United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 8, 2011 No. 101

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, July 11, 2011, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JULY 8, 2011

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the Members of this people's House deliberate these days, give them the wisdom and magnanimity to lay aside what might divide us as a people to forge a secure future for our country.

We pray for all people who have special needs. May Your presence be known to those who are sick, that they might feel the power of Your healing spirit. Be with those who suffer persecution in so many places of our world, and bless our troops who are engaged in the easing of those sufferings. Give to all who are afraid or anxious or whose minds are clouded by uncertain futures the peace and confidence that come from trust in Your goodness and mercy.

We thank You again for the tremendous opportunity You have given the Members of this House to serve their fellow citizens. Inspire them to be their best selves and may they be, in turn, an inspiration to the Nation and to the world.

May all that is done here this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FLEMING led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side.

FAMILIES NEED JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this morning's announcement of the unemployment rate proves again the President's economic policies are failing American families.

The unemployment rate has increased to a tragic 9.2 percent. The out-of-control borrowing and spending in Washington continues to kill small business job creation.

It has been 1 year since the President declared an end to the recession and the beginning of the summer of recovery. The only way to describe the country's job numbers during that time is a failure of leadership. Private employment is now 1.8 million below the level from when the wasteful stimulus passed.

Where are the jobs, Mr. President?

This administration's policies are crippling our economy and killing job creation. The President's reelection campaign says the unemployment rate does not matter, but American families know better.

The House Republicans' ''Cut and Grow'' plan is very simple: First cut spending, then the economy will grow. This is a practical solution to get Americans back to work.

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

WAR AND WAR POWERS

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Congress is awakening to its constitutional obligations on matters of war and peace. In the past 2 months, we have sparked a great debate on war and on war powers, the implications of which will continue to be felt in this Nation and around the world.

Soon, the war in Libya and the ongoing wars in Afghanistan and Iraq will go beyond foreign policy issues. They will become domestic issues, financial security issues. As we continue to wage these wars, more and more Americans

Printed on recycled paper.

will become aware that this administration has decided that bombing bridges in other countries is more important than building bridges in America with our present and new foreign adventures.

America, under this administration, chooses war, not jobs and wealth building here in America; bombs, not books; financial instability, not Social Security; austerity, not prosperity.

This isn't about partisan politics. This is about an administration that is demonstrating more of an interest in nation building abroad than a rebuilding of America here at home.

It has time to change, but will it?

THE FOX GUARDING THE OBAMACARE HENHOUSE?

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve to know the truth when it comes to Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan's involvement in crafting a defense of ObamaCare during her tenure as Solicitor General for President Obama. This is why I, along with 48 of my House colleagues, am calling for an investigation into the extent of Justice Kagan's involvement in defending ObamaCare and if it warrants her recusal from any and all ObamaCare cases that may come before the High Court.

It is imperative for Americans to have confidence in the impartiality of the Supreme Court. Americans have a legitimate right to know the truth about Elena Kagan's involvement in ObamaCare.

How can any reasonable person believe that she can be impartial when a case involving ObamaCare comes before the High Court? Furthermore, the U.S. Code, section 455, title 28, says she must recuse herself.

CONTINUING BUDGET IMPASSE IN MINNESOTA

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the frustration that I feel at the continuing budget impasse in Minnesota. Minnesota faces the biggest budget deficit in its history, and with it comes a responsibility to govern and a cautionary tale for this body.

A government shutdown at any level is not only detrimental to the economy and to the success of small businesses, but it's hazardous to the progress of our society as educational programs and nonprofit organizations are put at risk.

Like many of the citizens of southern Minnesota who have written me about this shutdown, I share a concern for the families harmed by this shutdown, working parents who receive child care assistance, disabled Minnesotans who rely on State services for their better quality of life, roads remaining unrepaired and simple things like campgrounds being closed where families can't spend time together.

A gentleman approached me in Stewartville at a Fourth of July parade. He asked me if I was working this week. I said yes, I was. And he said he wasn't, but he sure wished he was because he was force furloughed.

When it comes to divided government, we all win when no one political party wins. In Minnesota, that means both the Governor and the legislature need to compromise. We need to put politics aside to put Minnesota first. The same applies to this body.

□ 0910

CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR JOB CREATION

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, you can hardly turn on the television or the radio these days without hearing about our Nation's debt crisis. And the reason we find ourselves in this crisis is not because Washington taxes too little. Rather, it is because Washington spends too much. Raising taxes on America's job creators, as some here in Washington suggest, is not the answer. It won't open closed factories. It won't stimulate the economy. And it won't put our friends and neighbors back to work.

What we need, and what the American people are asking us to do, is to see that government lives within its means. Over the past few years, hardworking Americans across this country have tightened their belts and lived within their means and cut back on spending. And there's no reason that their government can't do the same thing. It's often been said that it's not in the Federal Government's nature to shrink. And I think here in Washington our colleagues should work to prove them wrong by ending wasteful Washington spending as a way to address our Nation's budget deficit.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN: WELCOMING A NEW NATION

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw people's attention to one of the great, nice spots of what's happening in the world today. There aren't many. We're going to hear about every one of them this morning. But there's at least one happening right now in Africa. Tomorrow we will welcome the newest nation to the community of nations, South Sudan. This is a country that most of us probably never heard of. I certainly didn't until a few years ago, and I heard about it because of some of the atrocities that are happening there.

South Sudan is a country that is born out of 20 years of internal civil war—20 years—not from outside forces like this country likes to do in Iraq and Afghanistan. They did it themselves on their own, and I just want to stand up here today and tell them congratulations, to welcome them into the community of nations, and to tell them that I, for one, and I believe this House, will stand with them as they struggle to make sure that their new democracy is successful.

They have a lot of threats on every border. They have a lot of internal issues. They are an incredibly poor country with a lot of challenges. But as the greatest democracy in the history of the world, we have an obligation to stand with them as they build their new democracy.

SOUTH SUDAN: PRAYERS FOR A NEW NATION

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the people of South Sudan have endured two decades of wanton violence, rape, torture and hunger systematically imposed upon them by the Bashir dictatorship in Khartoum. More than 2 million people were killed, 4 million people displaced, and countless families decimated.

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement of 2005 ended the war and put South Sudan on the path to nationhood. Tomorrow, when the people of South Sudan emerge as the newest nation on Earth, tomorrow, when that dream is realized, Americans will join the people of South Sudan in celebrating this extraordinary hope-filled event.

Yet recently at least 100,000 Sudanese have been displaced from the Abyei area, and tens of thousands of Southerners living in South Kordofan State have been recently forced from their homes, some of them murdered. So there are serious remaining challenges.

Nevertheless, we hope and we pray that the people of South Sudan will finally live in peace and enjoy respect for their basic human rights and freedom.

ISRAEL

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H. Res. 268.

America has not had a more pro-Israel President than President Obama. The President has unwaveringly supported Israel's right to self-defense, fought to ensure Israel's military edge, protected her citizens with the Iron Dome anti-rocket system, and worked

to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. The President also understands, as we all do, that essential to Israel's security, America's security, and Palestinian security is a negotiated resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict creating a lasting peace.

The President's call for a negotiated resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a pro-Israel position that's absolutely essential to ensuring our ally's future as the democratic homeland of the Jewish people.

We should also take an opportunity to be honest about what the President did and didn't propose. The President did not say that Israel should be forced to return to her 1967 borders. The President did say that the borders of Israel and a Palestinian state should be based on the 1967 lines with mutually agreed swaps, a concept which has been considered a given in all the serious discussions of a two-state solution in the last decade.

While fostering divisions serves the political interests of some, it's not in the long-term interest of Israel, Palestine, or the United States.

TIME TO GET OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2½ years, President Obama and his allies in Congress here have been on a spending spree which has led to annual deficits of $1.4 trillion and a national debt that now exceeds $14 trillion.

The Republicans have drawn a line in the sand and said enough. We've changed the culture here in Washington from how much more are we going to spend to how much are we going to cut. We've passed a responsible budget which focuses on getting economic growth going and on new jobs, a budget that would put us on the path to prosperity and also to fiscal sanity. And today's anemic job report with unemployment rising again now to 9.2 percent shows that we have so much more to do. And the idea of job-killing tax increases is absolutely a nonstarter.

I'm proud that our Republican negotiators that have been in the negotiations with the President and the Democratic leadership are standing strong over increasing the debt limit with a strong focus on jobs. And I hope that the President and the Democrats will finally join us in getting our fiscal house in order. And for the sake of the American people, Mr. Speaker, let's get the job done.

JUNE JOBS REPORT

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, yes, the June jobs report is not encouraging: 18,000 jobs added. But I cannot ever forget that it was January 2009 when we lost 741,000 jobs, the last month of the Bush Presidency.

Under President Obama, we have added jobs, and, of course, we have not added enough; but they have been adding. But the American people should know that we need about 150,000 jobs a month in order to push the unemployment rate down. Because we added jobs but not enough, the unemployment rate has gone up.

But the most important thing for the American people to know is that the Republican promise to make jobs the first agenda during the election has not been fulfilled. They have yet to introduce or pass through this House one single jobs bill, not one. All they have done is cut jobs, mostly by going after public employees. And this is what the American people need to bear in mind as they think about who is on their side.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1309, FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2011

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 340 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 340

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 0920

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 340 provides for a structured rule designated by the Rules Committee for consideration of H.R. 1309. This rule allows for 25 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee by Democrats and Republicans to be made in order.

I rise today in support of this rule, Mr. Speaker. This legislation was introduced by the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), and this bill has gone through regular order. There were hearings on this issue. H.R. 1309 was marked up in the

Financial Services Committee and reported out by a unanimous vote of 54–0, and the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), provided a structured amendment process with 25 additional amendments to be considered on the House floor.

Said another way, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee, under the leadership of DAVID DREIER, is willing to have in our upstairs committee room Members of Congress come and testify with the understanding that, in their confidence in the process of this House of Representatives, that they can bring forth their amendments, be heard by a Rules Committee that can equally give the Republican and Democrat sides the ideas that those Members wish to bring before this body, and that is what is happening with 25 amendments being made in order by the gentleman from California with the Rules Committee.

Today, I will discuss the background of the current National Flood Insurance Program or NFIP, and why a long-term reauthorization is important, what the underlying legislation does to the NFIP, and why reforms are necessary.

The NFIP was created in 1968 to address the Nation's flood exposure and the need to alleviate taxpayers' responsibility for flood losses paid out in the form of post-disaster relief following annual flooding that occurs across this country. In 1973, the Flood Disaster Protection Act established a mandatory flood insurance purchase requirement for structures located in identified special flood hazard areas. By 1984, Congress required lenders to purchase coverage on behalf of—and to bill premiums to—mortgagees who failed to purchase coverage on their own.

The 2005 hurricane season resulted in significant claims which the NFIP annual contributions could not cover, so the NFIP's borrowing authority, which was at $1.5 billion a year, was increased three times from 2005, 2006 and 2007, allowing the NFIP to borrow up to $20.8 billion. Currently, the NFIP owes the national Treasury $17.75 billion. A recent Insurance Journal article from March 8, 2011, discusses this plan and it stated: ''The proposal does attempt to put the program on sounder financial footing by insisting that current subsidized prices to most policies be raised so they eventually cover the actual cost of risk determined by the actuaries.'' The underlying bill allows for greater accountability so taxpayers, meaning the Federal Government, actually incur less risk than in the current NFIP. Limiting the exposures for the taxpayer is one piece of what this bill does.

The legislation we are discussing today reauthorizes the NFIP for 5 years through September 30, 2016. The current program is scheduled to expire on September 30 of this year. The last time Congress passed a long-term flood insurance program was in 2004. Since its expiration in 2008, the NFIP has been extended 11 times and lapsed three times during that period. These short-term extensions and lapses create needless uncertainty in the marketplace in an already struggling residential and commercial real estate market all across the United States. Charles Symington with the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America was quoted in a recent industry Insurance Journal stating: ''The 5-year extension of NFIP after several years of short-term lapses and last minute renewals is critical because it gives the marketplace certainty.''

Mr. Speaker, I believe Charles is correct. The Congress of the United States must do its job by looking at those programs, looking at their need to make sure that they work properly and to make sure that the exposure to the taxpayer is not overextended. Charles Symington has this correct.

In addition to providing a much needed long-term authorization, this bill amends the NFIP to ensure the immediate and near-term fiscal and administrative health of the program. The bill also ensures the NFIP's continued viability by encouraging broader participation in this program, increasing financial accountability, eliminating unnecessary rate subsidies, and updating the program to the needs that currently face this great Nation.

Since 2006, the NFIP has been cited by the Government Accountability Office, GAO, as a high-risk government program. This means that embedded within this program, it is not being run to the best benefit of not just its mission statement, but also the best interest of the taxpayer. The GAO has found that the NFIP does not charge sufficiently high rates to cover its claims obligations and projected future losses, resulting in significant Federal expenditures and potentially large future liabilities on top of the $17.75 billion that the program is already in debt.

To protect the American taxpayers from future risk of a Federal program already in debt, the NFIP must be reformed. That's why we are here today. The underlying bill provides for some of the necessary reforms, and certainly we don't have to debate this, but with a $14 trillion deficit and out-of-control wasteful Washington government spending, Congress must provide the necessary oversight and accountability to ensure less taxpayer risk. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those rare occasions when the gentleman from Texas and I actually agree on something. I think the underlying bill is a good bill, and I look forward to supporting it. While this rule is not an open rule, and I don't think that we have had an open rule on an authorizing bill since this Congress began, but the gentleman is such a good guy that I'm not going to make a big deal of that. Twenty-five of the 30 amendments that were offered were made in order, so I think we will have a good debate.

The rule before us today provides for the reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP, through September 30, 2016. This program was established in 1968 in response to increasing Federal Government spending for disaster relief. The NFIP was intended to alleviate some of the public's financial burden because the government covered losses generated by the floods in the form of disaster relief payments.

With the increase of severe weather in the past few years, the need to reauthorize this program before it expires on September 30 is great. The National Flood Insurance Program, housed within the Federal Emergency Management Agency, has become financially strained following severe hurricanes—including Katrina in 2005, which significantly increased insurance claims.

In addition to extending this bill for an additional 5 years, this bill also includes a 3-year delay of the mandatory flood insurance purchase requirement as a result of the new, updated flood maps. This will allow our constituents to be notified if their home is now at risk of flooding and purchase insurance accordingly, by requiring annual notifications to homeowners living in flood zones about the flood risk in their community, the geographical boundaries of the flood zone, the requirement to purchase flood insurance, and a general estimate of what similar homeowners in similar communities typically pay for flood insurance.

□ 0930

This bill also provides optional coverage for additional living expenses incurred by homeowners when losses from a flood make their homes unfit to live in. For businesses and commercial properties or multifamily properties, this bill provides optional coverage for losses resulting from any partial or total interruption of the insureds' businesses caused by flood.

Mr. Speaker, we saw massive devastation to the southeastern part of our country in 2005, but we also saw the resiliency of the American people. It's no easy task to rebuild your entire life from the ground up. In recognizing the economic reality that having flood coverage could keep families from financial ruin but at the same time add additional and substantial costs to family budgets, this bill allows families to pay flood insurance premiums in installments.

This bill will also help our local communities prepare for the worst by authorizing the use of Community Development Block Grant funds for communities to reach out to homeowners

about flood insurance rates, mapping and inclusion in flood zones, and by authorizing localities to use Community Development Block Grant funds to supplement existing State or local funding for building code enforcement. The National Flood Insurance Reform Act gives communities the tools they need to prepare, protect and to rebuild.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Rules Committee made in order my amendment to H.R. 1309. I would like to thank the committee for working with me to make this important amendment in order. My amendment is simple. If FEMA makes a mistake in designing a flood map, communities can be reimbursed for the costs of mounting a successful challenge.

Currently, communities that dispute FEMA's flood elevations can hire a private engineering firm to get a ''second opinion'' flood map. While this may sound like an attractive option, it puts a lot of small communities in very difficult financial positions. Hiring a private engineering firm is expensive and cost prohibitive for many small communities. On the one hand, if the community decides that it's too expensive to get a second opinion, homeowners are forced to pay higher or, in some cases, needless flood insurance premiums. On the other hand, if the community does mount a successful challenge to the original FEMA map, homeowners are spared from having to pay the higher flood insurance premiums, but the town still must pay the costs associated with obtaining that second map.

Now, I've heard of many small communities that are forced into this tough situation, including the town of Holliston, Massachusetts, which is in my district. There is substantial evidence to support the argument that the FEMA map is incorrect, but town officials are struggling to find a way to pay the $30,000 it would cost to conduct a second engineering study.

I feel for these town officials. They want to do the right thing and help their residents, but these small towns are already cash-strapped and are cutting funding left and right for essential services like schools and police and firefighters, not to mention infrastructure. There simply is no money for a legitimate but expensive second opinion map. If FEMA makes a mistake in mapping a flood area, then they should pay for it. So I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is proof that Congress can work in a bipartisan way. Passed out of the House Committee on Financial Services 54–0, this bipartisan bill is timely with hurricane season just around the corner. It is also important to add that the Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting H.R. 1309 will have no net impact on direct spending over the 2012–2016 or 2012–2021 periods.

