63)	($730)
Wisconsin	$486,000,000	119,192	$4,077	($80,300,000)	(123)	($670)
Wyoming	$51,100,000	12,284	$4,160	($8,400,000)	(13)	($680)
Puerto Rico	$1,258,000,000	270,060	$4,658	($195,800,000)	(535)	($717)
U.S. Territories	$71,300,000	15,628	$4,562	($11,700,000)	(16)	($744)
Total	$39,718,500,000	9,413,225	$4,219	($6,517,200,000)	(10,437)	($688)

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment to strike the provision of the Continuing Resolution, CR, that would significantly reduce the level of funding used by the National Institutes of Health, NIH, to fund competitive and noncompetitive grant programs. The proposed cuts would have a direct detrimental impact on students studying at institutions of higher learning.

Majority of the fellowships offered at institutions of higher education are funded by these competitive and non-competitive grants issued by the National Institutes of Health, NIH. Under the proposed Continuing Resolution, NIH funding would be cut by close to $1 billion. Such a cut would have a massive and immediate impact on the ability of students to continue their studies.

Many of the fellowships funded by NIH are multi-year programs, meaning that many of the students in receipt of these fellowships are studying in expectation of a certain level of funding. These students are dependent on these funds in order to continue their studies and pay their living expenses. Drastic cuts such as the ones proposed would leave these students in a very difficult situation financially, and in some cases, may even require them to put their studies on hold.

My district, the 18th Congressional District in Houston, TX is home to a number of colleges and universities, amongst those, Texas Southern University—a Historically Black College, and the University Houston system—a massive institution responsible for the education of over 60,000 students.

In 2010, Texas Southern University, a relatively small institution, received $895,228 in educational grants from NIH alone. The University of Houston, a much larger school, was able to offer close to 900 fellowships to students because of over $13.9 million dollars of grant funding received from NIH. Under the cuts proposed in the CR, approximately a thousand students in my district alone would be potentially negatively impacted.

These grants from NIH enabled students in my district at Texas Southern University and University of Houston to study and research in the fields of engineering, pharmacy, optometry, education, social work and other sciences. These students, and hundreds of thousands of other students across the country, are our future. They are actively taking steps to win the future for America, and the cuts proposed in this CR creating hardships that could lead to failure.

Not only will these cuts to NIH funding affect current students, but it will reduce the number of fellowships that colleges and universities will be able to offer to students in the future. We are living in a highly competitive global economy. If America intends to remain a global super power, we must arm our students with the knowledge and tools to remain competitive, specifically quality education. Cutting funding to these organizations will impose a great hardship on students striving to educate themselves in order that they may be competitive in a global economy.

Just a few weeks ago, during the State of the Union address, President Obama laid out his blueprint for how America can ''win the future.'' He acknowledged the need for America to tighten its belt and make difficult cuts to address our national debt Saying, ''we need to take responsibility for our deficit and reform our government.'' And I wholeheartedly agree—cuts will have to be made, and some of those cuts may be painful.

However, in the next breath, President Obama stated, ''The first step in winning the future is encouraging American innovation.'' The research grants and fellowships that NIH has been providing to students do exactly that. They allow American students to research and spur innovation, which is a long term investment in our economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

□ 2330

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I tried to craft my discussion in the form of an emergency. The loss of thousands upon thousands of

students' access to education, I consider that an emergency.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will suspend.

Will the gentlewoman speak to the point of order.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will.

I consider this an emergency, and I would ask that this point of order be waived in order to provide for the thousands of students, Mr. Chairman, that are now going to stop school because of the $1,000, $800 they will lose. I'm asking the gentleman for a waiver so that this is based on an emergency and the fact there was no offset available that would not impact negatively other vital programs to make America equal. I'd ask for a waiver and I'd ask for this amendment to be accepted and the point of order to be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

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

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Chu-Moore-Jackson Lee amendment for the continuing appropriations act, H.R. 1, because we're deeply concerned about the cuts to the Pell Grant funding contained in the continuing resolution which would slash funding by $845, a 15 percent cut, and, of course, this amendment would preserve the Pell Grant program and maintain the full award level.

I am, you know, again, just a little bit perturbed, Mr. Chairman. This cut, like so many cuts in the resolution, would disproportionately harm traditionally underserved communities. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, Pell recipients are more likely to be female, first-generation college students, and less likely to be white than those who don't receive the grants. In other words, Mr. Chairman, they kind of look like me.

Minority students also face disproportionate unmet need, meaning the amount that they still need to pay for college even after family contributions, parties, raising money from their churches, grants, nonprivate loans still will not meet their needs to go to college. Women sometimes come into college with more precarious financial situations. They're already parents and mothers.

Now, you know, if this country is prepared to just slide into irrelevancy in the global economic community because we don't educate our workforce, this would be the loss leading legislation to do that. Cutting the program is so counterintuitive to our remaining a first-rate power.

And what is our secret weapon in this country for staying on top? It's our diversity, our diversity to be competitive. We're women. We're blacks. We're Asians. We're Hispanics. We're Indians. We're Hmong. We bring different talents and abilities to the table, and our ability to educate these young people comes with our ability to provide a Pell Grant which levels the playing field for all students.

There's not a politician in this country that doesn't make part of their platform that this country has got to have a highly educated 21st century workforce. There's not a politician, Democrat, Republican, Independent, or any other stripe, that doesn't say and pronounce that education is the key, and yet we're not willing to provide the lubricant so that key can fit into the lock, and that is the resources to make sure our students can go to school.

This Pell Grant is that opportunity. Don't deny it to students. Don't deny it. Don't deny it, Mr. Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1832. Of the unobligated balances of funds made available in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 401A(e)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $986,433,851 is rescinded.

SEC. 1833. (a) Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Higher Education'' shall be $1,690,285,000, of which no funds shall be available for activities authorized under part A of title II, part B of title VII or subpart 1 of part D of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, section 1543 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, part H of title VIII of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, part I of subtitle A of title VI of the America COMPETES Act, or section 117 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

(b) The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth provisos under the heading ''Department of Education, Higher Education'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1834. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences'' shall be $530,106,000.