I want to commend my colleague from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for her leadership on this and for working in a bipartisan way and producing what, I think, is a good bill. I look forward to working with her to make sure that this is passed.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have a very valuable part of our Republican team here today, a gentlewoman who has taken hundreds of meetings and who has led the way in what, I believe, is to better the circumstance with the National Flood Insurance Program. She is from the Financial Services Committee and is the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011.

I would like to thank Mr. SESSIONS for introducing and managing this rule. I would also like to thank Rules Committee Chairman DREIER and the leadership for scheduling floor time.

On May 13, the Financial Services Committee favorably reported, as has been said, the Flood Insurance Reform Act by a unanimous vote of 54–0. This bill is important and reflects the hard work and bipartisan support of the Financial Services Committee. It would reauthorize for 5 years the National Flood Insurance Program, the NFIP, and enact a series of reforms designed to improve NFIP's financial stability, reduce the burden on taxpayers, and explore ways to increase private market participation.

To improve NFIP's financial stability, the bill phases in actuarially sound rates for policyholders. In doing so, it will help to shore up NFIP and allow it to pay down its $17.75 billion debt to the taxpayer. It also increases the minimum deductibles for properties while at the same time giving homeowners more flexibility on how they can pay for their flood insurance. According to the CBO, the combined effect of these and other changes would be to bring in an additional $4.2 billion of net income to the NFIP over the next 10 years.

Perhaps most importantly, H.R. 1309 eliminates a barrier to the development of a private flood insurance market and puts us on a path toward a long-term plan for flood insurance that eliminates taxpayer risk.

First, it requires lenders to accept non-NFIP-backed flood insurance coverage provided by a private entity if that coverage meets all the same requirements as NFIP-backed flood insurance.

Second, FEMA is required to solicit bids from the private sector and report to Congress on the cost to the private sector, not to the taxpayer, of bearing the risk of flood insurance.

Finally, the bill addresses many of the concerns that Members have raised with us about new maps, especially as they relate to dam and levee decertifications. This bill allows newly mapped communities facing higher rates to annually, and for up to 3 years, request that FEMA suspend the requirement to purchase flood insurance while they work to construct or fix their flood protection systems.

With the NFIP's authorization set to expire on September 30, it is critical that the House act to pass this bill as soon as possible. Doing so will give the House and Senate time to begin a dialogue and to shape a commonsense reform measure. In short, we fully intend to avoid a recurrence of what happened in the last Congress, which was when the program lapsed, causing turmoil in a recovering housing market, and was simply extended without reforms. Congress cannot continue to kick the can down the road.

With that, again, I thank Mr. SESSIONS and the members of the Rules Committee. I would also like to thank all of the Members from both sides of the aisle who helped to craft this bill. I thank my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee for their work on this bill, especially Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. STIVERS, who are original cosponsors of this bipartisan bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule for H.R. 1309.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to a great leader on this issue, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011.

A full 5-year reauthorization of the program is critically important for our Nation. I want to thank and commend Chairwoman BIGGERT and Ranking Member WATERS for their leadership on this issue as ushering in a 5-year reauthorization will provide welcomed relief for those who live in our country's floodplains.

I thank Chairwoman BIGGERT for including language from my own H.R. 902, legislation that would modernize FEMA's flood zone designations. Specifically, it would update current law to take local, State and Federal funding into account when determining flood zone designations. H.R. 1309 would extend the National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP, for 5 years and allow property owners in participating communities to purchase protection against flooding.

As we have seen across our country this year and in recent years, the NFIP is critically important to so many Americans. When a flood disaster strikes, the homeowners who have flood insurance can at least see their way through the crisis. The NFIP offers the victims of floods the ability to make their lives whole again. Of course, the best insurance against a flood is a strong flood protection system.

□ 0940

In my hometown of Sacramento, California, residents have taxed themselves hundreds of millions of dollars to pay for stronger flood protection. On one project in the Natomas Basin alone, State and local governments will have spent more than $300 million over the last 5 years on levee improvements. This has all been invested, I must point out, without acknowledgement by FEMA or funding from the Corps of Engineers. I am working tirelessly to change that and ensure that the Federal Government follows through with their commitment to this project.

There is no doubt that the Natomas Basin, like most of Sacramento, is at risk of flooding as it lays at the confluence of two great rivers. We know we must continue to build up our levees as well as carry flood insurance. Fortunately, the Sacramento region is working with the Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Water Resources to implement an aggressive levee improvement plan to achieve a 200-year level of flood protection.

While these efforts are ongoing, flood insurance has become mandatory for many homeowners, insurance that can cost more than $1,350 annually. That is nearly four times the PRP rate. The increasing cost of flood insurance, which is on top of the annual flood protection assessments that my constituents are already paying, compounds their financial burden. For these reasons, I believe that it is reasonable to phase in higher rates over a 5-year period.

I have an amendment that I will offer during debate on the underlying bill that will phase in the full cost of flood insurance policies in a more equitable way moving forward. I believe that this is a necessity that will assist homeowners in these trying economic times. I look forward to its being included in the overall reauthorization. This approach would encourage responsible homeowners across the country to continue paying into NFIP without adding risk to either the floodplain or the NFIP.

Again, I thank Chairwoman BIGGERT and Ranking Member WATERS for their leadership on this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. You know, Mr. Speaker, the beautiful part about the Republican Party is we have a whole bunch of Members who are just like the gentlewoman that I am going to extend time to in a minute who come to the table as friends of the taxpayer, who come and look at bills and reauthorizations of legislation from a perspective of what is the government's role, what should be the government's role, and how do we engage with the American people to keep these programs not only where they can sustain themselves, but also whether the taxpayer is well taken care of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Shelby Township, Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I actually live in Harrison Township. I appreciate that, though.

I certainly rise to support this rule, Mr. Speaker, but I am strongly, strongly opposed to the underlying bill, the National Flood Insurance Program. And I would start with this basic premise: Why in the world is the Federal Government even involved in the flood insurance business? Is that our core purpose of being the Federal Government? It's ridiculous.

This program was started in 1968, and the government began writing policies in the early seventies. And no great surprise, the Federal Government is doing a lousy job of being in the insurance business. This program is currently over $17 billion in debt, and now we need to raise the debt ceiling on this program to about $25 billion. And recently, the FEMA administrator testified to Congress that the flood insurance program—no great surprise—is likely to stay in debt, massive debt forever. And it's easy to understand why—because this program is not actuarially sound and because the Federal Government can be treated, apparently, as a bottomless pit of money. So we don't need to base the premiums on any normal risk evaluation, which is a matrix that private sector insurance companies have to do. In fact, we actually encourage people to build in flood-prone areas that repeatedly flood.

And just consider this one statistic: Only 1 percent of the properties in this program are considered to be repetitive losses, 1 percent; yet that 1 percent accounts for 40 percent of the claims because they repeatedly flood and the Federal Government subsidizes them to reconstruct.

At a time of extreme financial distress for our Nation, the Federal Government is subsidizing flood insurance. Why? If it's so great, why don't we start a fire insurance program? How about a wildfire insurance program? How about an earthquake protection insurance program? The truth is, Mr. Speaker, if we have a natural disaster in our country, this Congress, Americans, will always stand up and help that part of the country, that area of the country that is suffering. We will always help our fellow Americans.

This program may have been well-intentioned at the beginning, but it has evolved into something that is unrecognizable anymore. And if we ever truly want to downsize, to right-size the Federal Government, we just can't be nibbling around the edges of reforming a program that is ridiculous at its very core. We can't be reforming useless government programs. They need to be eliminated. And I believe that the National Flood Insurance Program is a waste of taxpayers' dollars, it is a boondoggle, and it needs to be eradicated.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, I do support the rule, but I obviously am very, very opposed to the National Flood Insurance Program. That is not the business of the Federal Government. We need to get out of that business.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the gentleman has no further speakers at this time.

I would like to yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the Republican leadership team, the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the work of Mr. SESSIONS and the very powerful Rules Committee in bringing forward this rule, which I support. And I appreciate the work of our colleague from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for introducing this legislation and working with me on some issues that are critically important to the people of eastern and southern Oregon, and, frankly, all across Oregon, especially in places like Milton-Freewater, Oregon.

In Milton-Freewater, citizens are paying hundreds of dollars more in flood insurance because FEMA came in and did a remap process, and it has put a real burden on the people of this community. The community has already set in motion a plan to fix the levees that FEMA says have fallen out of certification, to bring them back into compliance.

This bill could provide relief from the mandatory insurance purchase requirements—remember, you've got government sort of mandatory insurance hanging over these folks—while the community works to improve the levees. It also will force FEMA to factor in the actual protection afforded by existing levees regardless of their accreditation status.

Part of the problem we have out there in Milton-Freewater is you have a couple of agencies fighting over whether there should be brush allowed to grow on the levees. One agency says, oh, we need that for shade in the river, and the other says, no, that actually degrades the integrity of the levee. So we have Federal agencies fighting, and the people in Milton-Freewater get stuck with the bill.

These commonsense steps and others in the bill will provide the relief Milton-Freewater is in desperate need of. These changes will, according to one county commissioner from the area, benefit more than 2,000 people in the community.

Now down in southern Oregon, citizens in Jackson County have been adversely impacted by the recently redrawn FEMA flood maps that, as FEMA has admitted, used inferior mapping methods for some portions. Now the new maps force many homeowners into 100- and 500-year floodplains for the first time. Now that means they have to buy costly insurance when they may not even need it. It's not cheap either. While it runs about $400 a year for the 2-year discount period, premiums skyrocket after that to as

much as $25,000 annually, I'm told. Now, this bill would waive the burdensome mandatory insurance purchase requirements while the new maps are being appealed by homeowners. Homeowners shouldn't get stuck with this bill, this extraordinary cost, when it may, in fact, be a mapping error that even the agency admits they used inferior methods on.

This bill also improves the mapping process by reinstating the Technical Mapping Advisory Council, which will be better suited to take into account local factors during remapping, including natural topography and decertified levees that had not previously been considered.

This bill works to bring the National Flood Insurance Program out of the red while allowing communities more local input on their flood plans and time to adjust should they be designated as a high-risk area.

So I urge my colleagues both to approve the rule and the underlying bill so that we may reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program in a commonsense, fiscally responsible and bipartisan way.

□ 0950

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon, coming to speak not only about this bill but also his strong leadership in issues that deal directly with our Nation and keeping us fiscally sound.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia, one of my colleagues on the Rules Committee, Mr. WOODALL.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

We do have the great pleasure of serving on the Rules Committee together, though serving on the Rules Committee can be a benefit and a burden because historically there's been kind of a gentleman's agreement, I would tell you from what I've read about the institution; that if the committee of jurisdiction brings out a clever idea, they only bring out those clever ideas that they really like. And then the leadership of the House, whichever party is in control of the House, then only allows those reported bills that they really like to show up here on the floor of the House for us to debate. So then when the Rules Committee gets around to considering amendments, well, maybe the only amendments that are allowed are things that nibble around the edges but don't really make any substantive changes to the underlying bill.

Five months, six now, I've been here in the U.S. House of Representatives as part of this freshman class, and what we're doing today excites me. And to folks who have been here a little bit longer, maybe it's not as exciting to you as it is to me. But what is happening here today, not only did we get a bill that went through the regular order process—coming out of committee, no special games played, went through the amendment process in committee, everybody got a vote, and in fact was reported unanimously out of committee, as I understand—then it came to the Rules Committee. We had about 30 amendments offered up at the Rules Committee. A couple weren't germane, a couple were duplicative, but everything else we allowed. And one of those amendments was an amendment that said this is just a dumb program, let's scrap it, send it to the States and start over again. Wow.

And now there are a lot of amendments that we allowed that said let's change a ''six'' to a ''five'' or let's change this number of members to this number of members, things that would improve a bill, nibble around the edges. But this rule today, for the first time that I can recall, allows an amendment that says the entire underlying legislation is headed in the wrong direction. Let's take a new direction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are folks who would be scared about that kind of amendment, folks who would be intimidated to let something come to the floor. We have absolutely no idea what's going to happen.

But this House has made a new commitment, a renewed commitment to expressing the voice of the American people. And guess what? The only amendments that are going to pass on the floor today are ones the American people are behind. The only amendments that are going to pass the floor today are ones that get 218 votes and represent the majority will of this U.S. House of Representatives. It just makes me so proud.

And I hope, Mr. Speaker, for folks who don't follow the process as closely as you and I do, that they will see what a difference that is. And it is a difference from administrations going back 2 years, 4 years, 8 years, 10 years, 12 years. Folks say if it's an idea that has the support of the House, then it deserves to be heard, and we're going to hear all of those amendments here on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, it's not easy to maintain that level of openness in the House. It takes a lot of cooperation between both sides of the aisle to make openness work. We have had that cooperation. And I don't mean cooperation in the sense that folks agree on absolutely all of the ideas. I mean cooperation in the sense that folks know that when the House works its will, the people's work gets done. When the House works its will, the American people's voice is best heard.

And I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their commitment to making that work. And I again thank my friend from Texas for yielding me the time this morning.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I want to advise my colleague, the gentleman, Mr. MCGOVERN, that we do not have any further speakers at this time, and I would defer to his judgment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me, first of all, say that I'm glad the gentleman from Georgia is excited. I'm not quite at that level. I'm okay, but I'm not excited.

This is not an open rule. We had an opportunity to have an open rule. We called for a vote. Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle voted against it. But having said that, there are a lot of different amendments in here that represent a lot of different viewpoints, and so I'm okay with it. So I will begin by saying that.

Secondly, I want to share with my colleagues that this is a good bill. And it is not a boondoggle, as the gentlewoman from Michigan referred to it. It is a necessary protection for people.

The question was asked, well, why should the government be involved in flood insurance? Well, one of the reasons why is because the private insurance industry has no interest in providing the kind of coverage at an affordable level to people who need it. If there was money to be made, if they thought they could make money, you could bet the private insurance industry would step up and try to fill in the void. But they haven't, and they won't. And so without this, you will end up dealing with these catastrophes with disaster relief funds that Congress would have to approve. And that's not a very efficient or good way to deal with the issue of floods.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that this is an important bill not only because it is bipartisan in nature, but I think there is also a bipartisan consensus that it is important that we move forward with this.

Again, I want to commend Mrs. BIGGERT and the members of the Financial Services Committee. I want to commend Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS who worked together in a bipartisan way, who produced a bill that passed 54–0. You don't see that very much. And this has been a very contentious Congress, and there have been lots of partisan divides when it has come to voting on bills. But in this one area, there is consensus, which I think is an indication that it will win broad bipartisan support in this Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing this rule to the floor. I want to thank all of those who are responsible for the underlying bill and look forward to supporting it. And I hope my colleagues, at a bipartisan level, will support my amendment, which I think is a good amendment.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts not only for his service to the Rules Committee but also for the ideas that he represents. And I'm delighted that he had an opportunity today to state with

great clarity that the 25 amendments that have been made in order by the Rules Committee are good for this institution, this body, and lives up to the promise not just that our Speaker, the gentleman, JOHN BOEHNER, and our Majority Leader, ERIC CANTOR, subscribe to, but also the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman, DAVID DREIER.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are discussing today provides a long-term certainty in the flood insurance market. It allows for greater transparency and accountability in the flood insurance program and removes or diminishes greatly the great risk that taxpayers incur from bailing out the current program.

This country is facing a $14 trillion debt with almost $18 billion of that coming from the NFIP. Congress sorely needed to retain its control over this program and to ensure that we relooked at it in its reauthorization. However, we still have a government that spends way too much, taxes too much, listens too little to the needs of the American people. And today, the Republican Party, through the leadership that we're being provided by Mrs. BIGGERT from Illinois, is doing exactly that one at a time, to take on the programs and needs of this great Nation.

Once again, this bill provides us much needed long-term reauthorization and amends the NFIP to ensure the immediate and near-term fiscal administrative health of this program. The bill also ensures the NFIP's continued viability by encouraging broader participation in the program, increasing financial accountability, eliminating unnecessary rate subsidies, and updating the program to meet the current needs of this great Nation.

I applaud my colleagues for introducing the bill, the gentlewoman, Mrs. BIGGERT, for her hard work, the hundreds of meetings that were involved taking feedback from Members of Congress, looking at their needs, and then addressing those.

I encourage a ''yes'' vote on this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1000

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2354, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 337 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 337

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal, year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration If the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my colleague on the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this rule and the underlying bill.

House Resolution 337 provides for an open rule for consideration for H.R. 2354, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2012. This rule provides for ample debate and opportunities for the Members of the minority and majority to participate in that debate. The rule places no limitations on the number of amendments that may be considered, as long as they comply with the rules of the House.

This continues the Speaker's and the Rules chairman's desire and commitment to have transparency and openness, which was demanded by the American people. It's been a long time since we had this type of process, and it's great to have an open process. I think it helps with the partisanship that we have experienced.

The underlying bill funds the Department of Energy, while also moving forward several ongoing construction and operation and maintenance efforts by the Corps of Engineers. It also provides $1.2 billion in emergency funding for the communities of the Midwest and South ravaged by tornadoes, storms, and floods earlier this year. $477 million is set aside for fossil energy research and development. Nearly three times the amount, $1.3 billion, is appropriated for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs to ensure that we continue to move forward in developing next-generation power sources and fuels. Critical defense environmental cleanup efforts are funded at a total of $4.9 billion.

This bill recognizes the importance of a long term nuclear waste disposal policy for the United States; $3.5 million is provided for nuclear waste disposal for the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste storage site in Nevada. Further, no funds in this bill will be used to shut down Yucca Mountain. Since 1983, taxpayers have spent over $15 billion for the construction of this facility, and this bill reasserts the sense of the body that Yucca Mountain is the future repository for nuclear waste.

Is every program or project funded at the levels that we would like? Probably not. For example, long-awaited Federal funds for the Everglades effort in my home State of Florida are significantly pared back in this bill. I am sure almost every Member of this body could find some program, some project or effort that they would like to see plussed up. This is not a perfect world, however, and at the end of the day the funding levels in this bill represent only a 3.3 percent modest cut from last year.

We have to scale back our spending. Appropriations in the last Congress accrued about $1.65 trillion in deficit spending. That's the largest ever. We borrow about $4.5 billion every day. And we just have to pare back.

Will the cuts made in this bill alone right our Nation's fiscal ship? No, but it's a start. It moves the rudder; maybe a half a degree, but it does move the rudder to turn it around. The bill changes the way Washington has spent taxpayers' money in the past. For example, there are no earmarks in this bill. Also, because this bill is being considered in an open rule, any Member can offer an amendment to increase

or decrease funding levels. Again, a 3.3 percent cut to the Department of Energy and Corps of Engineers budget will not solve all of our Nation's fiscal problems, but at least it's a step in the right direction.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. Given our current budget situation, the Appropriations Committee has worked diligently to provide us with a fiscally responsible bill that allows Congress to begin living within its means, just like American families and businesses are forced to do every day.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to thank my colleague from Florida for the time, as well as to thank the majority members of the Rules Committee for a fair rule that will enable a wide variety of floor amendments to be brought forward.

I do rise in opposition to the underlying bill unless there are major changes made, which I hope a majority of the House successfully achieves in doing under this fair open rule.

The current political debate in Washington is dominated by the question of Federal spending. And I think it's a question that we need to revisit under each appropriations bill. We need to cut wasteful spending. We should eliminate programs that don't work, eliminate corporate giveaways, look at the cost of tax subsidies that cost billions of dollars to Americans but fail to create jobs, and really serve to enrich special interests.

We also need to make sure that we don't lose sight, in our drive to reduce the deficit, that we impact investments that are creative and help our economy and reduce deficits over time. Just as a successful business making cuts in a recession would make the cuts intelligently and wouldn't cut essential investments on capital resources, Congress shouldn't slash domestic investments that create jobs while also at the same time continuing to give handouts to multibillion dollar corporations.

Given the approach to budgeting this year in this body, it seems like the majority isn't basing their decisions on cold arithmetic that's needed to balance a budget. Rather, there seems to be a different equation in play, an approach driven by ideology and special interest lobbying, not by a real concern for deficit reduction. With this appropriations bill, I think what we are seeing is more of the same.

How else can we explain a budget that ends Medicare while preserving tax subsidies for Big Oil, tax subsidies for corporate jets, and continues wasteful defense programs, in fact actually increases the defense budget when we know that we have more defense than we can afford in this country? Why is wasteful spending prioritized over health care for our seniors, the education of our children, and investments under this bill that keep our air and water supply clean and healthy, reducing health care costs in the long run?

Now, again, when we talk about these appropriations bills it's not a debate over whether we should cut the deficit. I think Republicans and Democrats agree that we need to cut the deficit. It's a debate about how we restore fiscal discipline that has been abandoned over the last decade. Let's have that debate here in the U.S. House. And I am glad that this rule allows us do it under this bill. And I hope we are able to make some major changes to this bill.

□ 1010

Unfortunately, the Energy and Water bill as presented before the House under this rule exemplifies a reckless and ideological approach to the budget.

This bill actually increases funding levels, increases deficit funding levels for fossil fuel research and development, oil and gas research, increases Federal spending on these programs, while cutting investments in clean energy research. In the past, Republicans have claimed that they were for an ''all of the above'' approach to energy policy, looking at optimizing exploitation of fossil fuels and also investing in new energy research, but instead of ''all of the above,'' this bill represents an ''oil above all'' approach to national energy policy. It's simply not a serious response to America's need for cleaner, more affordable domestic energy.

At a time when we all agree we're confronting a fiscal crisis, how can we ask American taxpayers to foot the bill for ExxonMobil's R&D? That's exactly what we do under this bill. It's one of a series of subsidies for Big Oil that the majority has chosen to protect at a time that they're also demanding Americans see funding cut for schools and for seniors. Instead of increasing wasteful spending which benefits only the fossil fuel industry, we should invest in the American clean energy innovation that will benefit our national security, our environment, and our economy.

This legislation cuts total funding for the Energy Department's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by 42 percent compared to 2010, at the same time increasing subsidies to oil and gas. These cuts will mean less innovation, dirtier energy and fewer clean energy jobs. In my home State of Colorado alone, over 5,000 jobs have been spun off of research that was conducted at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, and the lab gives an estimated $714 million annual boost to our State's economy. It's that kind of research that is devastated under this bill. Through this open amendment process, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support efforts to restore that funding.

These labs, like the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the basic Federal research, are incubators for the private sector. The investments don't go to bloated bureaucracies or government bureaucrats in Washington. They go to the actual hiring of experts and innovators that will spin off their ideas to entrepreneurs to bring to the marketplace, a model for private sector job growth that's critical for our Nation's economy and critical for our national security in meeting our own energy needs domestically.

The Department of Energy's investments in clean energy are the first step in a job create domino effect. As of August 2010, as an example, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory had 329 contracts with Colorado companies totaling $414 million, including $75.3 million in the most recent fiscal year. NREL had cooperative research and development agreements with 23 Colorado companies, and NREL supports interactions with companies from across the Nation. That's just one example of the many research initiatives and public-private partnerships that this bill as written would call into jeopardy.

And while again calling into jeopardy much of this fundamental research that has private sector applications, we're again increasing subsidies to the fossil fuel industry's research. There is a $141 million or 81 percent cut to weatherization initiatives that help insulate the homes of low-income, elderly and disabled individuals in this bill, while continuing and increasing subsidies to the fossil fuel industry.

Another dangerous cut in this bill is cutting funding to the Advanced Research Projects Agency, ARPA-E, by 44 percent compared to the current year. ARPA-E has strongly had bipartisan support for years and helps fund innovation in the economy based on a proven successful model we've had in defense for many years called DARPA. It funds path-breaking ideas that are unlikely to get funding anywhere else at an early stage. This creative model is crafted after DARPA, which has led to things ranging from cell phones to the creation of the Internet itself, and it has tremendous implications for America to meet its renewable energy needs.

The bill before us is not smart, and it's not sensible. It's simply not a fiscally responsible bill that meets our Nation's future energy needs and cuts our deficit. I urge my colleagues to improve this bill through amendments during this open amendment process and, if it's in anything close to its current form, to oppose the final bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just like to address a couple of items: number one, the tax policy we've been talking about and how we could raise extra revenues. The tax policy we have today was given to us by the 111th Congress. I assume if they had wanted to change it, they would have when they had the majority. They didn't. They gave us the tax policy. We

haven't gotten to that yet, but we will at some point in time.

As far as the money we're using in this budget, it is a small decrease, but we have to do it. We're borrowing 40 cents on the dollar; $4.5 billion a day. We cannot afford it. If we were to increase the allocation in this particular bill, then we would actually be borrowing 100 percent of that allocation increase because we do not have the cash.

So to me, we are here with a good bill. The rule certainly is a good rule. It's an open rule. It's the perfect opportunity for anybody that wants to change this bill to do so. However, the underlying bill is also a good bill. It's done very well.

Just to give you a picture of what the minority said about it in their views that serve on the committee:

''We commend the chairmen, both the sub chair and the full chair, for their efforts to assemble this bill in an inclusive manner. The bill funds critical water resource projects, supports science activities necessary to American competitiveness, and contributes to our national defense through vital weapons, naval reactor research and nonproliferation funding, all priorities that unite rather than divide us.''

There was a disagreement and that is over the allocation, but we simply cannot afford any more of an allocation for this than we have. The budget that was done is an excellent one under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a former colleague of mine on the Rules Committee, Ms. MATSUI.

Ms. MATSUI. I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a tireless advocate on behalf of Sacramento's flood protection priorities. Sacramento is the most at-risk metropolitan area for major flooding, as it lies at the confluence of two great rivers, the Sacramento and the American. The city is home to California's State Capitol, an international airport, the State's water and electric grids and over a half million people. If Sacramento were to flood, the economic damages would range between $28 and $40 billion. The consequences of such a flood would be felt across the Nation.

Even in this austere budget environment, it is critical that Sacramento's basic flood protection needs are met. I want to applaud the Energy and Water appropriations subcommittee for including funding for Sacramento's top flood protection projects. Each one of these projects is a critical component to improving the flood protection for the entire Sacramento region. Taken together, the completed projects will bring us closer to the level of flood protection that families and businesses throughout the region need and deserve.

Moreover, these projects are already in the midst of construction. A lapse of funding would not only postpone the safety that the completed projects will provide but would also increase project costs, something that we cannot afford. In fact, these projects have already been funded at the local and State level and are awaiting a sustained Federal match. For example, Federal funding will help finish the Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project, the JFP, where continued construction on the auxiliary spillway will provide greater efficiency in managing flood storage in the Folsom Reservoir. The hundreds of thousands of residents living below the dam will be better protected once the project is finished.

The JFP and our levee improvements will go a long way toward protecting and preventing flooding in Sacramento, but the funding in this bill does not fully support Sacramento's flood protection needs. The levels in this bill are actually below the Corps of Engineers' full capability.

This winter, we have had record-breaking snowpack in the Sierra Nevada mountain range, which rests just above Sacramento.

□ 1020

We are fortunate that the snowpack did not melt all at once. When this occurs, our dams and levees are put to the test.

Mr. Speaker, luck is not something that the American people should have to rely upon. Hurricane Katrina and this year's flooding in the Midwest taught us that we need to take large leaps forward in shoring up our Nation's flood protection infrastructure.

Let's take the opportunity to fix our Nation's flood protection system while the sun is out and not watch another American community get swept away in high water.

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

Mr. POLIS. I have no additional speakers and would inquire of the gentleman from Florida if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, again, while we appreciate the open amendment process, will need an open amendment process to correct because it's so highly flawed in its current form.

It serves as the majority's vehicle for a whole series of anti-environment, anti-public interest riders. These riders undercut the Clean Water Act, putting at risk public health and increasing economic burdens on local communities.

The bill prevents the Army Corps of Engineers from applying anti-pollution protections to many rivers, streams and wetlands that supply drinking water and prevent flooding. Over 100 million Americans get their drinking water from public supplies provided in whole or in part from waters that are at risk of losing Clean Water Act safeguards under this bill as written.

Furthermore, the committee report language that accompanies the bill contains even more explicit policy directives, including the mandate that what was to be an independent advisory board on the safety of shale gas drilling be dominated by industry representatives, which would be a prime example of the fox guarding the chicken coop.

Unconventional shale gas has been expanding into new areas at a breakneck pace and has been accompanied by growing health and pollution problems experienced by residents and communities when the drilling is taking place in close proximity to where families are living. Its growth is outpacing current safeguards and exemptions already give the industry too much isolation from public safety assurances.

I have grave concerns that the committee felt the need to interfere in a balanced and truly independent technology advisory panel with the aim of silencing public voices in favor of representing the industry above all other legitimate stakeholders. In fact, the advisory panel is already heavily tipped in industry's favor, and the language shows us exactly whose side this legislation is on—entrenched industries and polluters, not the public interest.

The annual Energy and Water appropriations bill is important funding legislation. Historically, it has been broadly bipartisan, and it shouldn't be a playground for special interest handouts. Yet under this majority, that's what this bill has become that we are considering today.

The bill in its current form undermines our energy future, undermines our national security and subsidizes an energy industry that has given us record gas prices, fracking health hazards and dirtier air. It attempts to drive a supertanker-sized loophole through the laws that keep our clean water safe.

This bill should be focused on investing in innovation to strengthen our country and our national security and our energy future, not focused on wasteful spending to special interests supporting entrenched industries and harmful cuts to their clean competitors.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

I urge my colleagues to come forth and try to improve this bill under the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, as you heard me say earlier, my Republican colleagues and I are committed to providing a more open, accountable, and transparent process. And the underlying bill went through regular order, including eight different subcommittee hearings. Several Democrat amendments were adopted on the committee level. It has provided an open rule to allow Republicans and Democrats alike to offer their ideas in open, honest debate.

This vote is on the rule, which provides for an open, transparent process where the ideas and policies will rise and fall on the basis of their merit, not on their party affiliations. This is what the American people expect of their elected officials. It's an expectation that's being fulfilled by this rule, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 320 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. 2219.

□ 1028

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. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 7, 2011, the bill had been read through page 161, line 12.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

''SEC. ____. None of the funds in this Act may be used for military operations in or against Libya except under a declaration of war against Libya pursuant to clause 11 in section 8 of article I of the Constitution.''.

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

□ 1030

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, before the House completes work on this important bill, I think that it is imperative that the House is provided with one more opportunity to clarify its position with respect to the Constitution and our power under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution, which reads as follows, that Congress has the power to declare war.

This amendment says none of the funds in this act may be used for military operations in or against Libya except under a declaration of war against Libya pursuant to clause 11 in section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

So what this amendment does is it recognizes Congress' power to appropriate and links it, in this case, to Congress' ability to declare war and enables this House to definitively—definitively—make a statement that it is our prerogative, our Constitutional right, to determine whether or not this Nation goes to war, and we are not going to see any war funded absent a declaration of war by this Congress.

It is imperative that we act, because by September, this administration will have spent $1 billion on the war without Congress having any say in that whatsoever. We will have gone to a war without any ability of Congress to have a voice.

Now, to its credit, this House has taken up numerous proposals relative to the war in Libya that have sought to limit the sphere of conduct of hostilities against Libya—no ground troops and no money to rebels. This amendment, however, gives the House one last opportunity within this bill to speak very clearly about article I, section 8, clause 11 and to do it in the context of an appropriations bill which says that we will not permit any funds to be spent unless this Congress moves forward with a declaration of war.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kucinich amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. First of all, the President has made a very strong case for our military action in Libya. I think, as Commander in Chief, he has the authority. We had a U.N. resolution, the NATO allies were involved and so was the Arab League.

There is another option. The other option is the War Powers Act. And I hope at some point the President will ask for congressional support of his initiative in Libya.

The idea that we're going to pull out of this unilaterally and undermine the NATO alliance I think is a terrible mistake. Although I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Ohio, I'm strongly opposed to his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will first admit that this gentleman introducing this amendment, if nothing else, is certainly persistent. The only problem is, after 2 lengthy days, 10 and 11 hours each day, with amendment after amendment being presented, we have just been given this amendment in the last 5 minutes. We would have liked to have had a little more time to really analyze it. But a quick analysis of this amendment tells me that it is very similar to all of the other Libyan amendments that we have defeated in the last 2 days.

For example, I believe that this amendment would preclude any search-and-rescue mission on the part of Americans to save Americans. I'm satisfied it would prevent us from providing any intelligence surveillance, or reconnaissance. I'm satisfied that it would not permit us to do any aerial refueling of our coalition or NATO partners. I'm satisfied that the amendment would prohibit us from even being involved while operational plans are being developed that might have an effect on the support role that the United States plays.

So, here we go again. We've already defeated this issue close to a dozen times in the last 2 days. So I just suggest that we move on and defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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:

The first amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

The second amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

The third amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 77 by Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas.

An amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. KUCINICH of Ohio.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the first 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 39, noes 380, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

AYES—39

Amash
Bachmann
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Cantor
Chabot
Chaffetz
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Flake
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jordan
Landry
Lummis
Mack
McClintock
McHenry
Mulvaney
Paul
Posey
Price (GA)
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Southerland
Stearns
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Woodall

NOES—380

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
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
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Cardoza
Crowley
Culberson
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Payne
Pelosi
Rokita

□ 1102

Messrs. McNERNEY and LUETKEMEYER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. PASCRELL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. HURT, BISHOP of Utah, SCOTT of South Carolina, CHABOT, and SOUTHERLAND changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 118, noes 295, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

AYES—118

Amash
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Capuano
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
DeFazio
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Larson (CT)
Levin
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lummis
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McGovern
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Olver
Paul
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Velázquez
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Welch
Woolsey
Yoder

NOES—295

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo

Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
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
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Towns
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Campbell
Cardoza
Carter
Crowley
Culberson
Giffords
Granger
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Hirono
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Payne
Peterson
Reyes
Rogers (MI)
Wasserman Schultz
Wittman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1106

Mr. POE of Texas 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. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 526, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the third 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 321, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—100

Amash
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Benishek
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Camp
Carney
Chabot
Chaffetz
Conyers
Cooper
Dent
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Frank (MA)
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hirono
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Inslee
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kind
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Lummis
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Matheson
McHenry
Mica
Michaud
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Tsongas
Upton
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—321

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Cardoza
Crowley
Culberson
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1112

Ms. LEE and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. POE of Texas, WESTMORELAND, and DOLD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) 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 236, noes 184, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

AYES—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
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)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
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
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)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
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 (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—184

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
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
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Cardoza
Crowley
Culberson
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne
Rangel
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1117

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) 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 113, noes 307, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

AYES—113

Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Capuano
Carney
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Keating
Kind
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lummis
Maloney
Markey
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Tierney
Tonko
Upton
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—307

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin

Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Barton (TX)
Campbell
Cardoza
Carnahan
Crowley
Culberson
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1120

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) 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 169, noes 251, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—169

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bonner
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Flores
Foxx
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Luján
Lummis
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Upton
Velázquez
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—251

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Cardoza
Crowley
Culberson
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lynch
Payne
Whitfield

□ 1124

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 530, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

CONGRATULATING REPRESENTATIVE JOHN DINGELL ON HIS 85TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a wonderful day of celebration. Today we celebrate the 85th birthday of an extraordinary American, an American who has served over five-eighths of his life in this House, an American whose father served before him, an American who has been sent to the Congress after Congress after Congress after Congress, a Member who has made an extraordinary contribution to the legislative history of this Congress and to the welfare of this country. JOHN DINGELL today is 85 years of age.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to now yield to somebody who has not served with him for 85 years, but has served with him for a very significant time on the extraordinarily important Energy and Commerce Committee, my friend from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Thank you, Congressman HOYER.

It has been my pleasure to serve for 26 years on the Energy and Commerce Committee with the distinguished gentleman who is having his 85th birthday.

What some of our newer Members may not know is what a gentleman Chairman DINGELL is. And the uniqueness of his character is he will impart his wisdom to those of us in the opposition party and encourage us to then go out and use it against him, knowing that he is smart enough, tough enough, and effective enough to beat us at our own game. He is truly a paragon of this Congress, and will go down, in my estimation, in history as one of the top 10 Congressmen or -women of all time.

I want to extend him my warmest 85th birthday wishes and get him to guarantee that as long as he is able he will serve in this body, because he is truly a treasure for both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. Those of you who are new to this body, what Mr. BARTON has just said, if you want an example of a truly great legislator, a legislator who has year after year sat down with both sides of the aisle, with all the different interest groups that are represented in this Congress, and worked together to bring consensus to quality legislation, you could have no better example than JOHN DINGELL.

So I am pleased to rise, Mr. DINGELL, and express great admiration, respect, and deep affection for you, which I know is shared by all of your colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012''.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 320, the previous question is ordered.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1130

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BARROW. In its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barrow moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2219 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 7, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 12, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $160,000,000)''.

Page 135, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARROW. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We Americans owe no greater debt than we owe the men and women of our armed services who risk their lives to protect our freedoms. We currently have around 350,000 troops deployed overseas. About a third of that number come from our National Guard and Reserve.

While most Americans don't know it, many National Guard members don't get the same support we give career servicemembers. When many National Guardsmen and -women get on the plane to go overseas, their families don't even know about the services that are available to them, and when many of those troops get back home, they don't have the help they need to get back into their daily lives.

To address this disparity, in 2008, Congress established the yellow ribbon reintegration program to provide a support program tailored to meet the needs of National Guard and Reserve combat veterans and their families. The yellow ribbon program helps servicemembers and their families throughout deployment, with programs such as career counseling, suicide prevention, access to health care, veterans benefits, and education benefits. This final amendment would increase funding for that program by $200 million.

There is an excellent program in my district called the Augusta Wounded Warrior Project. They have several projects in Georgia to help wounded veterans. I've had the honor of working with them on some of these priorities and to meet with some of the returning veterans they have helped. What I hear over and over is that veterans can't take advantage of the many different support services available to them if they don't know about them or don't know how to navigate the bureaucracy that runs them. The yellow ribbon program helps our National Guard and Reserve combat veterans make that connection and get the services that they've earned.

According to the 2010 annual report to Congress, the yellow ribbon program held over 2,000 events and had over 300,000 contacts with individual servicemembers and their family members. That's a 50 percent increase in participation over 2009. And as the total number of returning National Guard and Reserve combat veterans goes up, the need goes up. This amendment will help make sure that the yellow ribbon program can help meet that need.

My amendment makes these funds available through a transfer from the account for the Afghanistan security forces fund. That account is funded in this bill at $12.8 billion. While I think those funds are an important part of our strategy for long-term success in Afghanistan, I think the highest and best use of a very small part of that money is to help our National Guard and Reserve combat veterans get back on their feet again.

My amendment would use about 1.5 percent of that money for this purpose, which I think is reasonable. In exchange for about 1.5 percent of what we're about to provide to help the Afghans take care of themselves, we can provide a 125 percent increase in support for those American soldiers and their families who make it all possible. I think that's a pretty good deal.

Finally, my amendment will not in any way delay final passage of this important legislation. If adopted, we move straight to a final vote on passage of this legislation.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their service and for their work on this bill. I think my amendment will have virtually no adverse impact on what we're trying to do for Afghanistan, but it will have a huge positive impact in meeting the needs of our combat veterans and their families. I hope that's something we can all support.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHOCK). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit, I think, is a strong statement that this is a pretty good Defense appropriations bill, because the minority, using the procedural vote that minorities most always use, does not do any real damage to the bill, but it doesn't really do anything that needs to be done, either, so it's a procedural vote, and I suggest we just vote against it and get on to the bill.

But about the yellow ribbon. The bill already contains $246.5 million for the

yellow ribbon program, which we support. It's a good program, especially for reintegration for returning guardsmen and reservists and their families. In addition, we accepted an amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) to add $20 million for further suicide prevention for our returning combat veterans. This comes to a total of $266.5 million. That's not a bad number, when you consider that we had to reduce the President's budget by $9 billion.

So I think we did pretty good, and I think that this motion to recommit is a strong indication that there's nothing really wrong with this bill, we just ought to go ahead and defeat the motion to recommit and pass the bill.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my chairman yielding.

I must say that the gentleman from Georgia is making a point that we all understand. The Guard and Reserve are very important to our future, clearly, but even more important is for us to get this House back on a pathway to regular order, whereby we bring bills through the committees, bring them to the floor, open rules, have the opportunity to have these debates and the like.

I must say our chairman has done a fabulous job in moving in that direction, but I also would say that the ranking member of the subcommittee, who's also ranking member of the full committee, has been publicly committed to getting us back to regular order. Indeed, as a tribute to both of their work by way of strengthening the future of the House and our work this year, I would hope we not just defeat this motion to recommit but give an overwhelming vote in support of their fine work on final passage.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 2219 and adoption of House Resolution 340.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 234, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

AYES—188

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
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
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—234

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

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Cardoza
Crowley
Culberson
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1156

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 336, nays 87, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

YEAS—336

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack

Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—87

Amash
Baldwin
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Capps
Capuano
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cohen
Costello
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Keating
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Cardoza
Culberson
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1204

Mrs. MALONEY changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1309, FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 340) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 269, nays 146, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—269

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
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)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—146

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating

Kildee	Neal	Schwartz
Kind	Olver	Serrano
Langevin	Owens	Sewell
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Sires
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Slaughter
Lee (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Levin	Pelosi	Speier
Lewis (GA)	Peters	Stark
Loebsack	Pingree (ME)	Sutton
Lofgren, Zoe	Polis	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Luján	Quigley	Tierney
Lynch	Rahall	Tonko
Maloney	Rangel	Towns
Matsui	Reyes	Tsongas
McCollum	Richmond	Velázquez
McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Visclosky
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Wasserman Schultz
Meeks	Rush	Watt
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
Moore	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
Moran	Schakowsky	Wu
Nadler	Schiff	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Schrader	

NOT VOTING—16

Campbell	Hinchey	Payne
Cardoza	Jackson Lee (TX)	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Franks (AZ)	Markey	Van Hollen
Giffords	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Graves (MO)		

□ 1211

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 533, the rule on H. Res. 340 appears to contain amendments which could be adverse to economic interests in the State of Illinois, subject to further study. The rule is traditionally a procedural, partisan matter. Accordingly, despite my presence on the floor in the center aisle, I chose to abstain. Had I voted, I would have voted, "present."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2109

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 2109.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and at noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

On Monday, the House will begin amendment debate on H.R. 2354, the Energy and Water appropriations bill; and consider H.R. 2417, the Better Use of Light Bulbs Act, under suspension of the rules.

For the remainder of the week, the House will consider H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011; H.R. 2018, the Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2011; H.R. 2434, the Financial Services appropriations bill; and potentially legislation relating to the expiring authorization of the FAA.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as a scheduling notice, Members are advised that the House will now be in session during the week of July 18. I expect legislative business for the week to begin on Tuesday, July 19, at 2 p.m., with first votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. The last votes for the week are expected to conclude no later than 3 p.m. on Friday, July 22.

And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his scheduling information.

I want to pursue what I presume is the reason for not having the district work period that was originally scheduled. My presumption is that we are concerned about the impending arrival of the August 2 date on which America would be put in the position of defaulting on its obligations. I presume that's the reason, that we want to make sure that we are here to work on that issue. Am I correct on that?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is correct.

It is my hope that we can have some deliberative processes and open discussions so that we can arrive at an appropriate conclusion of the challenges surrounding the issue of the debt limit expiration. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

I know the gentleman has said in the past that he believes it would be a very bad situation for our economy and for our country if we did not extend the debt limit.

Am I correct that the gentleman still shares that view?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that I have said before that America pays its bills just like the American people are expected to pay their bills at home and in their small and large businesses; but the fact is I think that the American people are expecting us to live up to the promise that we are not going to let spending get out of control again.

So the purpose of the deliberations that are ongoing throughout this Capitol, at the White House, et cetera, are focused—and should be—on making sure we change the system, on making sure that we accomplish the necessary cuts which would exceed the amount that we raise the debt limit, as well as to signal to the American people that we have changed the system; that this kind of unbridled spending ceases and that we begin to live within our means and get the fiscal house in order so that we can focus on the overriding need for this country right now, which is to create an environment where jobs return.

I know the gentleman has seen today's jobs report. ''Disappointing'' is an understatement, so I make the point again:

As the gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, he and I were at a meeting at the White House yesterday with the President in which I said, again, the import of our need to act and act responsibly and not—not—to raise taxes on the American people and the small businesses, and that we need so desperately to begin to create jobs again.

Mr. HOYER. I am pleased, as the gentleman knows, to hear that you want to stop the spiraling deficits that confront our country. I will repeat again because the gentleman keeps mentioning this, and I have enough experience to know what has happened:

In the 30 years that I've been here, of course we've had some few years of the Obama administration, but we had Mr. Reagan's administration, Mr. Bush I's administration, Mr. Bush II's administration, and we ran up—and I know the gentleman knows these figures—over $6 trillion of deficit during that period of time. However, in the 8 years that Mr. Clinton was President of the United States, we had a $62.9 billion surplus.

Now, the gentleman makes the point that spending is out of control. The fact is, as the gentleman clearly knows, when you were in charge of the House and the Presidency and the Senate, you increased spending by more than was increased during the Clinton administration by a percentage on an annual basis. So I'm glad to hear that your side now, without fail, talks about spending being out of control. Very frankly, I have the feeling, if your side were spending 5 cents, you would think that we would need to cut an additional 5 cents in revenues so that we could not pay the bills, because that's why we ran up $6 trillion in deficits: you did not pay for what you bought.

Now, I'm one of those who very strongly believes we ought to pay for what we buy, but I also believe that we ought not to put this country on the brink of financial chaos and bring us down in the eyes of the world because we don't extend our debt.

Very frankly, I think we ought to pay for what we buy. We call that ''taxes''—whether it's defending America, paying our FBI, paying people who are researching cancer, heart, lung, diabetes issues. Those are Federal expenditures for which the American people pay through taxes. If we are going to be responsible, we make a very simple judgment: if we want to buy it, we ought to pay for it.

That $6 trillion of deficit was incurred during those Presidencies, and the President is the only person in America who can stop spending—the only one. You can't do it and I can't do

it. We need 217 other votes in our House. Over there, they need at least 60 votes to do anything. The President can do it himself. Ronald Reagan never had a veto overridden of a bill that said we spent too much money. George Bush I never had a veto overridden in which he vetoed a bill saying we spent too much money, and George Bush II never once had a veto overridden so that we spent money that he did not sanction.

So I say to my friend, we did meet at the White House, and the President of the United States, the leader of our party, and I and Mr. REID and Mr. DURBIN all said, yes, we need to get a handle on this spending; yes, we need to get a handle on the deficit; and, yes, we need to bring down the debt. We need to come to the table together with everything on the table, and we need to pay for what we think we ought to buy. Frankly, we ought to ensure that the United States of America, for the first time in history, doesn't fail to pay its bills.

□ 1220

I tell my friend that we've had a lot of commentary over the last few days, people on Wall Street, people in business—large, medium and small—and I will tell you that if the United States doesn't, by August 2, agree to pay that which it owes, that which it has incurred—not what we're going to incur, but those debts that we've incurred in the past—everybody in America is going to be hurt.

Every economist that I talk to says that interest rates are going to spike, the stock market is going to be at risk and, very frankly, millions of people who have pension funds and who have interest in their pensions are going to be adversely affected, the housing market, which is struggling, is going to be hurt, the economy that is struggling is going to be hurt. So I would hope that my friend and I will go to the White House on Sunday, we will sit with the President of the United States, and we will be for a large deal that is euphemistically referred to as a ''comprehensive solution'' so that we can in fact—not in the short term, not temporarily, but in the long term—bring fiscal discipline to the operations of our country. Our country needs that. I think the international community expects that of us. And if we don't do that, I tell my friend, I think we will not have fulfilled our oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and serve the general welfare of our country and our people.

Now, some in your party of course have suggested there is no need to raise the debt. Does the gentleman agree with that proposition? I'm not going to go through the quotes, but as you know, one of your candidates for President has indicated there is no need to worry about raising the debt. She serves in this body, as a matter of fact.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman, as he knows—he and I have had plenty of discussions about this; so I assume we are just on for show here—that he wants me to say yes. I believe it would be a grave consequence if we did not reach the point at which we could arrive at a solution and put a bill forward that would permit an increase in the credit limit of this country, with an associated cut in spending, and move to get our fiscal house in order.

And as the gentleman correctly pointed out, the reason why now we will not be in our districts on the week of the 18th is to ensure that we do get it right and that we recognize that the markets, the investors around the world are smarter than expecting us to just go and check the box to meet the date. At the end of the day, what the markets and investors, and, more importantly, the American people, are looking for is that we act responsibly, that we begin to manage down the debt and deficit. That means trillions of dollars of cuts are necessary. Because I think most Americans are looking at Washington in disbelief, that somehow we think there's not enough money coming into the Federal Government.

I mean, just look at the jobs report today. I cannot fathom how anyone thinks right now is a good time to raise taxes. Who thinks that raising taxes on individuals and small businesses can help create jobs? We are in a crisis. People in this country need to get back to work.

And let me just, Mr. Speaker, for the point of explanation because the gentleman insists on going back decades to recount the past—and as the gentleman knows, I'm the first one to say that we came to this majority with some contrition—that, no, we weren't always acting in the best interests of the fiscal health of this country, that's why we have taken the job at hand and acted responsibly and passed a budget that actually puts a plan in place to manage down the debt and deficit, unlike the other body, unlike this President. And that's why we come to the table right now, as we approach this debt ceiling vote, with a well thought out, deliberative plan to get people back to work while we get the fiscal house in order.

But let's just review some of the statistics, Mr. Speaker. There have been 2.5 million jobs lost since this President took office. There are 13.9 million Americans unemployed right now. A gallon of gas is significantly higher—well into the $3.50, $3.60 a gallon in some places in this country, if not higher, up from $1.85 when this President took office. $14.3 trillion in current national debt, up from $10.6 trillion when this President took office. If you work that out, $46,042 debt per person, up from $34,371 when this President took office. So you can go through line by line of how things have gotten worse for the American people.

Now, we can sit here and blame and point fingers all day long, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of the bickering. They want to see some solutions. They want to see us come together. That's exactly why we have altered the schedule so we can begin to actually deliver on the promise.

So I agree with the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip; we've got a serious challenge ahead of us. We on this side of the aisle have been consistent in our efforts to meet that challenge in a responsible way. But I would underscore again that now is not the time to raise taxes. Now is not the time to say that Washington needs more money because that money comes off the hard work and backs of the American people.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, very interesting comments he makes. Of course, he leaves out some things. He talks about the jobs that were lost. Those jobs were lost of course as this administration took office. This administration has gained back 2 million of the 8 million jobs that were lost during the economic program that my friend from Virginia voted for, for the most part. Eight million jobs were lost. And the month that this administration took office in January, 780,000 jobs in one month were lost, the last month of the Bush administration. That's not very distant past.