SEC. 1835. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Corporation for National and Community Service, Operating Expenses'' shall be $0.

SEC. 1836. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Corporation for National and Community Service, National Service Trust'' shall be $50,000,000.

SEC. 1837. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Corporation for National and Community Service, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $68,000,000.

SEC. 1838. (a) Of the funds made available for ''Corporation for Public Broadcasting'' in title IV of division F of Public Law 111–8, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

(b) The amounts included under the heading ''Corporation for Public Broadcasting'' in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ''$0'' for ''$86,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$25,000,000''; by substituting ''$0'' for ''$36,000,000''; and by substituting ''$0'' for ''$25,000,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 436 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 303, strike lines 3 through 9 and insert the following:

(b) For payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (''Corporation''), as authorized by the Communications Act of 1934, an amount which shall be available within limitations specified by that Act, for the fiscal year 2013, $460,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation by this Act shall be used to pay for receptions, parties, or similar forms of entertainment for Government officials or employees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation by this Act shall be available or used to aid or support any program or activity from which any person is excluded, or is denied benefits, or is discriminated against, on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation by this Act shall be used to apply any political test or qualification in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking any other personnel action with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation by this Act shall be used to support the Television Future Fund or any similar purpose.

(c) For taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, the allowance under section 611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to an oil or gas well shall be calculated without regard to subsection (c) or (d) of section 613A of such Code.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I'm sad to have to offer this amendment this evening. It's more unfortunate that if we're going to be subject to a strict interpretation of the House rules, I have a list of provisions already in this young session where time after time the majority has chosen to waive the rules since they were first adopted, when it served their purpose. If our colleagues are serious about cutting the deficit, they will not just allow the amendment to be debated, but they will vote upon it and pass it.

Mr. Chairman, the public doesn't care whether the deficit is reduced by closing a tax loophole or reducing spending. I'll bet it would rather stop another giveaway to large oil companies rather than cutting programs that are important to them. For that matter, I think the voters like public

broadcasting a lot more than they like Congress.

These funds for public broadcasting are absolutely essential to protect. It helps serve 170 million Americans every month. Especially important are the innovative programs for education, culture, and public affairs.

Make no mistake, the reduction of the funds that are contemplated by my colleagues in 2 years, eliminating public broadcasting support altogether, will damage all the stations, and, indeed, I think all of us listen to these stations ourselves. But it would particularly hurt the stations in rural and small town America.

First, small town stations rely more heavily on public funds than the stations in big cities like Boston, New York, Chicago, and even Portland, Oregon.

Second, not only do these smaller communities rely more heavily on the stations that are located there, but in rural and small town America, the circumstance is that it is much more expensive to broadcast to them. Taking an example in a region familiar to the Chairman, in our Pacific Northwest, for Oregon public broadcasting, which serves both our districts, it costs 11 times as much to broadcast to remote Burns, Oregon, than it does in the metropolitan area.

Public broadcasting is also the source of innovative journalism that you're not going to find anyplace else. At a time when large corporate newsrooms are cutting back on foreign affairs, for instance, public broadcasting, because of the generous support of viewers and support from the country itself, is being able to expand its foreign coverage.

□ 2340

I'll bet most of us in this Chamber today relied on NPR first thing in the morning as we were getting ready to go to work to be aware of the recent events, for example, in Egypt. It is particularly important for our children. Public broadcasting is the only source of programming that is geared to educate our children, not try to sell something to them. Pulling out this vital public funding stream is going to undermine that mission of educating our children.

And at a time when I would think that we would want to support public-private partnerships, taking away the essential contributions that the Federal Government has provided since 1967 undermines that public-private partnership where we see six, seven times the funding leveraged as a result of that public contribution.

Mr. Chairman, we've seen this movie before. The Republicans, when they came into power before, tried to shut down public broadcasting, and we have seen the American public push back. Just this last week, tens of thousands of people have called our offices entreating us to allow the funding to continue. I would strongly urge that there not be selective application of the rules to this amendment but waive, as the majority has done time and time again for their purposes, to enable this provision to go forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment adds a limitation to a general appropriations bill. Under clause 2 of rule XXI, such amendments are not in order during the reading of a general appropriations bill. The rule states in part: ''Except as provided in paragraph D, an amendment proposing a limitation not specifically contained or authorized in existing law for the period of the limitation shall not be in order during consideration of a general appropriations bill.''

Mr. Chairman, the amendment adds a limitation and is not specifically contained or authorized in existing law during the reading. The amendment, therefore, is in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

The amendment includes a limitation. As such, under clause 2(c) and 2(d) of rule XXI, it is not in order, as a matter of form, until the reading for amendment has progressed to the end of the bill.

The point of order is sustained.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. It's deja vu. Here we go again. This week, we are again fighting extreme efforts to dismantle the public broadcasting services that 170 million Americans use for news and education. In 1995 and in 2005, we defeated efforts to slash the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. How long will it take for some people to learn that the public wants Congress to focus on creating jobs, not laying off Burt and Ernie with GO-pink slips. My grandchildren are learning from not only old favorites like Big Bird, but also Maya and Miguel, Clifford the Big Red Dog, and a cast of other fun and educational characters.

Millions of Americans rely on public TV and radio for vital news in the community, and broadcasters leveraged $6 for every $1 in Federal funds. Do we want to live in a society in which the only characters that appear on children's programs are those who gross the highest profits rather than those who deliver the most compelling lessons to our kids? Or one where our news is delivered primarily from sources focused on their bottom line? Of course not. That is why I am so pleased to support this amendment to restore cuts.

In recent years, we have already cut funding for programs related to public broadcasting, including the Department of Education's Ready-to-Teach Program. We cannot abandon the Corporation for Public Broadcasting altogether. Republicans should be less preoccupied with silencing Cookie Monster and more focused on getting our economy back on track.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hard work that the House Appropriations Committee has done in crafting a bill that in so many ways is making the tough choices necessary to bring back fiscal sanity to Washington. I am pleased that they have incorporated a bill that I had earlier filed in this session, H.R. 69, which also would eliminate taxpayer subsidies for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. There are a number of well-known accountability groups, such as the Club for Growth, Americans for Limited Government, and National Taxpayers Union, that have all endorsed this end of funding for taxpayer-supported broadcasting.