But let me tell you, I heard the same rhetoric—you said you've changed, I heard the same rhetoric in 1993, same rhetoric when we adopted a program that we said would balance the budget, bring the economy back and create jobs. The same rhetoric, oh, no, you won't do it. The program that you're going to adopt—none of which you voted for, you weren't here, I understand that—but the same rhetoric applied. You thought we were going to tank the economy, kill jobs, explode the deficit and have high unemployment. In fact, as my friend well knows—he didn't read those statistics because he thinks they're ancient history because you opposed that policy. But that policy created 22 million jobs. That's a 30 million job difference between the Bush administration that was the follow-on administration and the Clinton administration. Thirty million job difference, I tell my friend, under the policies that you adopted and you supported in the 2000s.

So I would hope that my friend's comments are correct, that you have decided to change. In point of fact, we need change. And in point of fact, the American public—which is divided itself, but would like us to come together, and I'm hopeful that we'll do that. And my friend and I have had the opportunity to talk about this. We do have significant differences. But none of us can put something on the table and say if you don't agree, I'm going to tank the economy, I'm going to have America default for the first time in its 200-plus years of history if you don't agree and do it my way.

I have said, the leader has said on this side, everything is on the table.

We understand that you have to pay for what you buy, and we also understand we have to buy less, and we are prepared to do both.

□ 1230

In fact, we have agreed to do both in the Biden talks.

Now, my friend talks about economists. The most successful investor in America, I think most people will agree, is Warren Buffett. Warren Buffett said we raised the debt ceiling seven times during the Bush administration. And now in this Congress, under the Republicans, they're using it as a hostage, and you really don't have any business playing Russian roulette to get your way in some matter. We should, he said, be more grown up on that. To that extent, he echoed the comments of our Speaker, who is trying, in my opinion, to get to a place where we can come together, compromise—as is critical in a democracy—pay our bills, and reduce our obligations and reduce spending. Buffett went on to say we should, as I said, be more grown up on that.

If we don't meet the August 2 deadline, he observed, you're playing with fire when you don't need to play with fire. And we don't need to tell the rest of the world that any time people in Congress start throwing a tantrum, that we're not going to pay our bills. That is not responsible behavior. It's not adult behavior. It's not good for anybody in the United States of America, and it's not good for the international community.

In fact, Senator Alan Simpson was referring to TOM COBURN, who has said, look, you've got to have everything on the table, including, yes, revenues; yes, taxes.

Some bard has said that taxes are the price we pay for democracy. They should not be any higher than they need to be, but we ought to pay for what we buy. And if we don't, if people don't want to pay for it, we ought not to buy it.

Unfortunately, the reason we racked up $6 trillion of deficits during the Reagan and both Bush administrations is because we bought things and didn't pay for them. As you heard me say at the White House, we, both parties—you weren't here—voted for some things and didn't pay for them. We've got to stop that. That's why we put in place statutory PAYGO.

But, very frankly, you say, Well, we've changed. You passed a budget that doesn't balance the budget for the next 27 years. You passed the budget. You voted for that. I didn't vote for that budget. It doesn't balance the budget for 27 years, almost three decades. Very frankly, I don't think that does it.

That's why we went down to the White House yesterday, and almost everybody in the room said we need to do a comprehensive, disciplined, courageous, honest, principled resolution of doing what you say you want to do, that your party wants to do, and what I'm telling you, my friend, we want to do because there is no option. We must bring this deficit down. We must. The debt we have confronting us is not sustainable.

So I would urge my friend, and I want to congratulate Speaker BOEHNER, who at the White House said, Look, we need to do this and we need to have a comprehensive agreement. That's what democracy demands.

I'm not going to agree with some of the things that are in that bill. You're not going to agree with some of the things that are in that bill, if, in fact, we pass a bill. But if we come together, if we act as adults, if we do what every responsible financial economist and adviser has told us we must do, then America will be pleased with us.

But I tell my friend from Virginia, if we don't do that, if we continue to buy things that we don't pay for and we continue to ask the people to get it for free, then frankly your children, and my grandchildren and children and great-grandchildren, will not be happy with us.

So I urge my friend—he and I will be going to the White House on Sunday. I urge him to come to the table, as I will come to the table. I tell him, with the understanding that compromise is essential, that the crisis that confronts us is real and that America expects us to act in their best interest and have the courage—not the politics, not the ego, not the view of the next election—but the view of the long term, as we come together and try to confront this issue for which all of us are responsible. No one party, no one member. All of us are responsible. But then again, if that is the case, we are all responsible for its resolution.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would just try to keep my remarks short, and that is to say, listen, it's about jobs right now. The gentleman correctly points out we have a real spending problem here. And the question is, how do we address the first priority to get Americans back to work and address that spending problem we've got?

Now, if the gentleman says we have to pay for what we buy, I certainly agree with that. We ought to just be buying less as a government because the money doesn't belong to the government, it belongs to the people. And if we want more people to get back to work, we should allow them to keep more of their money so that they can create jobs.

And that's really where the fundamental disagreement has been over the last couple of weeks. It certainly was what put the Biden talks into abeyance because there was a lot of good work that was done by both sides of the aisle in those talks. And I still believe that the product of those talks will prove to be the basis upon which we can arrive at an appropriate resolution of the challenge before us around the debt ceiling.

But why these talks ended was that your side insisted that we raise taxes. And I would say to the gentleman, raising taxes is, as he would put it, paying for what we buy. And I'm saying let's stop buying so much and let the people decide what it is they want to do with their money.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, if I can——

Mr. CANTOR. If I could finish.

Mr. HOYER. I will continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, I know he likes to engage in a lot of the decades of history before. And I don't like to go finger-pointing and engage in that. But every time the gentleman raises the issue about jobs lost here, jobs lost there, what it does is require me to posit again, there have been 1.4 million jobs lost since the stimulus bill.

But that makes my point. We didn't need to do the stimulus bill. We didn't need to do the stimulus bill because now we are stuck with over $800 billion in additional debt with now unemployment today at 9.2 percent.

So, again, question whether we're on the right policies here and we're spending the dollars we need to be spending. Maybe we shouldn't spend it. Maybe we should let it be invested in the private sector.

I would end by saying, again, the deficit is a real problem. We've got a $1.6 trillion deficit this year, the largest in history and the third consecutive year of trillion dollars of deficits.

I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, we can't tolerate that. The President shouldn't tolerate that. The American people have no patience any more. That's why we need to get to work, try and lower the hyperbole and get the job done.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

The gentleman, I understand, does not like me to look back. But the problem with being around for some time, you hear people say that this isn't going to work or that's going to work, and you know what? Hopefully that ought to be instructive as to whether it did work or didn't work.

And the problem I have, which, apparently, I know you don't appreciate, is that I've heard the rhetoric before that you've just used today, and I heard it in 1993 when a program which had revenues in it, or, as you like to say, taxes—obviously those are revenues—and it was going to destroy the economy. Who said so? Phil Gramm, an economist on your side. He said we would devastate the economy. He was dead, flat wrong, 180 degrees wrong. We had the best economy in your lifetime.

Furthermore, let me instruct the gentleman, I don't know what you're reading from, but your figures are wrong. Over the last 20 months we have gained 2 million jobs.

□ 1240

Now, did we lose a lot of jobs in the first 6 months? We did. Now, there is no

doubt in my mind for 1 second that if it were a Republican President and it had been a Democratic administration, there is no administration in history that wouldn't have blamed those first 6 months on their predecessor because they couldn't turn the economy around. So, since the stimulus took effect, we have gained 2 million jobs. Have we gained enough? No. We lost 8 million jobs under the Bush administration. So we have only filled 25 percent of the hole. Again, I don't know what paper you are looking at, but you check the figures.

Now, unfortunately this month, he is absolutely correct. It was disappointing, and the month before was disappointing. In fact, of course, some people are doing pretty well in America. The stock market closed at about 12,700-plus on the Dow yesterday, some $2 trillion on hand.

One of the things I think that people are worried about is making sure that we act as adults, we act responsibly, we pay our bills, and we ensure that America does not default. All I am going to say, and then I will close, is that I hope the gentleman and I can join together on Sunday and on every day thereafter between now and when we can resolve this issue so that we can pay our bills, stabilize our economy, and give what the gentleman talked a lot about in our colloquies when our positions were reversed—I remember those days—talked a lot about, and that was confidence, that was stability.

The failure for us to act, as we acted seven times in the Bush administration to raise the debt limit, and I don't have the specific number, but more than that in the Reagan administration—and by the way, during the last 4 years of the Clinton administration, does the gentleman remember how many times we raised the debt limit? Zero. Zero. Why? Because for every one of those 4 years we had a surplus, not a deficit. A surplus. And Mr. Greenspan was worried at the end of the Clinton administration that we were going to pay off the debt too quickly. And President Bush projected a $5.6 trillion surplus.

So I tell my friend that the reason I look back is to not repeat the mistakes of the past. We didn't pay our bills. We paid our bills in the nineties. We started not paying our bills again. You jettisoned the statutory PAYGO. You jettisoned it again, essentially, not the statutory part, but the rule part.

Again, I don't enjoy going back and forth on this, but I am very concerned for my country. The Speaker said he wanted to solve this problem by June 30. It is now July 7. We haven't resolved it. And the country is waiting for us. So let us hope that all of us will not say, can't do this, can't do that, can't do the other.

Let us go down to the White House on Sunday with the President, with the Senate, with the leaders of this House, and say, yes, we can. We can be responsible. We can be adults. We are going to get this done for the people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 11, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO APPOINT MEMBERS TO PERFORM THE DUTIES OF THE CHAIR

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period from August 8, 2011, through September 6, 2011, as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 91

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 91.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REED). Pursuant to House Resolution 337 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2354.

□ 1245

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water appropriations bill before the House this afternoon.

Before I begin my remarks, let me thank the full chairman, Mr. ROGERS, as well as the ranking member, Mr. DICKS, for their support of a very open process and their support of me as well as the ranking member. I would particularly like to thank my ranking member, Congressman PETE VISCLOSKY, for his dedication to our joint mission and our close working relationship. The bill is stronger for his input and knowledge.

I would also like to thank the committee staff, Rob Blair, the clerk; Joe Levin, Loraine Heckenberg, Angie Giancarlo, and Perry Yates. On the minority side, I would like to thank Taunja Berquam. I would also like to thank my personal staff, Nancy Fox and Kathleen Hazlett, and certainly recognize Mr. VISCLOSKY's personal staff in the form of Joe DeVo.

Mr. Chairman, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill supports programs critical to our Nation's security, safety, and economic competitiveness. Mr. Chairman, for far too long Federal agencies have been assuming ever-increasing budgets, leading to programs with poor rationale and even less accountability. Those days are behind us now. This bill clearly shows that much greater fiscal discipline and a strong national defense and a strong economy can be achieved together.

The bill for fiscal year 2012 provides $30.6 billion, $1 billion below fiscal year 2011, and $5.9 billion below the President's request, bringing the total spending levels for our bill down to approaching the fiscal year 2006 level. An additional $1.03 billion is emergency offset funding which is provided to help recovery and repair efforts due to the severe floods we have seen in the Mississippi and Missouri River regions. These floods have resulted in immense devastation and loss of life and livelihoods. I commend the good work of the Army Corps, which is in the front lines, along with municipal, county, State, and other Federal first responders when tragedies like this occur.

Mr. Chairman, there are no congressional earmarks in this legislation. The highest national priorities are protected by supporting the Department of Energy's national defense programs

and by preserving activities that directly support American competitiveness, such as water infrastructure and basic science research.

The bill also supports critical national security programs by providing $10.6 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration, including $195.3 million above fiscal year 2011 for weapons activities to support the modernization of our nuclear stockpile.

The bill also supports urgent, ongoing efforts to secure vulnerable nuclear materials worldwide and the full request to design a reactor for the replacement of the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine.

We've seen how catastrophic flooding can affect many lives locally and the economy nationally, and we know that yesterday's crisis could be anywhere tomorrow. This bill protects public safety and keeps America open for business by providing $4.7 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers, $195 million above the President's request, and $89 million below fiscal year 2011. The bill makes funds available above the President's request for navigation and flood control, the activities most critical to public safety, jobs, and the economy, and gives the Corps 45 days to deliver and justify their spending plans.

□ 1250

This will give each project, whether in the President's budget or not, the opportunity to compete for these funds and ensure we understand how the Corps really develops its request.

Science research at the Department of Energy strengthens American competitiveness and enables true breakthroughs in the energy sector, and the bill preserves strong funding for this program at $4.8 billion, just $43 million below fiscal year 2011.

The committee continues to support nuclear energy, providing $8 million above the request for ongoing research in promising new programs such as small modular reactors, which it funds at the request level. By reducing funding where stimulus funds are still available or where the private sector is able to invest without Federal help, the bill reduces funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy to $1.3 billion, $491 million below fiscal year 2011.

The bill also upholds historic cleanup responsibilities by funding defense environmental cleanup at $4.9 billion, less than 1 percent below last year's programmatic level, and includes language to curb the department's use of bartering to evade congressional oversight.

Finally, this bill includes numerous steps across all accounts to ensure the administration follows the will of Congress. For example, it includes funding and restrictions enforcing that Yucca Mountain is the law of the land and cannot be stopped by executive action alone. Over the years, this House, in a bipartisan fashion, has been fighting this administration's disdain for sound science and the hard-earned tax dollars of our constituents that went into building that disposal site.

Now the Government Accountability Office has issued a report saying that there is no scientific reason for shutting down Yucca, and the administration has been forced to release its own review showing that the science actually supports Yucca. Even the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's own Inspector General has released findings highly critical of the way the NRC chairman has withheld information regarding Yucca Mountain from the public and his fellow commissioners. This bill supports these findings by including $35 million to keep Yucca Mountain going and language to ensure that political appointees at the NRC can no longer inappropriately use their insider positions.

It also includes new reporting requirements so the administration must track, and show, that the investments we make in science and technology are effective uses of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I take seriously our responsibility to rein in Federal spending in fiscal year 2012. The bill is premised upon hard questions, and focused cuts where the answers didn't hold up to scrutiny. This is the sort of analysis that will get our fiscal house in order. This bill deserves our Members' support, and I look forward to an open and full process and discussion.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2010 (H.R. 2354)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil /1					
Investigations	126,746	104,000	104,000	-22,746	---
Construction	1,789,822	1,480,000	1,615,941	-173,881	+135,941
Rescission	-176,000	---	-50,000	+126,000	-50,000
Subtotal	1,613,822	1,480,000	1,565,941	-47,881	+85,941
Mississippi River and tributaries	263,906	210,000	210,000	-53,906	---
Recission	-22,000	-23,000	---	+22,000	+23,000
Rescission of emergency funding (Sec. 105)	---	-35,000	---	---	+35,000
Subtotal	241,906	152,000	210,000	-31,906	+58,000
Operations and maintenance	2,365,759	2,314,000	2,366,465	+706	+52,465
Regulatory program	189,620	196,000	196,000	+6,380	---
FUSRAP	129,740	109,000	109,000	-20,740	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	---	27,000	27,000	+27,000	---
Expenses	184,630	185,000	185,000	+370	---
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	4,990	6,000	5,000	+10	-1,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,857,213	4,573,000	4,768,406	-88,807	+195,406
Appropriations	(5,055,213)	(4,631,000)	(4,818,406)	(-236,807)	(+187,406)
Rescissions	(-198,000)	(-23,000)	(-50,000)	(+148,000)	(-27,000)
Rescissions of emergency funding	---	(-35,000)	---	---	(+35,000)

1/ Additional funding provided in Title V

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	---	29,441	25,154	+25,154	-4,287
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	---	2,000	2,000	+2,000	---
Subtotal	---	31,441	27,154	+27,154	-4,287
Program oversight and administration	---	1,550	1,550	+1,550	---
Undistributed funding level	31,940	---	---	-31,940	---
Total, Central Utah project completion account	31,940	32,991	28,704	-3,236	-4,287
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	911,673	805,187	822,300	-89,373	+17,113
Central Valley project restoration fund	49,914	53,068	53,068	+3,154	---
California Bay-Delta restoration	39,920	39,651	35,928	-3,992	-3,723
Policy and administration	61,078	60,000	60,000	-1,078	---
Indian water rights settlements	---	51,483	---	---	-51,483
San Joaquin restoration fund	---	9,000	---	---	-9,000
Rescission	---	---	-66,000	-66,000	-66,000
Subtotal	---	9,000	-66,000	-66,000	-75,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,062,585	1,018,389	905,296	-157,289	-113,093
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,094,525	1,051,380	934,000	-160,525	-117,380

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2010 (H.R. 2354)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Programs					
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	1,825,641	3,200,053	1,304,636	-521,005	-1,895,417
Rescission	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Subtotal	1,795,641	3,200,053	1,304,636	-491,005	-1,895,417
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	144,710	237,717	139,496	-5,214	-98,221
Rescission	-3,700	---	---	+3,700	---
Subtotal	141,010	237,717	139,496	-1,514	-98,221
Nuclear energy	732,124	754,028	733,633	+1,509	-20,395
Rescission	-6,300	---	---	+6,300	---
Subtotal	725,824	754,028	733,633	+7,809	-20,395
Fossil energy research and development	584,529	452,975	476,993	-107,536	+24,018
Rescission	-140,000	---	---	+140,000	---
Subtotal	444,529	452,975	476,993	+32,464	+24,018
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	22,954	14,909	14,909	-8,045	---
Rescission	-2,100	---	---	+2,100	---
Subtotal	20,854	14,909	14,909	-5,945	---
Strategic petroleum reserve	209,441	192,704	192,704	-16,737	---
Rescission	-86,300	-71,000	---	+86,300	+71,000
Subtotal	123,141	121,704	192,704	+69,563	+71,000
SPR petroleum account	---	-250,000	-500,000	-500,000	-250,000
Clean coal technology (rescission)	-16,500	---	---	+16,500	---
Northeast home heating oil reserve	10,978	10,119	10,119	-859	---
Rescission	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---
Subtotal	10,978	-89,881	-89,881	-100,859	---
Energy Information Administration	95,409	123,957	105,000	+9,591	-18,957
Rescission	-400	---	---	+400	---
Subtotal	95,009	123,957	105,000	+9,991	-18,957
Non-defense environmental clean up	224,350	219,121	213,121	-11,229	-6,000
Rescission	-900	---	---	+900	---
Subtotal	223,450	219,121	213,121	-10,329	-6,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	506,984	504,169	449,000	-57,984	-55,169
Rescission	-9,900	---	---	+9,900	---
Subtotal	497,084	504,169	449,000	-48,084	-55,169
Science	4,857,665	5,416,114	4,800,000	-57,665	-616,114
Rescission	-15,000	---	---	+15,000	---
Subtotal	4,842,665	5,416,114	4,800,000	-42,665	-616,114
Nuclear Waste Disposal	---	---	25,000	+25,000	+25,000
Rescission	-2,800	---	---	+2,800	---
Subtotal	-2,800	---	25,000	+27,800	+25,000
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy	179,640	550,011	100,000	-79,640	-450,011

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2010 (H.R. 2354)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	58,000	38,000	38,000	-20,000	---
Offsetting collection	-58,000	-38,000	-38,000	+20,000	---
Loan volume rescission	-181,830	---	---	+181,830	---
Additional loan volume	11,830	360,000	---	-11,830	-360,000
Federal participation in Title 17 loan guarantee projects	---	500,000	---	---	-500,000
Additional subsidy cost	169,660	200,000	160,000	-9,660	-40,000
Subtotal	-340	1,060,000	160,000	+160,340	-900,000
Advanced technology vehicles manufacturing loans program	9,978	6,000	6,000	-3,978	---
Better buildings pilot loan guarantee initiative:					
Loan guarantees	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Administrative costs	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Subtotal	---	105,000	---	---	-105,000
Departmental administration	250,139	240,623	221,514	-28,625	-19,109
Miscellaneous revenues	-119,501	-111,883	-111,883	+7,618	---
Net appropriation	130,638	128,740	109,631	-21,007	-19,109
Rescission	-81,900	---	---	+81,900	---
Subtotal	48,738	128,740	109,631	+60,893	-19,109
Office of the Inspector General	42,764	41,774	41,774	-990	---
Total, Energy programs	9,181,665	12,596,391	8,282,016	-899,649	-4,314,375
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration					
Weapons activities	6,946,398	7,629,716	7,131,993	+185,595	-497,723
Rescission	-50,000	-40,332	-40,332	+9,668	---
Subtotal	6,896,398	7,589,384	7,091,661	+195,263	-497,723
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	2,318,653	2,549,492	2,086,770	-231,883	-462,722
Rescission	-45,000	-30,000	-30,000	+15,000	---
Subtotal	2,273,653	2,519,492	2,056,770	-216,883	-462,722
Naval reactors	960,176	1,153,662	1,030,600	+70,424	-123,062
Rescission	-1,000	---	---	+1,000	---
Subtotal	959,176	1,153,662	1,030,600	+71,424	-123,062
Office of the Administrator	398,993	450,060	420,000	+21,007	-30,060
Rescission	-5,700	---	---	+5,700	---
Subtotal	393,293	450,060	420,000	+26,707	-30,060
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	10,522,520	11,712,598	10,599,031	+76,511	-1,113,567
Environmental and Other Defense Activities					
Defense environmental cleanup	4,991,638	5,406,781	4,937,619	-54,019	-469,162
(Transfer to Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund)	(-33,633)	---	---	(+33,633)	---
Rescission	-11,900	---	---	+11,900	---
Subtotal	4,979,738	5,406,781	4,937,619	-42,119	-469,162

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2010 (H.R. 2354)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other defense activities	788,420	859,952	814,000	+25,580	-45,952
Rescission	-3,400	---	---	+3,400	---
Subtotal	785,020	859,952	814,000	+28,980	-45,952
Total, Environmental and other defense activities	5,764,758	6,266,733	5,751,619	-13,139	-515,114
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,287,278	17,979,331	16,350,650	+63,372	-1,628,681
Power Marketing Administrations /2					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	78,444	8,428	8,428	-70,016	---
Offsetting collections	-78,444	-8,428	-8,428	+70,016	---
Subtotal	---	---	---	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	82,918	45,010	45,010	-37,908	---
Offsetting collection	-69,868	-33,118	-33,118	+36,750	---
Subtotal	13,050	11,892	11,892	-1,158	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	610,179	285,900	285,900	-324,279	---
Offsetting collections	-497,337	-189,932	-189,932	+307,405	---
Offsetting collection Colorado River Dam Fund	-3,879	---	---	+3,879	---
Subtotal	108,963	95,968	95,968	-12,995	---
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,568	4,169	4,169	+1,601	---
Offsetting collections	-2,348	-3,949	-3,949	-1,601	---
Subtotal	220	220	220	---	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	122,233	108,080	108,080	-14,153	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	298,000	304,600	304,600	+6,600	---
Revenues applied	-298,000	-304,600	-304,600	-6,600	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy	25,591,176	30,683,802	24,740,746	-850,430	-5,943,056
Appropriations	(26,285,806)	(30,925,134)	(24,911,078)	(-1,374,728)	(-6,014,056)
Rescissions	(-694,630)	(-241,332)	(-170,332)	(+524,298)	(+71,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	68,263	76,000	68,400	+137	-7,600
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	23,203	29,130	29,130	+5,927	---
Delta Regional Authority	11,677	13,000	11,700	+23	-1,300
Denali Commission	10,679	11,965	10,700	+21	-1,265
Rescission	-15,000	---	---	+15,000	---
Subtotal	-4,321	11,965	10,700	+15,021	-1,265
Northern Border Regional Commission	1,497	1,500	1,350	-147	-150
Southeast Crescent Regional Commission	250	---	250	---	+250
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	1,043,208	1,027,240	1,027,240	-15,968	---
Revenues	-906,220	-899,726	-890,713	+15,507	+9,013
Subtotal	136,988	127,514	136,527	-461	+9,013

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2010 (H.R. 2354)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2011 Enacted	FY 2012 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General	10,858	10,860	10,860	+2	---
Revenues	-9,774	-9,774	-9,774	---	---
Subtotal	1,084	1,086	1,086	+2	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	138,072	128,600	137,613	-459	+9,013
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,883	3,400	3,400	-483	---
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska natural gas transportation projects	4,457	4,032	4,032	-425	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	246,981	267,627	266,575	+19,594	-1,052
Appropriations	(261,981)	(267,627)	(266,575)	(+4,594)	(-1,052)
Rescissions	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)	---
TITLE V - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR DISASTER RELIEF					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
Construction, FY 2011 (emergency)	---	---	376	+376	+376
Mississippi River and tributaries, FY 2011 (emergency)	---	---	589,505	+589,505	+589,505
Operation and maintenance, FY 2011 (emergency)	---	---	204,927	+204,927	+204,927
Flood control and coastal emergencies, FY 2011 (emergency)	---	---	233,876	+233,876	+233,876
Subtotal, Corp of Engineers - Civil	---	---	1,028,684	+1,028,684	+1,028,684
Transfer from title XII, P.L. 111-5 (emergency)	---	---	-1,028,684	-1,028,684	-1,028,684
Rescission of emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5)	---	---	-471,316	-471,316	-471,316
Total, Title V, Emergency supplemental for disaster relief	---	---	-471,316	-471,316	-471,316
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	---	---
Rescissions of emergency appropriations	---	---	(-471,316)	(-471,316)	(-471,316)
Grand total	31,789,895	36,575,809	30,238,411	-1,551,484	-6,337,398
Appropriations	(32,697,525)	(36,875,141)	(30,996,059)	(-1,701,466)	(-5,879,082)
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	---	---
Rescissions	(-907,630)	(-264,332)	(-286,332)	(+621,298)	(-22,000)
Rescissions of emergency appropriations	---	(-35,000)	(-471,316)	(-471,316)	(-436,316)

2/ Totals adjusted to net out alternative financing costs, reimbursable agreement funding, and power purchase and wheeling expenditures. Offsetting collection totals only reflect funds collected for annual expenses, excluding power purchase wheeling.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his staff for their efforts to be inclusive and transparent in drafting this legislation. The chairman has ensured that the Energy and Water Subcommittee continues its tradition of bipartisanship and, within the constraints of the allocation, he has done wonderful work. While I hope that we can modify some elements of the bill, I would observe that our differences are marginal and our agreement is fundamental. Also, I would like to join the chairman in thanking the other members of the subcommittee and also all of our staff for their exceptionally good and dedicated work.

As the chairman mentioned, the allocation for Energy and Water is more than $1 billion below fiscal year 2011. This allocation has necessitated severe cuts to crucial programs. While I appreciate the chairman's considerable efforts and recognize difficult choices must be made to address the Nation's serious financial situation, this bill starkly illustrates the shortsighted nature of the spending cap set by the House budget. The allocation for Energy and Water is simply insufficient to meet the challenges posed by the economic downturn and to guarantee our national security.

Importantly, the chairman continues efforts to improve program and project management at all of the agencies under the bill's jurisdiction. He has honed provisions carried in the past and instituted others aimed at increased oversight. To point out one example, the bill includes a requirement that the Department of Energy complete independent cost estimates at major milestones for projects with a total cost in excess of $100 million. A recent review of the department's cleanup-related construction projects by the Army Corps of Engineers paints a bleak picture of the management system for such projects and casts doubt on recent reforms intended to remove the department off the Government Accountability Office's list for high risk, a list that the department has been on for the last 21 years running. I am pleased the chairman has included a number of reporting requirements and statutory limitations that will contribute to increased transparency and improved management, and I strongly support his actions.

The science account, critical to the competitiveness of our Nation, is essentially the same as in 2011, not an insignificant achievement in light of the challenge the allocation provided. The bill also provides funds for the continuation of a promising new program called ARPA–E, which can drive innovations to support our scientific competitiveness. While ARPA–E has shown some promise as a new organizational model, I am troubled that the same vigor that led to its creation has been largely absent when it comes to addressing the systemic management and communication problems in other existing applied programs.

I support and appreciate the inclusion of emergency funding to respond to the historic flooding in the Mississippi and Missouri River basins. Communities devastated by natural disasters deserve our full support. I am, however, disappointed that the bill offsets this funding by withdrawing critical investment dollars from economic infrastructure in the United States. I would note that this is the second time this year that the committee has transferred funds between bills, the first time from Energy and Water Development to Homeland Security, and now from Transportation to Energy and Water. We need to reconsider this practice and not strip investments in one area to pay for emergency needs in another.

I disagree with the notion that all funding for domestic emergency response should be offset immediately from domestic investment. In every year except two since 1997, the Congress has recognized the need for emergency funds to respond to the impacts of natural disasters on the Nation's water resource infrastructure. Since 2001, the Congress has provided more than $24 billion to the Corps for this purpose. While I grant that this figure is inflated by the enormous cost of reconstructing New Orleans and the surrounding areas, perhaps New Orleans would not have flooded in 2005 had we invested in critical infrastructure in the prior years.

As we debate the long-term trajectory of taxes and spending, we cannot forgo actions necessary for the security and safety of our citizens. Yes, we must make difficult choices that will impact the future of this Nation, but we cannot allow those decisions to fall on the backs of those who have already suffered. Our country has provided billions in infrastructure funding on an emergency basis for dams, schools and roads in Iraq and Afghanistan. Yet we don't have the fortitude to acknowledge that it costs money to protect our citizens at home. We must stop disinvesting in the United States economy. In its 2009 report card on America's infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers estimated an investment of $2.2 trillion is necessary to bring our Nation's infrastructure up to a good condition. Moving forward, we must have the strength to budget for emergencies on an annual basis. We know they happen every year, and it is time to begin to responsibly budget for them.

I appreciate the chairman increasing Corps funding by $195 million above the President's woefully inadequate request, ensuring that some ongoing projects will not be terminated.

□ 1300

Even with this additional funding, the bill provides $677 million less than it did in 2010.

Our ports, harbors, navigational channels and locks continue to provide the foundation for long-term economic growth. At this funding level, we are not close to addressing the dredging backlog that plagues waterborne commerce in the United States.

Currently, for the top 59 ports in the United States, the Corps is only able to maintain authorized steps within the middle of the channel 33 percent of the time. Every day, this costs companies that rely on these ports money and serves as a major impediment to expanding their workforce. This is merely one of the reasons why in 2009 the American Society of Civil Engineers gave our Nation's dams, levees and inland waterways grades of D or D minus.

Renewable energy programs in this bill are reduced. We can debate whether our dependency on imported oil and other carbon fuels is an environmental problem or an economic problem. Either way, it is clearly a national security problem. We must expand the mix of our energy supply, and we must use the energy supply we have more efficiently, and we must also transport it more effectively. We have to make an investment to do that, and I do not believe that the allocation allows for the support necessary.

I would note that the bill adds two hubs to the Department of Energy while cutting both the Science and Renewable Energy accounts that fund them, giving the Department a total of five. This organizational model has not yet been proven, and I have serious reservations about starting two new hubs in light of the cuts to the underlying accounts.

Nonproliferation accounts are reduced significantly, and while I appreciate the chairman's efforts to preserve some of the most critical activities, the bill reduces our ability to counter the most serious threat confronting our national security and that is the threat of nuclear terrorism.

The bill cuts the defense nuclear nonproliferation account by more than $460 million from the request. This comes on top of more than $360 million cut from the request that was provided in final fiscal year bill 2011. These cuts reduce our ability to secure vulnerable nuclear materials around the world, delaying the removal of bomb-grade uranium, and limiting our capacity to detect illegal and illicit trafficking of nuclear materials.

And, finally, I am troubled that the bill includes a misguided prohibition on funds to develop, adopt, implement, administer or enforce a change or supplement to rules related to the Clean Water Act regulatory guidelines. This provision applies not only to this fiscal year but to any subsequent energy and water act. We should be taking actions that address legitimate concerns while providing some clarity and certainty to the regulatory process, not prolonging the confusion, as this provision ensures.

In closing, I am truly appreciative that we are again doing the work of

this committee, and I commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS for their efforts to this end. And as I said at the beginning of my remarks, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has done a superb job. While marginal differences exist, our agreement on the overall bill is fundamental.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this is a great bill. It's a model of fiscal restraint. I can attest to the fact that the committee has taken a long, hard look at each and every line in this bill to make sure that we are getting the greatest value from each and every taxpayer dollar spent, cutting back funding for programs that are not operating up to par. This bill is also proof that we can make these commonsense spending reductions without damaging or impairing the programs that help keep our country safe and our citizens at work.

This legislation rightly appropriates taxpayer dollars where they should be, in programs that provide the greatest benefits to the American people and that get the economy moving again. This includes $30.6 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Energy and a host of independent agencies, including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Now, that is $5.9 billion below the President's request; it's a billion dollars below current spending levels.

The Energy and Water appropriations bill funds important work that affects every community in every single one of our colleagues' districts. These are the quality-of-life programs that preserve our public safety and our economic competitiveness, including energy independence programs and national defense programs within the Department of Energy. This bill supports Army Corps construction projects, projects which are vital to national security and which are of a tangible impact on job creation.

But this year's bill is unlike any Energy and Water appropriations bill in recent memory, or perhaps even in history, in one major way. Some of our colleagues and critics were no doubt wondering how we could write this bill under the earmark moratorium, but I am proud that we have been able to craft a responsible bill that funds projects across the Nation without one single earmark. By doing so, we have made the process much more transparent, requiring that organizations like the Corps provide an outline of how, when, and why they are spending precious Federal dollars while maintaining the constitutionally mandated congressional authority over budget decisions. We have retained the power of the purse and strict oversight of these agencies.