You know, if we go back in time, in 1967, when the Public Broadcasting Act was first enacted, the intent of that act was ''to provide telecommunications services to all citizens in the United States.'' Well, that has been accomplished. That was over 40 years ago. Now we have 500 channels on cable TV. People get Internet access on their cell phones. We have satellite, wireless available around this country. We have so many media options that are available now that were not available 40 years ago. So we have fulfilled the purpose of that Act.

Now that Republicans are in control of the House, we're getting serious about getting the budget under control.

There is some good programming that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting produces that I personally enjoy and like; but that's not the issue, whether we like it or not. It's whether taxpayers should subsidize this form of broadcasting. When something puts out good quality programming, like the corporation does, they could survive, if they wanted to go into the free market and get funding—whether it's selling advertising or something like that. They are perfectly capable of surviving, and not just surviving but thriving in the open market because they do have some good-quality programming. They don't need to rely on taxpayers.

And when you look at what a deep fiscal hole we are in now as a country—for instance, this annual deficit that we are in the middle of right now is going to be $1.6 trillion, the highest in the history of this country. The time has come to end funding for government programs that are no longer necessary.

So it's a matter of fiscal responsibility and fiscal sanity that the Appropriations Committee has produced this

amendment. It's not against the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; but it's for the taxpayers, saying, You don't have to keep subsidizing something that no longer needs the government crutch that it originally was given.

□ 2350

The amount of money we're talking about is considerable. For fiscal year 2011, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting appropriation is $430 million. For next year, it will be $445 million. And President Obama's budget request that was just submitted that we got on Monday asks for $451 million for 2014. That's almost half a billion dollars. When we have $1.5 trillion annual deficits, we have to get our budget in order. And the reason is because, by leaving money in the private sector, that will create jobs. Rather than the government and the favored programs having the money, if that can stay in the private sector, people can invest and create private sector jobs, and those are the jobs that Americans are really looking for.

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

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon that the majority has, unfortunately, ruled out of order.

In this continuing resolution, the Republicans are trying to dismantle one of the most precious landmarks of the entire media landscape. Public broadcasting is an electronic oasis for learning in what has been called the vast wasteland of commercial television.

Now, why do I say that? Well, I say it because you just have to look at what is on commercial television from the perspective of a parent with children trying to ensure that those children are given the educational and informational programming that will help in their development.

Here's a short sampling of what was on television during the day today. There's a spate of daytime soap operas which are full of adult themes not appropriate for young children. Then there were programs on this afternoon such as ''Hoarding,'' ''Buried Alive,'' and ''The Babysitter's Seduction.'' Again, more programming not suitable for children. In addition, there was ''Hollywood's Most Shocking Breakups,'' and ''Dog, the Bounty Hunter,'' and they were not talking about Clifford the Big Red Dog.

Ladies and gentlemen, what we hear is that the private sector, private television, commercial television is taking care of the children's audience. It does not. The Cartoon Network is in no way to be compared to what is on the Public Broadcasting System from 6 a.m. every morning until 6 p.m. every night, 12 hours every day, something that parents can rely upon for their children to see which is educationally nutritious for their development. And it's on every television station, every public television station in the country, every single day.

Let me give you a typical day. On WGBH up in Boston, but on every other public television station, beginning at 6 a.m., it's ''Between the Lions,'' then ''Clifford the Big Red Dog'' and ''Arthur,'' followed by ''Martha Speaks,'' ''Curious George,'' ''Dinosaur Train'' and ''WordWorld,'' which brings us all the way up to noontime. The parents are happy. The kids have good programming that they're watching.

And then rather than soap operas in the afternoon, on the Public Broadcasting System, the kids get to see ''Sid the Science Guy,'' ''WordGirl,'' ''The Electric Company,'' and on and on and on until 6 every night.

PBS is really the children's television network, and generations of children and parents have benefited from this programming being on.

What the Republicans are trying to do is just end this era and just toss these families over to this commercial world, which is fine if you really do believe that Cartoon Network and other networks like that targeted at children for commercial purposes can in any way substitute for this Sesame Street diet that children have been on for more than one generation and have immeasurably helped, not just those that come from the white upper middle class, but in polling it's actually above 80 percent, whether your family is Asian, Hispanic, white, African American. All poll out at 80 percent in terms of what those parents believe about the benefit that comes from the Public Broadcasting System in the children's programming that is presented to those children.

So CPB doesn't just stand for Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It also stands for Children and Parents Benefit. And that's why it's important. And that's why it was important in 1967, and that's why it is important today. This has been the crown jewel in our national media mix when it comes to the children of our country. And this attempt to take out a meat cleaver and to cut this programming source off in a way that would harm those families in our country is a huge mistake.

Now, Mr. BLUMENAUER has attempted to offer an amendment that would have restored the full $460 million in funding for the Public Broadcasting System. But in turn, what his amendment would have tried to do is to go to the big tax breaks for oil and gas companies in our country.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I would ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. And it's altogether understandable why the gentleman who did object objected because I know where he's coming from on this. He did not want to hear the next sentence, because the gentleman from Montana is someone who does believe that the tax breaks for Big Oil should stay on the books. It's $40 billion over the next 5 years, and he'd rather see a cutting of Big Oil be substituted by a cutting of Big Bird. Okay? That's what tonight's all about, just this misallocation of resources within our society.

And I understand why the gentleman from Montana doesn't want to hear those words spoken, but he should get ready to hear it over and over again. Big Oil is going to get all the breaks that they want, and it might come at the expense of children's television or poor people. But I will tell you this much. Grandma isn't going to get her lunch because of these people over here. And these guys want to continue to take Big Oil to lunch, but we're going to have a big debate about this as each and every day goes by.

I thank the gentlelady, and I congratulate the gentleman from Oregon for making this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Very briefly, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for confirming the strategy that is being used by our friends on the other side of the aisle. If it's good, if it has been good, it's time for it to go.