On the subject of oversight, I would like particularly to note that $35 million is included to continue the Yucca Mountain review process. The committee has supported these efforts for years, and I am relieved to see that the rest of Congress is finally beginning to see the light and support this program and to realize the extent to which the administration's position ignores good science and wastes billions of taxpayer dollars.

While providing the vital funding for our Nation's energy and water programs, the bill abides by the committee's promise, and my promise as chairman, that we would cut spending wherever and whenever we can.

I must commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the subcommittee members and staff and the ranking member who have worked so closely together on this bill. They have found the significant spending reductions in areas that seem excessive and unnecessary increases, and in these accounts with large unspent balances. This is the responsible and serious way to get our budgets back into balance and to help keep us on track toward economic recovery.

Again, I want to thank Mr. VISCLOSKY and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for doing a great job in bringing a bill to the floor under difficult circumstances. They work collegially and they work intelligently together, and I want to particularly thank the subcommittee staff on both sides of the aisle for their tireless effort putting together this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill that all of us can support, and I urge that we do just that.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I deeply respect my colleagues coming here and raising the subject of increased funds in this bill for the Corps of Engineers. I also want to thank Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. VISCLOSKY for understanding this very important need. That money, in construction accounts and the Mississippi River and Tributaries account, will go to address an immediate need to repair and rebuild flood protection so that the victims of the historic flooding all up and down the Mississippi River and the Missouri River can recover from the terrible losses they have suffered.

It's not just the people in the southern Missouri district I represent who need help; it's also people in Louisiana, in Iowa, in North Dakota, in Kentucky, in Mississippi, Illinois and a host of other States.

□ 1310

Throughout the country, people who rely on flood protection to shelter their homes, their schools, their churches, and their workplaces have seen their lives and their livelihoods totally disrupted. In one Missouri county alone, the economic losses from flooding are estimated at over $300 million. In the entire MR&T, the total exceeds 4 billion.

Without the certainty of future repairs to the levee systems that protect them, these Americans will remain at risk. They will be unable to rebuild. They'll find it difficult to get insurance. They'll watch their family businesses slip away with the receding floodwaters. Long after the disaster, there will be many, many personal disasters—even if it never rains another drop.

I know that some of our colleagues have raised concerns that this funding will come at a cost to future years of high-speed rail development. I greatly appreciate the desire to retain the promise of funding for those projects, but I must ask them to weigh the immediate need for flood protection against the future need for high-speed rail.

If these repairs aren't completed by next spring, a flood protection system that barely holds against the record flood of 2011 will be in extreme danger in 2012. The Corps would not have the same tools at its disposal to avert flooding in many parts of the country, including major urban areas along the river, like Memphis, Tennessee, just for example.

The funds in this bill respond to an unanticipated disaster of enormous magnitude. Failure to fund the effort to reset the levee system nationwide is an unnecessary risk with widespread economic and public safety implications.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the certainty this funding provides to distressed families all over the country, and I ask them to support a responsible arrangement to fund the Corps of Engineers during a very difficult budgetary climate for the Congress and the Nation.

In closing, I'm very, very grateful for the support of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for this funding increase.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

We continually hear from the Republicans that the pain of budget cuts has to be spread all around. Everyone has to deal with some pain. But we saw that was completely untrue in their budget plan. The GOP said, Sorry Grandma, not enough money for Medicare; sorry, low-income kids, we can't afford Medicaid. But billions, billions in tax breaks for Big Oil companies, they all stay on the books. They don't even touch any of the tax breaks for Big Oil, for Big Gas, for Big Coal. Tax loopholes that help keep companies offshoring jobs, those were too important to cut as well.

The Republican plan is about misplaced priorities, and we see it in full

display here, once again, today in this bill on the House floor. When it comes to nuclear power, the Republicans want to spend more taxpayer money after Fukushima. When it comes to coal, Republicans want to spend more taxpayer money. This bill even keeps alive the deepwater drilling program, ensuring that millions in tax breaks continue to be wasted on developing oil drilling technologies that rich oil companies already have and can afford to pay for themselves by tipping American consumers upside down at the pumps every time they go to refill their gas tanks. They don't need taxpayer money to do this. The last in line should be oil companies. They're the first in line. They are the first in line under the Republican agenda.

Now, when it comes to clean energy, though, when it comes to the future, what young people think should be the future of our country—solar, wind, geothermal, biomass, clean vehicles, hybrids, plug-in vehicles, all-electric vehicles, more efficient buildings, increases in science spending for research so we make the breakthroughs in energy research and weatherizing homes and buildings—what does this budget do? Down, down, down, down, down. They cut those budgets, every one of them. They cut the future. They cut the future. What do they do for the past, for oil, for coal, for gas, for Yucca Mountain nuclear waste dump? Up, up, up with the past. That's what this whole debate is about. It's a debate about the past versus the future.

And their budget, this budget, cuts the future. It cuts it in a radical way. And it says to the young people in our country, you're going to have to wait for another generation before we see the breakthroughs in wind and solar and all-electric vehicles.

That's the message to young people all across our country in this Republican budget. They cut wind and solar $134 million. They cut clean vehicle technology $46 million, green building technology $61 million, science research $43 million, weatherization $141 million. The list goes on and on and on—more money for technologies of the past, less money for technologies of the future.

I will have an amendment next week that will give us an opportunity to rectify some of these misplaced spending priorities. But I have to hand it to my Republican colleagues for one thing. They are actually being honest.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

I have to hand it to my Republican colleagues. They are being honest with this bill. For the first time, unequivocally, the Republicans are telling Americans that their plan is to retreat from a clean energy future, from a solar, wind, biomass and all-electric future. They are saying it here, We want to cut all of those programs.

There's no hiding behind the numbers. They're screaming out here at the Members of the House on the floor and to the young people of our country. They're screaming, We are going to retreat from the future. They can't talk about their all-of-the-above energy program anymore. No, ladies and gentlemen. Their program is not all of the above. It's oil above all. That's what it's about. That's how they keep the tax breaks. That's how they keep the subsidies for the oil industry. They cut the programs for wind and solar.

Now, which industry in America is the last one, right now, that needs a tax break? It's the oil industry. They're recording the largest profits of any corporations in the history of America. If we're going to begin anywhere, can we begin with them? Do we have to take it out of clean energy to keep all the tax breaks for those wealthiest companies?

Do you know who's the happiest right now, who is really smiling? The corners of their mouths are turned upwards all across Venezuela, all across Saudi Arabia, and all across OPEC. They're looking out here at the Republican budget for the future, and they're saying, Ah, we can sleep at night. We don't have to worry that there will be more efficient vehicles. We don't have to worry that they're moving to an all-electric vehicle future. We don't have to worry that they're going to tell us that they don't need our oil any more than we need their sand. No. Their message is going to be, Bring it on. Let us continue to go on our hands and knees and beg for them to please produce more oil, please sell us more oil at $100 a barrel. Please do that. That's what this Republican budget says.

Vote ''no.''

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and simply to make a point about the emergency funds and the offset that's provided to the Army Corps of Engineers.

I think everyone is aware, but I want to emphasize the dire situation we have today on the Mississippi River and, certainly, the very dire situation we have on the Missouri River that is costing lives, costing livelihoods, businesses, and the futures for so many families.

We also, Mr. Chairman, have a dire situation with our deficit today, and we've got to address that. In order to fund the immediate repairs for the life-saving levees, the committee proposed an offset from the high-speed rail. And that's really a program that they're talking about that in 10 years still won't be beyond the planning phases.

□ 1320

As the chairman of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee on Appropriations, I understand that a portion of this money would have gone to very important projects in the Northeast corridor. Some of these projects have great merit, and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has been the strongest advocate for funding for these programs that do have merit. He understands it; I understand it. We will do everything that we can to fund those projects because they are needed up there.

But I will also say that today we have an emergency beyond anything that I have ever seen before in my years. It would be a week ago Wednesday that I was standing on a levee by the Missouri River by the town of Percival, Iowa. Farmers were there on the other side of the levee trying to fix boils that were coming through underneath the levee, trying to save their farms, their communities. Some of those farmers, they were fifth- and sixth-generation farms, and they were fighting desperately to save their livelihood and their family's heritage. That was 3 in the afternoon on Wednesday. At 4 the next morning, Thursday morning, that levee blew out. And those livelihoods, those thousands of acres of farmland, the town of Percival itself is now underwater.

That is why these funds are desperately needed today, as soon as possible, to make sure that we can fund the type of emergency that we have going on today.

The Army Corps of Engineers needs that money today so they can repair those levees so we can save lives and livelihoods and the heritage for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, today is not a question of what we want. We all want to see improvements in the Northeast corridor, and we are going to do everything we can to make that happen. But it is about what is needed today, what is an emergency today, what funds have to go to dire problems that we face and the dire consequences we will face if, in fact, we do not do the work that we need to do today.

I commend the chairman for his great work.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair and the members of the committee and the exceptional staff that we have for their good work.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that

Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the very notion of freedom of expression was recently on trial in the Netherlands. The popular Dutch lawmaker Geert Wilders was charged with discrimination and incitement of hatred after he made a movie depicting Islamic clerics who incite violence in the name of religion. He was prosecuted not for his actions, but for his words. That is a scary thought.

There was only one proper resolution here, and, thankfully, the court did the right thing. Wilders was acquitted of all charges. The court ruled that his statements might be offensive to Muslims, but fell within the bounds of political free debate.

Freedom of speech is a God-given right to which every person and every nation is entitled. It is no coincidence that our country's Founding Fathers deemed it so important they listed it first in the Bill of Rights. A country that refuses one's freedom of speech is doomed to grow stagnant. How can it develop as a society when it stifles or tries to punish opinion? As Wilders himself said, ''Every public debate holds the prospect of enlightenment.'' He certainly is correct.

And that's just the way it is.

THE TRUTH

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor and a privilege to be here speaking on the House floor. It is interesting these days being a part of Congress. The media is given unfettered access to so much because we believe that people should be entitled to the truth. In fact, many libraries around the country have the line ''the truth shall set you free.'' Of course, most people don't know where that came from. It was Jesus talking about him being the truth, and he was the truth. A lot of libraries that put that up don't realize that's what it is talking about. And I imagine there are a lot of reporters who have used that same line, and they don't know where that came from.

But what gets troubling is when reporters have access to complete transcripts, video, and they intentionally set out to deceive the public. It seems to happen a great deal. I personally think it is one of the reasons that Fox News has just taken off so strongly, because people can see that the other cable news networks, so many of them at least, have such a slant. They don't give you the whole truth. There is nothing fair or balanced about some of the presentations. I know personally, having been on a CNN show where they cut your mike off for 4½ minutes, trash-mouth you for awhile, turn your microphone on, and then refuse to acknowledge that there is even the possibility that what you're saying is true when you know, indeed, it is true.

But this happened just here in the last week. I was on a Fox Business show, and we were talking about the money being spent by this White House and also comparing that to the Bush White House, and I had the data, absolute factual data that, for example, in the Bush White House, there were 447 total staff, and in the Obama staff there are 454 total White House staff.

□ 1330

You wouldn't think seven additional people would be that big of a deal except that nearly a fourth of the Bush White House staff—102 people, in fact—made under $40,000; whereas, in the Obama White House, there is no paid staff member who gets less than $40,000. So you see dramatically the difference. I was pointing out that perhaps, in the Obama White House, because of all the greatness of this White House as compared to prior White House staffs, that you deserve to be paid more because you're associated with so much more greatness in this White House.

It's interesting to see over the last 6½ years I've been in Congress that there are an awful lot of people in the mainstream media, especially in Washington, who do not understand sarcasm, who do not understand facetiousness. So, at times, it's funny to say things sarcastically, knowing that they won't get it.

But in any event, we also commented on the fact that there were all these—I think 34—czars in the Obama White House, and they're getting paid tremendous amounts of money. So Fox News had published an article, and they pointed these things out. They were talking about the interview, and they got all of the quotes accurate.

As they pointed out, it said: ''The White House released its annual salary report to Congress, and like anything in Washington, it depends on who you ask if they went up too much or are an adequate reflection of the tough economic times and have moved down.''

This is the writing of Kimberly Schwandt with Fox News.

Ms. Schwandt goes on to say: ''The salaries, which can be seen here, show that about a third of the employees make more than $100,000 per year and the lowest earn $41,000, except for three people who are working for no compensation, or zero annual salary; 21 employees made the maximum of $172,000.

''The White House backs the figures, saying that salaries went down an average of $150 per person and that total salary spending decreased, in part, due to the total number of staffers going down as well.''

Then a quote from spokesman Eric Schultz from the White House: ''President Obama is deeply committed to continuing to reduce costs in government. However, some critics say they are spending too much, like Representative Louie Gohmert, Republican of Texas.''

He quoted me accurately as saying: '''In the White House, in looking at it, this administration's got over 450 employees. Now, under the Bush administration, there were over 100. About a fourth of the employees made less than $40,000.'

''Fox News fact-checked, and the Congressman's statements do pan out, with 102 of the 447 employees on the 2008 list having salaries of less than $40,000.''

Another quote from me. I said: '''I guess, you know, there's so much greatness when you associate with this White House you deserve to be paid more. I don't know,' he said.

''Gohmert added another sarcastic jab, 'Don't forget the 34—the 34 czars that are out there dictating policy, and let's face it. When you're a dictator, you need to be paid more.'''

Then it points out: ''As the economy faltered, President Obama enacted a pay freeze earlier in his administration for top wage-earners. Wednesday, at a Twitter town hall, he referenced the freeze.''

Of course, as we've learned from this White House and as we know from the House rules, the President never lies or misrepresents, but certainly there are many facts that are just wrong. For example, when the President ordered our troops to bomb Libya and be involved in what he called a ''kinetic attack'' in Libya, which was clearly military action, he said we would be there for days, not weeks or months. It has turned out it's months and maybe years unless Congress gets the Senate to go along with one of the things we passed here in the House, to cut off the spending in a country where this President is fighting for and with a group that may turn out to be worse than the bloodthirsty, mean-spirited Qadhafi has been.

In any event, there was an article written in The Hill newspaper. Again, this was fact-checked by Fox News, but it's just interesting. You hear about it all the time, the slant of the mainstream media. It's interesting because The Hill has reporters like Molly Hooper. I've never had her be anything but completely honest and truthful. She has always, that I'm aware of, been fair to me and fair in her reporting that I've seen; but this one is a person named Judy Kurtz, who just, I have to say, was dishonest. This is the story that Judy Kurtz wrote this week, July 6, in The Hill.

She quoted me as saying: ''I guess there's just so much greatness when you're associated with this White House that you deserve to be paid more,' Representative Louie Gohmert said. 'Let's face it. When you're a dictator, you need to be paid more.' ''

That gave the impression to people who read the article and who had picked up on it that I was saying President Obama was a dictator. In this setting, that is not what I said. The interesting point is just how clearly deceptive and dishonest Judy Kurtz was. She took two quotes. She had access to the whole video, to the whole transcript, and chose to put them together and give the wrong impression. When you do look at the full quote in context, we were talking about the czars, that there is so much greatness when you're associated with this White House that you deserve to be paid more, but then ''don't forget the 34—the 34 czars that are out there dictating policy, and let's face it. When you're a dictator, you need to be paid more.''

So it is important to note there are some reporters you can trust even within the same newspaper, and there are some who can be dishonest.

During my days as a trial judge of major civil litigation and felonies, including through death penalty cases, the rule of evidence was always—and is—that credibility is always an issue. It's always an issue. Everyone should understand that, especially reporters, who are so important to this country's being different from any other country in the world.

So it's hoped that more and more reporters will get back to deserving their protected status that they have under the Constitution and have a little more responsibility than Judy Kurtz did. I did appreciate Ms. Kurtz' noting that I was being sarcastic to be sure that people like her didn't miss it. I didn't just leave it to chance. I pointed out verbally that I was being sarcastic, so I'm glad she got that part of the quote anyway.

□ 1340

But nonetheless, I've heard from people that were shocked that I called President Obama a dictator. Now they know the context.

But there are some important things going on; and with the massive overspending we're getting, it's important to understand who is spending money where they shouldn't. We have just voted out the Defense appropriation bill today. There were a number of amendments that were voted on that would defund the action this President has committed us to in Libya. This President has repeatedly said that he doesn't believe he violated the War Powers Act and doesn't believe he needed to comply. But he certainly didn't comply with the War Powers Act. He certainly didn't get approval of Congress before he took such action.

Most Presidents, knowing that Congress constitutionally has the power of the purse, have come to Congress, and the President has made his case to Congress as to why we should be involved in a theater of operation that the President wanted to commit us to. Not this President, of course. This President heard from the Arab League; he heard from apparently some in NATO and the U.N., and decided that they were more important than a consensus from Congress, not even from the Senate. The Senate is Democrat controlled. The President didn't bother to get a vote or even approval tacitly from the Senate and here in the House, where this body, especially as a Republican majority, has steadfastly stood with the President of any party when that President committed troops to harm's way.