I'm going to join the gentleman in supporting the gentleman from Oregon's amendment and to cite Channel 8 in Houston, Texas, that compensates for bloody domestic fights on domestic or commercial TV during the day and doesn't expose our children to opportunities for learning.

I might add, the National Public Radio, as well, has its challenges. So I just hope that as we begin to understand that our economy is churning, that we will invest in our children, which the National Public Radio represents.

And as my friend from New York said, Big Bird is still alive, and other new characters have been utilized to teach children. Public broadcast equalizes opportunity for good education in preschool for children who are at home, or in home daycare, to give them an exposure to learning, reading, writing and colorful activities.

So let me just say that I'm sorry the gentleman's amendment was ruled out of order. It looks as if we have just turned our head away from investing in education—cutting Pell Grants, cutting NIH fellowships and scholarships,

cutting public broadcast. It looks like we've just said enough is enough with job creation and let's get rid of education as well. And I ask, of course, that this CR be defeated.

□ 0000

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1839. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Institute of Museum and Library Services, Office of Museum and Library Services, Grants and Administration'' shall be $265,869,000.

SEC. 1840. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $12,450,000.

SEC. 1841. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''National Labor Relations Board, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $233,400,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 410 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 303, line 19, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $233,400,000)''.

Page 359, line 15, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $233,400,000)''.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I think it's important to put this discussion tonight in a little context.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of saying that we want to dismantle this and slash that and cut that. And the truth of the matter, Madam Chair, is that what we want to do is save. We want to save the American taxpayer and, yes, save the country. Because what is happening, and the American people know it, is that this Federal Government has for year after year after year and more over the last 4 years borrowed too much and spent too much and taxed too much, and it's destroying jobs. It is destroying jobs.

If you don't believe the words, all you have to do is look at the picture. The pictures show very clearly that's what is happening. This is 2006 down here when Speaker PELOSI came into power, and the amount of spending at the Federal level. And this is where we are right now, about one-third more under this administration, and this is where it is going. And the American people are sick and tired of it. And what they sent folks here to Washington to do is to decrease spending, to decrease borrowing, and to decrease taxes so that we can put the American people back to work.

That's what this is all about. It's not about some small program here or some large program there. It's about putting American people back to work and making the government the right size.

So I rise on my amendment, which identifies an agency that can only be described as anti-worker and anti-business and anti-jobs. You know what it is, Madam Chair. It is the National Labor Relations Board. It's a New Deal relic charged with conducting elections for labor union representation and investigating unfair labor practices. However, what has happened is that the board has gotten beyond any claims that it's a neutral arbiter of labor relations. And this starts with Craig Becker, the recess appointment, which means no Senate confirmation by the Obama administration, to lead the board. He has got huge ties to SEIU and AFL–CIO, and has proven to be very adept at carrying the water for Big Labor while siding against American employers and the American taxpayer. He could hardly be characterized as an impartial voice.

The out-of-control NLRB now is seeking to expand the board's role beyond current law. American businesses are under constant threat from the NLRB. They tried to push for card check, which is actually the ''Secret Ballot Destruction Act.'' You will recall, Madam Chair, that this was a bill that the Democrats, when they were in charge of this whole place, couldn't get through Congress so now they want to do it by rule. They want to enact it by rule through the NLRB. A remarkable, remarkable overreach. They try to rig the deck over and over again.

But the rigging of the deck is just what Big Labor needs at this point, because the private sector unionization is only about 7 percent in this country of our workforce. So a new influx of dues-paying members is needed for their contributions and for their political campaigns.

So my amendment is very simple. At a time of crippling national debt that destroys jobs, my amendment would defund the NLRB and save the American taxpayer $283 million. It makes sense, since this agency really has seen its role remarkably diminish. The NLRB's caseload has shrunk dramatically, by some estimates, a 40 percent drop in elections and petitions since 2001. And yet, while its role has been diminishing, its reach into America's workplaces and into America's pocketbooks has only expanded.

So a vote for this amendment would be a vote for America's job creators, and we would work to defund an agency whose time has really, really passed. So I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. This is amazing. What a step backward for democracy if there was support for this bill. This amendment would actually eliminate all funding for the National Labor Relations Board.

The NLRB has been in existence for 75 years. Its functions are to protect the rights of workers to unionize or not unionize; to promote peaceful, productive relations between labor and management. It conducts secret ballot elections to determine whether workers want to be represented by a union. It investigates, it resolves complaints of unfair labor practices that are brought against both unions and employers. It protects workers from retaliation from exercising their rights. These functions are fundamental to democracy and a workplace. Why do we want to throw out the entire system with nothing to replace it?

If the amendment were adopted, what would take the place of the NLRB in determining workers' preferences about unionization? If workers are fired for joining a union, where would they go for a remedy?

The continuing resolution itself is bad enough as far as the NLRB is concerned. It cuts the board's budget by $50 million, an 18 percent cut to be made in the last 6 months of the year. So it really winds up being a 36 percent cut. It would have to furlough employees to get through the rest of the year, furloughs that could be as much as 3 months per each employee. Now, these are folks who want to really create jobs, and now we are going to lay off people. In other words, the CR has crippled already the ability of the board to protect workers' rights. It's simply about protecting workers' rights, and to shut down the board completely truly is a backwards step for democracy.

I urge the defeat of the amendment. And I certainly hope whatever the final appropriations legislation for 2011 ultimately emerges will ensure that the NLRB has enough funding to continue to do its job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. This amendment sets a new standard of irresponsibility that I hope the House never again emulates.

Let's assume that a worker who is trying to organize a union is fired because of his or her union organizing activity, files a complaint against the employer for an unfair labor practice, and the National Labor Relations Board is in the process of determining whether that claim is right or wrong and what should happen as a result.

Or, let's imagine that a worker believes that he or she has not been properly represented by the union they are in, and they file a claim against their union claiming that the union has failed in its duty to represent that worker.

This amendment says that both of those claims and others will just stop in the middle. We will pull the plug from the adjudication of the rights of these Americans.

I frankly think that it's ironic that a majority which chooses to define itself in terms of its great devotion to the Constitution may be proposing an amendment that violates the due process rights of American citizens kind of on its face.

If you file a claim and a duly constituted adjudicatory body starts to hear that claim, my sense is the Congress cannot step in and interrupt that claim in the middle of its adjudication and take your rights away. But that appears to be what is happening here.

This is a precedent that would be inappropriate and even dangerous to the extreme in this regard: The principle that apparently informs this amendment is if Congress doesn't like something that an agency is doing substantively, we can pull the plug on the agency and not give it any more money in the middle of its deliberations.

Imagine for a moment if during the runup to the Wall Street meltdown in 2008 that those of us who were unhappy with decisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which we were unhappy with, said we're so unhappy with what the SEC is doing, we're going to defund that organization and stop the process of any investigations they are doing, stop the process of any decisions they are making. Just pull the plug in the middle of their deliberations.

□ 0010

I think that the majority would have correctly criticized us for an act of irresponsibility. We didn't do that. When we disliked the actions of the SEC, we came together and passed a law, the Dodd-Frank law last year, that tried to improve its operations. That is the way a responsible legislative body acts.

So forget for a moment about the consequences of this amendment for those who work for the NLRB or for those somehow engaged in it. Let's talk about the litigants, the workers, the employers, the unions, all of those involved here. The agency just disappears the day that this law is signed.

Yes, Congress has the power of the purse, but with power comes responsibility. This is an amendment which sets a new low standard of irresponsibility in this House. If we don't like the substantive decisions of an agency, then amend the statute they are operating under or litigate those decisions. But to pull the plug in the middle of decisionmaking that affects thousands of Americans is, frankly, an abuse of the power of the purse. I think it is unconstitutional or a violation of the due process rights of those litigants, and I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation. As my colleague from New Jersey has pointed out and the ranking member of the subcommittee, this amendment, to begin with, seems to make no sense at all. It is interesting, as the gentleman said, you pull the plug, but then everybody is left without a right. There is no private right of action. There is no place to go.

There were some 1,571 secret ballot elections for union representation last year that were supervised by the National Labor Relations Board to certify those unions, or to decertify unions in some cases where that action was taken in the secret election; and now there will be no remedy. You won't be able to decertify the union; you won't be able to certify the union.

There are employees every day who are fired for simply suggesting to their employer that they would like to have a union. That alone will get you fired over and over again in this country. That employee is now without a job, but no right of action to go back and find out whether that person was wrongfully fired.

The same is true if an employer wants to make an allegation of secondary boycott, which is illegal under the law. Where do they go for the remedy? Where do they go? There is no private right of action. It is contained within the National Labor Relations Act, and it is administered by the board.

So this amendment just sort of creates chaos; and it denies people rights, be they employers or employees, be they pro-union or anti-union, whatever it is. Whatever their situation is, this simply denies them the ability to take advantage of the law or to have the law administered in any way or fashion, and it provides really no alternative to them, because, as I said, this occupies the entire area for these individuals.

So I don't know if this law is a temper tantrum. I don't know if this law is just—I don't know what the hell it is. But clearly it doesn't address what might be legitimate concerns about the operation of the board.

The board has been controversial over the years and back and forth, and people have agreed and disagreed with its rulings and its actions. Or you might want to amend the law. But this amendment doesn't do any of this. And I would certainly hope that we would continue—when you look around at other countries, I think you would say this is a pretty successful system of managing labor relations in the workplace. It certainly took a history of actions that people considered wrong and dangerous and concerned about the economy, concerned about individual safety, concerned about the safety of workplaces and the ability of businesses to survive, and through the passage of the National Labor Relations Act regularized that so people had a place to go for their complaints and determine their rights.

So I would hope that Members of Congress would reject this amendment and maintain the rights of workers and employers to have their concerns addressed and adjudicated, if necessary.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1842. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Railroad Retirement Board, Dual Benefits Payments Account'' shall be $57,000,000.

SEC. 1843. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Social Security Administration, Payments to Social Security Trust Funds'' shall be $21,404,000, and in addition such funds may be used to carry out section 217(g) of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 1844. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for the first paragraph under the heading ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' shall be $10,675,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 304, beginning on line 3, strike section 1844.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chairman, I offer this amendment because I am seriously concerned about the effect the irresponsible Republican spending plan will have on our Nation's seniors.

This amendment would stop the cut of $125 million to the Social Security Administration's operating budget. Slashing funding for the Social Security Administration is slashing money out of Social Security, plain and simple. Cuts to Social Security will directly affect our seniors, there is no way around it; and my amendment seeks to avert this impending crisis.

The funding in this irresponsible Republican spending plan is over half a billion dollars less than what Social Security spent in 2010 to process payments to seniors and carry out basic operations. But the cost of running Social Security in 2010 will not suffice for 2011. Our Nation's baby boomers are retiring each month, growing the number of seniors in the system and the number of claims Social Security must process each month. This continuing resolution leaves Social Security more than $1 billion short of what they actually need to help keep checks going out on time to seniors.

This irresponsible Republican spending bill creates an enormous funding shortfall that Social Security will not have to survive on for the remainder of the year. Both Social Security and the Office of Management and Budget have confirmed that these massive cuts would force Social Security to lay off nearly 3,500 employees, furlough other employees, and close their offices in States across the country for up to 4 weeks.

What does this mean for seniors on Social Security? It means that 400,000 seniors would not have their applications processed this year. It means that 290,000 people would not have their disability applications processed, adding months of wait time for newly sick and disabled workers with no other source of income.

It means that 70,000 fewer people will have their appeals heard, burdening seniors and the disabled with wait times of over a year before their cases can move forward and allow them to receive their benefits earned. And it means that there will be 32,000 fewer investigations to root out improper payments, fraud and abuse.

Each month Social Security processes nearly 500,000, half a million, yes, half a million, new applications from seniors and the disabled. Employee layoffs and office closures lasting a month would delay benefits to all those applicants, disrupting seniors' and widows' checks and delaying payments for those trying to live on a fixed income.

Furthermore, closing Social Security offices would create a backlog of applicants, so even when offices reopened they would be dealing with an ongoing backlog of applications affecting our seniors long into the future. Who knows when they would ever catch up on the claims.

Never in the history of Social Security has there been a backlog of retirement and survivors' benefit applications. This bill is certainly precedent setting. Without a doubt, it would create the first Social Security backlog in our Nation's history.

□ 0020

This bill would force the Social Security system to shut its doors for up to a month, something that will affect every person receiving Social Security payments. People will get busy signals or unanswered rings when they call their local offices for help. Seniors will wait weeks for appointments and wait even longer to access their hard-earned benefits. Make no mistake about it, the seniors we represent—the entire body here represents—will feel the impact of these cuts.

The majority is lauding the fact that this bill represents the largest spending cut in the history of our country. If they want to cut funding to satisfy that base, fine. But I will not stand for cutting Social Security. I will not support budget cuts balanced on the backs of our Nation's seniors and middle class that bail out the rich and comfortable. I urge defeat of this bill and the adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, the amendment proposes a net increase in the budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states: ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise to speak against the point of order.

My amendment eliminates the extreme and irresponsible budget cuts to Social Security. These cuts will create massive gaps in Social Security's operating budget, leading to even larger costs in the future. My amendment averts this shortsighted downfall, creating a net budget savings that addresses the gentleman's point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TONKO. These cuts pose real threats and force to Social Security Administration and senior benefits.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I ask that this point of order be waived. And on behalf of seniors in my district and seniors across this country who rely on Social Security, I ask that the gentleman withdraw his point of order. We cannot blindly cut Social Security in the name of reducing the deficit without regard to drastic consequences.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. TONKO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1845. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for the first paragraph under the heading ''Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Income Program'' shall be $39,892,164,000, of which $3,402,164,000 shall be for administrative expenses.

SEC. 1846. Of the funds appropriated for ''Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' for fiscal years 2010 and prior years (other than funds appropriated in Public Law 111–5) for investment in information technology and telecommunications hardware and software infrastructure, $500,000,000 is rescinded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 304, beginning on line 12, strike section 1846.

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I offer this amendment because I am seriously concerned about the effect of the irresponsible Republican spending bill on our Nation's seniors and most specifically on our Social Security system. If my amendment does not pass, $500 million will be stripped from Social Security. In this nearly 400-page irresponsible Republican spending bill, which has held no hearings, which was written and debated through the night and is being rammed through this Chamber, Social Security is put at risk.

The bedrock and foundation for so many of our Nation's seniors and retirement is Social Security; and yet this bill would steal half a billion dollars from the program. This is money that helps keep the lights on, the doors open, and the checks going out to those who earned it—those who worked hard and play by the rules. It goes to those who have rightfully paid into the system and deserve their return on investment. And it should not be taken away in the dead of night.

Nearly half a billion dollars, if stolen back from Social Security, will be devastating. In fact, we might as well put the sign on the door of Social Security now: Sorry, we're closed for business. That is because a cut of $500 million will lay off employees that process and mail these checks to seniors. It will furlough every Social Security Administration employee for a month or more this year. Every worker that works for the Social Security Administration could potentially lose his or her job for at least 1 month this year.

Most of my constituents might say, Well, I don't really know anybody that works for the Social Security Administration. What does that mean for me? Unfortunately, it means 400,000 people across these United States will not have their claims processed this year. Think of it. You're finally eligible for

Social Security. Your plan for monthly income and budget based on this program is disrupted. Perhaps it even allows you to retire completely after a long and productive life of work. You walk up to the office to apply, but you are greeted with a dark and empty building. Or perhaps you called to ensure your payments will soon be processed, and all you get is a dial tone. Nobody is there to answer.

This is unthinkable. Even more egregious, 290,000 disabled workers would wait months for their claims to be processed, threatening already vulnerable people with further insecurity. Or imagine you want to appeal your funding amount or there's an error in your payment. What do you do?

Something my office prides itself on is helping these appeals get heard and settled to give Social Security recipients their due payment and peace of mind. Under this irresponsible Republican spending bill, which will cut half a billion dollars to Social Security, some 70,000 appeals cases would cry out but nobody would be there to listen, nor would the Social Security Administration be able to clean up cases of fraud, abuse, and improper payment. This cut could actually cost the government more than it saves.

It is no secret that the majority in this body seeks to privatize Social Security. Their top budget-maker has already proven that in his plan. This provision in the irresponsible public spending bill is simply another brick laid along the path to Social Security's destruction.

President Bush proposed privatizing this program in 2005, and Americans said ''no.'' We were right to say '' no,'' as Social Security would have trillions in the stock market during the meltdown of the Bush recession lost. Instead, Social Security did not lose a single penny. That bears repeating. In the worst economic recession since the Great Depression, Social Security did not lose a single penny.

We must protect Social Security from being raided for short-term political gains. Without it, almost half of all our seniors would be living in poverty. It makes up 76 percent of the total income for middle- and low-income seniors. But it is not just the seniors who depend on Social Security. Families who have lost loved ones are able to survive on their loved one's benefits, including about 6.5 million children. Raiding Social Security would hurt them, too.

In 1934, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt uttered a quote that is as true today as it was 76 years ago. He said, ''We put those payroll contributions there so as to give the contributors a legal, moral, and political right to collect their pensions and their unemployment benefits. With those taxes in there, no damn politician can ever scrap my Social Security program.''

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states: ''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard?

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise to speak against the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized and is asked to confine his remarks to the point of order.

□ 0030

Mr. TONKO. I want to be clear so that everyone in this House and everyone watching knows what a $500 million cut to Social Security will do.

On the point of order, Madam Chair, my amendment eliminates harmful budget cuts to Social Security, which actually saves more money in the long term than what is cut by the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, on the point of order, the Social Security Administration has said that an additional cut in their funding would lead to many local offices closing their doors, stopping all claims processing, and not being able to answer the phones for a month.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlemen from New York and Montana will suspend.

The Chair needs to hear the argument that the gentleman from New York is making.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, on the point of order, I am disappointed that the other side submitted a rule that doesn't allow an amendment to save this funding for Social Security and guarantee that checks go out on time; but they can right this wrong right now. My amendment will ensure that checks go out on time. It will ensure that we continue to save billions by allowing Social Security to continue to go forward.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York will suspend. The gentleman is not confining his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Chair, I ask to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Through all of the talking and interrupting, the gentleman was addressing the point of order directly.

Madam Chair, the point of order alleges that, if Mr. TONKO's amendment is accepted, it will raise net budget authority in this line. In fact, as Mr. TONKO has said, if you will look at the net effect of reducing this line item, the net effect is to increase the amount of senior poverty, to increase the amount of seniors who are not getting Social Security checks on time and, therefore, raising the cost to society and ultimately raising the cost to the budget. In fact, unless you adopt the Tonko amendment, you will be agreeing not only to slash services to seniors but to increase the deficit by raising costs throughout the system.

It is directly on point, and it is important to understand that the points that Mr. TONKO is making about the quality of the service under Social Security impacts directly on whether or not this is net higher budget authority, which it is not. It saves money to endorse the Tonko amendment. This House should consider it on its merits, ''yes'' or ''no.'' This point of order should be ruled out of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

For the reasons stated in the previous ruling of the Chair, the point of order is sustained.

The amendment is not in order.

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

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

Mr. WEINER. Madam Chair, the support for your last three points of order rulings against Mr. TONKO has been relying upon the Budget Committee chairman's advice to the Chair. The Budget Committee chairman is someone who advocates on behalf of the majority for privatizing Social Security.

To explain to the viewers and to this Chamber what that means, it is that he believes and the Republicans believe, if you take Social Security, which is a guaranteed program that can pay 100 percent of all of its benefits for at least 26 years, and if you invest a portion of that in the stock market, it is a better policy.

It is on that person's advice that you have been ruling on the last few occasions that Mr. TONKO is out of order in trying to preserve that system that we have.

If there is an important debate in the context of the American budget in the year 2011, it is the one that Mr. TONKO is trying to engage: It is privatizing Social Security, which is what this side of the aisle, Madam Chair, seeks to do, versus keeping this program the way it is—the single most successful government program, arguably, in American history.

What Mr. TONKO and many of us are trying to do is to preserve that program. Let's have this debate on this

floor in an honest way. For months now, we've had this kind of strange shadow dance around the idea of the privatization of Social Security. Well, the chairman of the Budget Committee, not some fringe element of the Republican Party, has suggested in a book that they paraded around the country that they are going to offer the privatization of Social Security as the foundation for their budget.

Now, for the last three amendments, Mr. TONKO has been trying to engage that debate, and the Chair has said, in using the best judgment of the Budget Committee, it seems that his policies would increase the net budget authority in the bill.

Let's put that aside for a moment and have a real full-throated debate about whose side the different people in this Chamber are on with regard to this fundamental question of the security of the Social Security system. Let's review the bidding.

On one side, you have Democrats who have created, supported, and fought for the Social Security program ever since it was passed in 1933 and ever since the first check went out in 1935. We say it should be something that generation by generation is there for seniors. One group works; the seniors retire, and we support each other as part of that contract. It is fundamental to democratic values—I believe with a capital ''D'' but also with a small ''d.''

Then you have my Republican friends. They say, You know what? In watching the stock market, we think it would be a good idea to take a portion of that Social Security trust fund and sock it into stocks and equities and bonds. They make an argument that actually has an element of truth to it. They say, if you'd invested every dime of Social Security into the stock market since the beginning of the Social Security system, you would have had more money in it today, because they say, Look. The stock market has gone way up since 1933.

Yes, but as we all know, it didn't go like this (indicating). Let the stenographer note my hand going up. It went like this (indicating). Let the stenographer note a roller coaster shape.

So I ask: Do you want to be one of the seniors who retires in the dip of the roller coaster?

They apparently want to take that chance. My Republican friends want to take that chance. We Democrats say, No, this is not a program that seniors get wealthy on, but it's a safety net program—and it worked. It took, roughly, a 30 percent poverty level among seniors to the single digits that we have today.

Then they say, Oh, no, but it will never be there in the future.

The baby boomer generation, the biggest generation in American history. We've heard that one before. Huh-uh. The baby boomers had babies. Now they're the biggest generation in American history. Now they're paying in.

By the way, do you know what helps the Social Security program more than anything else? People working, people paying Social Security taxes, people on the job, which are all the things that they're cutting in this very same budget.

So, as Mr. TONKO tries to make that point and engage that argument, I see nothing but Members on this side of the aisle cowering under their desks and hiding behind Roberts Rules.

When the Chair makes her rulings, listen carefully. She says she is relying on the best judgment of the chairman of the Budget Committee. Now, I like the chairman of the Budget Committee. He is a fine man—his judgment, not so much. I think that we should have this conversation because, if there is a fundamental difference here, it is on Social Security and its future. We want it to be there.

So I say to people watching at this hour:

First of all, have a warm glass of milk. There might be other ways to get to sleep. I would say to you, think very carefully about what the budget debate is about. It's very easy to lose sight of page this, line that. What it is really about is a fundamental difference in philosophy.

On the Democratic side of this debate, we are saying let's try to build this country on a foundation of everyone having a safety net, of everyone having a basic opportunity, and none of us can really get too far ahead if we're leaving a whole bunch of people behind.

This debate is not new, and I will let someone else continue it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I appreciate the comments from my colleague from New York.

Madam Chair, I think that one thing that comes out, the clarity that comes out of tonight's debate on this bill, is to look at what, in fact, the American people have asked us to do. They have asked us to truly work together to address what their top priority is, which is creating jobs and fostering economic recovery.

Again, as we listen to this debate that unfolded tonight, what we see is that, unfortunately, the majority's priorities are deeply out of touch with those of the country. Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We believe that we start by ending tax subsidies and special interest waste. We need to make programs accountable and end the ones that will not work.

But the challenge is not whether we address the deficit and spending, or not to do that. The question is: Where do we start? Do we start with slashing special interest waste and ineffective programs, or do we start with what helps the middle class, our businesses, our working families, with children, and with seniors?

We could have achieved cuts. We could have achieved cuts in spending in this continuing resolution.

□ 0040

It was where the majority decided to start to make cuts. What about those oil subsidies that we spoke about tonight, $40 billion over 5 years, and eliminating the 10 tax breaks for the oil companies? What about the $7.4 billion we can save over 10 years by shutting down the current practice that allows multinational corporations to avoid paying their taxes? What about cutting agriculture subsidies in half and saving $8 billion? What about the $3 billion a year we can save by saying to the pharmaceutical companies that you can no longer pay to delay in order for us to get cheaper generic drugs to market because it raises the cost of health care?

Let's do away with the $3 billion that we want to spend on an alternate engine for the Joint Strike Fighter. That's about $61 billion. That is approximately the amount of money that you are taking out of K–12 education, Pell grants where you lower the amount of maximum award that people could get, 9 million people trying to get an education, trying to be able to get that education in order to be able to get a job and to go to work, take care of their family, pay their taxes, and do the right thing. You say no.

Another 1.3 million, you say no to the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant so that they can no longer get education. You take 218,000 kids off of Head Start. You lay off 55,000 teachers, you close down centers around the country, and you don't give youngsters the opportunity for early childhood education, and we know that that succeeds.

You tell seniors, up to 10 million, meals will no longer be served to you because you're a homebound elder, you can't get out. We're not going to do anything about low-income energy assistance for you—you're on your own.

It is, in fact, Washington to the country: Drop dead, is what you're saying to them, and all because there is no courage, no courage at all to go after the special interests and the tax subsidies that could overwhelmingly pay for the cuts that we need in order to be able to bring down the deficit.

That is what's wrong with this bill tonight. The issue is where do you start. Do you start to cut in that reckless rush to slash without regard to the impact on our economy, without regard for our businesses to create jobs, or the middle class or working families who are being responsible? They're doing the best for their families today. They're trying to educate themselves for the future. You are hitting families with children and the elderly, and that is your starting point. It is not our starting point. Therein lies the difference of Democrats and Republicans in this continuing resolution debate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair must remind Members that remarks must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1847. Notwithstanding section 1101, and section 505 of division D of Public Law 111–117, section 505 of division F of Public Law 111–8 shall apply to funds appropriated by this division.

SEC. 1848. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses'' shall be $459,653,000, of which $138,928,000 shall be for compliance assistance programs: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting ''$89,502,000'' for ''$104,393,000''.

SEC. 1849. Notwithstanding section 1101, the level for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Office of the Director'' shall be $1,128,800,000, and the fifth proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111–117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting ''$495,609,000'' for ''$544,109,000''.

SEC. 1850. The amount provided by section 1101 for ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'' is reduced by $639,463,000 through a pro rata reduction in all of the Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health'', based on the total funding levels for each such Institute, Center, and Office of the Director accounts (excluding the Common Fund). In addition, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall ensure at least a total of 9,000 new competing research grants are awarded in fiscal year 2011 from all Institutes, Centers, and Office of the Director accounts within the ''Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health''.

SEC. 1851. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Refugee and Entrant Assistance'' in division D of Public Law 111–117, $77,000,000 is rescinded.

AMENDMENT NO. 221 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 306, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1852. (a)(1) Section 4002(b)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''80'' and inserting ''131''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''20'' and inserting ''34''.

(2) Section 4002(f) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) RULES RELATING TO ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF FIRST-TIER EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State determines that implementation of the increased entitlement to first-tier emergency unemployment compensation by reason of the amendments made by section 1852(a)(1) of the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 would unduly delay the prompt payment of emergency unemployment compensation under this title, such State may elect to pay second-tier, third-tier, or fourth-tier emergency unemployment compensation (or a combination of those tiers) prior to the payment of such increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation until such time as such State determines that such increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation may be paid without undue delay.

''(B) SPECIAL RULES.—If a State makes an election under subparagraph (A) which results in—

''(i) the payment of second-tier (but not third-tier) emergency unemployment compensation prior to the payment of increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation, then, for purposes of determining whether an account may be augmented for third-tier emergency unemployment compensation under subsection (d), such State shall treat the date of exhaustion of such increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation as the date of exhaustion of second-tier emergency unemployment compensation, if such date is later than the date of exhaustion of the second-tier emergency unemployment compensation; or

''(ii) the payment of third-tier emergency unemployment compensation prior to the payment of increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation, then, for purposes of determining whether an account may be augmented for fourth-tier emergency unemployment compensation under subsection (e), such State shall treat the date of exhaustion of such increased first-tier emergency unemployment compensation as the date of exhaustion of third-tier emergency unemployment compensation, if such date is later than the date of exhaustion of the third-tier emergency unemployment compensation.

''(4) COORDINATION OF MODIFICATIONS (RELATING TO ADDITIONAL FIRST-TIER EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION) WITH EXTENDED COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding an election under section 4001(e) by a State to provide for the payment of emergency unemployment compensation prior to extended compensation, such State may pay extended compensation to an otherwise eligible individual prior to any additional emergency unemployment compensation under subsection (b) (payable by reason of the amendments made by section 1852(a)(1) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Expansion Act of 2011), if such individual claimed extended compensation for at least 1 week of unemployment after the exhaustion of emergency unemployment compensation under subsection (b) (as such subsection was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this paragraph), (c), (d), or (e).''.

(3) Section 4004(e)(1) of such Act, as amended by section 501(b) of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–312), is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

''(H) the amendments made by section 1852(a)(1) of the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011; and''.

(4) Section 4007(b)(3) of such Act, as amended by section 501(a)(1)(C) of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–312) is amended by striking ''June 9, 2012'' and inserting ''September 22, 2012''.

(b) The Secretary of Labor may prescribe any operating instructions or regulations necessary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–205), except that no additional first-tier emergency unemployment compensation shall be payable by virtue of the amendments made by subsection (a)(1) with respect to any week of unemployment commencing before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d)(1) The budgetary effects of this section, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(2) This section—

(A) is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g)); and

(B) is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010''.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the fourth quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. William D. Delahunt	10/9	10/13	Russia		1,620.00						1,620.00
	10/13	10/15	Belarus		681.03						681.03
							[4] 3,190.30				3,190.30
Howard Diamond	10/16	10/22	Israel		1,645.00				632.70		2,277.70
							[4] 6,632.29				6,632.29