In this case, there are still some in the Republican Party who have said I don't think we ought to be in Libya; but I'm afraid if I vote to cut off funding to the action in Libya, then it may be perceived as not being supportive of the troops. Some of us who have been in the military and still talk constantly to people in the military know the common response we get from the military goes something like this: Sir, we take orders. We salute and we follow our orders. That's what we took an oath to do. And if we're ordered to go to Libya or anywhere else, we will salute and go. But we hope, we pray that somebody in Washington will use some good sense so that when we lay down our lives in the call of duty from Washington that it will not be in vain. Please take action to make sure that when we lay down our lives, it's not wasted.

And for this administration and some in Congress, certainly not a majority, to think it's a good idea to go into Libya and to get our services involved in an action which Secretary of Defense Gates said we have no national security interest in that action—it's not a good idea—and when we find out factually that there are al Qaeda, a group with whom we are at war, and when there are Muslim Brotherhood, who believe in violence, involved in the rebel action against an evil Qadhafi, then wisdom would indicate you should find out if the person that is going to be replaced by your bombs and your military or kinetic action—you have an obligation to find out—is going to be worse than the person you're replacing.

And we don't know that. In fact, the indications are whoever replaces Qadhafi in this current rebel group will likely be a tremendous enemy of Israel, a significant enemy of the United States. It may be a situation in which the people that replace an intolerant leader like Qadhafi may be worse than Qadhafi, just as we saw happen in Iran back when Jimmy Carter was President.

As I recall, I believe Jimmy Carter welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini back as a man of peace. Well, Khomeini's idea of peace was a whole lot different than most of ours and certainty the party's in Congress that's in the majority, because Khomeini's idea of peace was a world in which there is a world-wide caliphate and one great Muslim leader dictates what peace means. He dictates shari'a law for everyone. There is no freedom of worship for Christians, for Buddhists—certainly not for Jewish people of orthodox faith, absolutely not. In fact, they're obviously infidels from the things that were written and the things that can only be written and spoken in the Middle East.

In Egypt, Mubarak was a problem, but Mubarak had seen the handwriting on the wall. And he was moving toward some local elections and could see he needed to move toward the idea of democracy, but didn't want to give up power. Mubarak, for all his flaws, at least was not an active belligerent against Israel. Qadhafi we knew had blood on his hands, but we also saw from Ronald Reagan dropping bombs down his smokestack back, I believe in '86—and then again when the United States moved into Iraq we saw it again—Qadhafi was afraid of us. And perhaps it's better to have a leader who is afraid of you in power than people who are religious fanatics who have sworn that their goal in life is to bring your country down.

One of the important things—and to me, I think it's the most important job, Mr. Speaker, here in Congress—is to provide for the common defense. We heard the President down at the border not along ago say he has committed more Federal troops to our border than any President ever—more people down there to protect our border anyway. Actually, he probably didn't have enough history training to know that in 1916 President Woodrow Wilson—I'm not a big fan of President Wilson's, but nonetheless, after a man named Pancho Villa was responsible for coming across into the United States and killing some Americans, Wilson committed General Pershing to go—my recollection is it was around 14,000 troops that went into Mexico. Because Pancho Villa had come across our sovereign border and killed people, then it was deemed to be appropriate to chase him down wherever he might go because that individual, with his cronies, had declared war on us and taken warlike action.

And there was also a group, a new group basically, the National Guard, that was called up. One account I read said over 100,000 National Guard soldiers were called to our southern border to ensure that no one came across and killed Americans again.

Now, I know that President Bush committed National Guard troops. I was very disappointed that the troops were not put on the border. They were put miles back, and they were given rules of engagement that said, in essence, if you see some armed group coming from across the border, then you are to report it and then flee the

area. Well, that's not what should have been done, and I can assure what's being done today is not what should be done, where we take more action to go against the States that are trying to defend themselves than we do to try to defend the States themselves.

□ 1350

But we are at a crucial time in this country's history. Admiral Mullen said the national debt is the biggest threat to our security. But take your pick. Whether it's a nation like Iran that is led by a religious zealot who may be crazy—but he's not stupid—they've got people working toward, around the clock, moving toward having nuclear weaponry. They already have at least one bomb. And even though our friends down in the majority in the Senate, even though in this White House so many say, ''Oh, no. We just need to step up sanctions and all will be well. We'll bring them into line,'' Iran knows that once they've got enough in the way of nuclear weaponry that they'll be able to extort countries into removing any type of sanctions.

People in Israel are well aware, most of them—certainly Prime Minister Netanyahu is—that when Iran has adequate nuclear weaponry, they'll be a threat to Israel. They'll be a threat to freedom. They'll be a threat to liberty around the world because they will be able to take blackmail or extorted action to get countries to either do as they say or a nuclear weapon will be going off in that country.

They're working on the missiles. They'll be able to carry those nuclear weapons to places like the United States. Even now, it wouldn't take a missile to put a nuclear weapon on a boat, a yacht, to bring it into one of our harbors. And let's face it. We saw our vulnerability on 9/11, many of us, even though I was a judge at the time. We said we can never let ourselves be that vulnerable again. And here we are, nearly 10 full years later, and we're allowing a madman, a religious zealot in Iran, to develop nuclear weapons. Sanctions haven't worked. They're not working. The centrifuges are still turning. They're still developing nuclear weaponry.

We've got these type of threats in the world, and instead of standing firm as Ronald Reagan did, which led to bringing down the Iron Curtain, this administration has chosen to placate our enemies and turn against many of our allies.

That was further brought home to me when I traveled with DANA ROHRABACHER and a couple of other Members of Congress. There were warlords from the Northern Alliance of Afghanistan that wanted to meet with us because we were told that the administration didn't want to meet with them. And after we met with them, it was clear why the administration wouldn't want to.

Now, I was not aware—and it was during the Bush administration of course, our initial actions in Afghanistan—we sent in intelligence. We sent in special forces. We sent in weaponry. We equipped the Northern Alliance tribes who had a special personal interest in defeating the Taliban. Afghanistan, as a whole, had seen how evil the Taliban was, how much damage they could do to society as they burned paintings and books and films and totally suppressed freedom in Afghanistan. Well, they knew. These people are evil, but they were afraid of them. But with the United States weaponry, with our guidance, intelligence, training, these people defeated the Taliban.

What I was not aware of until we met with these folks—and it turns out I could have been aware. I just was not. But you do the research. You'll find out. The Bush administration convinced the Northern Alliance, Okay. Now that you've whipped the Taliban, you need to totally disarm, because we're the United States, and we're here, and we'll make sure nothing happens to you again.

Well, the Northern Alliance messed up because they trusted us, and they turned in their weapons. I asked one, You turned in all your weapons? Well, apparently, they have some small arms but nothing that would allow them to take on the Taliban again. Naturally, these people were concerned, because they know because they fought for and with the United States against the Taliban that, if the Taliban is allowed to overtly exist in Afghanistan, then these people that fought for us and with us will all be killed as will all their family members.

They were and are our allies. They fought for us. They defeated the Taliban, and now we're on the verge of leaving these people disarmed, vulnerable, and to be killed by the very people we went into Afghanistan after. It doesn't have to be this way. It doesn't have to be this way at all.

I mean, we can learn from the past. Rearm the Northern Alliance. We perceive the arrogance, the condescension not only from Prime Minister Maliki in Iraq but certainly from the leader in Afghanistan, Karzai, certainly from his brother. There's just too much arrogance there. All kinds of stories about corruption. But whether or not you believe that, it's clear that the Taliban is being allowed to do things now in Afghanistan that we were supposed to have eliminated by our coming in.

It may well be, as one Afghan told me, that once we begin, if we would, to rearm the Northern Alliance, Karzai might be a lot more cooperative than he has been.

But nonetheless, a year ago, we were being told, Your administration in Washington, the Obama administration, is indirectly talking, negotiating with the Taliban to just let the United States out without any big incidents, and then they can have whatever they take. And that's when they pointed out, You can't let this happen. You can't do this to your allies.

Well, we've already seen it with Israel. We voted with Israel's enemies in May of last year, I believe it was, to demand that Israel disclose all of their weaponry, their nuclear weaponry. It's the first time the United States had joined forces with Israel's enemies, and it was one of the reasons that shortly after that that we saw the flotilla come from Turkey down to challenge the Israeli blockade. That was a blockade for one thing: weapons. Prevent weapons from going into the Gaza Strip. The rockets were coming every day. Israelis had been killed. There was no reason to allow those weapons to come into the Gaza Strip. It was a legitimate blockade. It came after we showed distance between our great ally Israel and this country.

That also came on the heels of the President snubbing Prime Minister Netanyahu. And of course Prime Minister Netanyahu has not spoken of this that I've ever heard or read, but certainly others noted how badly he was snubbed by the President just blowing him off where normally you would have a meal, saying, Good luck on your own, and when you get ready to accept what I told you to do, then send me a note and I'll come back and see you. But anyway, we have not been allies as we should be to Israel.

But it was after that when I started pushing to try to get Prime Minister Netanyahu, the leader of Israel, to be invited in this room. Speaker PELOSI, when I broached the subject with her, thought it was a good idea, but she didn't feel there was adequate time. And I brought it up in June, between then and the end of the year, to work him in.

□ 1400

Obviously, we did have to name a lot of courthouses and had athletic teams to congratulate, so we weren't able to get to that. But Speaker BOEHNER, to his credit, did extend the invitation. Prime Minister Netanyahu did an incredible job. With the ideas he put forth, he did an incredible job, from the second level here, of addressing this body and addressing the world from here in Congress.

What I had hoped for came to pass. The world got an incredible visual image of the fact that this body, both sides of the aisle, that can't hardly agree on much of anything, over and over—I am told 26 times—stood to applaud the leader of Israel, showing the world that we are united in our support of our friend Israel from Congress, regardless of what the house down Pennsylvania Avenue does the rest of the time. Congress controls the purse strings, and Congress is a friend of Israel and vice versa.

So it is important, in order to provide for the common defense of this country, that we make sure that our allies know, if you're our friend, then we stand by you. If you're our enemy, then we will do as President Kennedy pointed out, as President Bush pointed

out: We will seek you wherever you are, and we will eliminate you as an enemy. By doing that, you can have peace in the world.

There is a sign that emerges from time to time. People carry it around. I've seen it up here. I've seen it in New York: ''War never brought about peace.'' It says a great deal about the history teachers that an individual that would carry that kind of sign must have had because the only time you have peace for an extended period is when a big-hearted country does take on evil that has grown too big and becomes a threat to people's liberty and freedom and defeats that evil. Then you have a period of peace.

And the only way it becomes an extended peace is when a country is strong enough, or countries are strong enough, that the world knows if you become a threat to our liberty, our freedom, then we will eliminate you as a threat to freedom.

Now, again, there are those who believe shari'a law talks of freedom and peace, but that's a freedom and peace as dictated by the ultimate leader of the group. That also brings me back to the issue of the Muslim Brotherhood. This administration has given the indication that they think it is a group of peace. You can go on Wikipedia, and the proponents of the Muslim Brotherhood have done an excellent job of cleaning up the history that shows them to be supporters of terrorism and the numerous ties linking them to terrorism in the world.

They've also done a good job of making this administration believe that they're peaceful and loving to the point that, as Denis McDonough, the number two person in our national security agency or administration, thanked President Magid, Imam Magid, the president of the Islamic Society of North America, for the wonderful prayer he gave inside the White House in the celebration of Iftar last year, the end of Ramadan, that President Obama had.

The Islamic Society of North America, ISNA, is a named co-conspirator—was—in the Holy Land Foundation trials in which the first five defendants were found guilty of 108 counts of supporting terrorism. And when some tried to have their names stricken because they were not indicted in that first action, the judge, in essence, ruled there has been a prima facie case here showing that they are linked and supportive of terrorism; we're not eliminating their names.

So it was shocking to some of us when the Holder Justice Department dropped the cases against the named coconspirators and refused to go forward with them. This notebook has some of the materials, and there are plenty of them, as anybody can see. This is a thimbleful compared to what is there. You want checks from the Islamic Centers' co-op funds? You want deposit slips? You want ledgers? The FBI's gathered all this stuff. There are great cases against these groups that the Holder Justice Department decided not to pursue.

And when we had Attorney General Holder in front of our Judiciary Committee and he was asked about dropping it, he acted like and basically stated he had nothing to do with it, that that was somebody down in Texas, an attorney down there, and he could get us a copy of the Dallas Morning News article where the U.S. Attorney—actually, it was acting U.S. Attorney—had made that statement that politics played no role.

Well, certainly politics played a role, and that became very obvious. And the more we find, the more it appears the Attorney General is not honest about perhaps the reason that these were not pursued. But until we find out the actual reasons for these being dropped, we will not know how honest or dishonest the situation with this Attorney General is.

I know that Chairman ISSA is pursuing the Fast and Furious investigation. But on this one, we could put this whole matter to bed very quickly if the Attorney General will just produce the memorandum that Chairman PETE KING and Chairman LAMAR SMITH have requested from the Justice Department. If he will just come forward, produce that memo, not black it out, then we can find for sure the documentation of whether or not what the Attorney General had said in testifying before Congress was true or not.

Now, it was interesting to find that the FBI had a special relationship, a special partnership, with CAIR, another of the named coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial. And it was rather shocking to me that it was not until 2009 that the FBI decided to end their special relationship with this named co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation case. Apparently, the FBI had had a special relationship with CAIR for years, even though the FBI began to gather these materials back as early as 1993 and had solid proof for a number of years that they were involved in supporting Hamas with terrorism.

And yet nothing was done until 2009, when a letter was sent, saying, because of the evidence that was introduced some months back regarding CAIR and their relationships with terrorism, we think it's appropriate to suspend our relationship for now.

Now, I realize that there are people in the media, as we saw this one reporter from The Hill that will not give adequate coverage, who will take quotes out of context in order to misrepresent or give people a false impression. But if this is adequately looked at, people will find the truth: that we have people who have been associated with the support of terrorism coming to the White House—one who was president of a group, who certainly from the documentation appears to have supported terrorism, leading the White House in prayer.

□ 1410

And then we find out that when the President was giving a speech at the State Department, in the State Department—security was very, very tight; it was difficult to get in without going through all the checking, the bag checking, the metal detectors and all the different things you had to go through to make sure security was tight—apparently the White House invited Imam Majid, the president of the Islamic Society of North America, a named coconspirator for supporting terrorism. It invited him into the inner sanctum of the State Department to listen to the President's speech and give comments about what he thought about the speech.

At some point, this administration is going to have to get around to the point where providing for the common defense means you get tough with people who associate with groups that support terrorism. You don't do, as Senator Obama said, just go talk to terrorists because you're so, apparently, warm and friendly. Really, the President, having met with him, he is a charming man. He comes across as bright, engaging. You want to like him. Apparently that's worked so well, he must think that he can convince religious extremists that we're good folks, so you can just get along with them. The problem is, when you're dealing with people who want to destroy your way of life, there's only one way to deal with them.

We've seen this from the attacks in the early days of our country's existence from Islamic zealots in North Africa who captured our ships, took prisoners—the men on those ships—held them for ransom, used some as slaves, were willing to kill or enslave others, and I read at one point, and it's hard to believe that this is true—hopefully it's not—but that at one point we may have paid as much as 18 percent of the country's budget back in the late 1790s for getting our sailors back from the Barbary pirates, these Islamic extremists.

Thomas Jefferson, who had been sent at one point as one of the diplomats to negotiate with the Muslim extremists, was taken aback when he asked, Why would you attack American ships? We're no threat to you. We don't have a powerful Navy. We've never attacked you—and reportedly was told that we in our religion believe we go to paradise if we were to die while attacking infidels like you. Jefferson was shocked. He was an extremely well-read person. He found it hard to believe there was a religion anywhere that any believer of that religion perceived that you could go to a paradise by killing innocent people. So he got his own English translation of the Koran, that can still be found in the Library of Congress, so he could read for himself. Some of the passages are subject to interpretation and certainly have been interpreted by some as meaning the only way to proceed is to attempt to

take out infidels like those of us who are Christians, those who are Jewish, because we are certainly considered infidels in their eyes. Thank goodness not all Muslims believe that that has to be what occurs, but that is certainly what some believe.

I might read a passage from the judge's decision from July 1, 2009, in response to the effort by the named co-conspirators, some of them to have names stricken who were not actually indicted in the first trial. The judge, having reviewed acting U.S. Attorney Jacks's memos, said this:

''The government has produced ample evidence to establish the associations of CAIR, ISNA and NAIT with the Holy Land Foundation, HLF, the Islamic Association for Palestine and with Hamas. While the court recognizes that the evidence produced by the government largely predates the Holy Land Foundation designation date, the evidence is nonetheless sufficient to show the association of these entities with HLF, IAP, and Hamas.''

The judge said:

''Thus maintaining the names of the entities on the list is appropriate in light of the evidence proffered by the government.''

It is important to note that CAIR, with whom our Justice Department had a special relationship until on into 2009, and ISNA, that the evidence has certainly been produced by the government shows, as the judge says, ample evidence to establish the associations with these groups with the Holy Land Foundation, the group that was convicted, as well as Hamas, and yet this administration continues, I guess, to think that their winning personalities, charming as they are, will bring people around, and so they trust them to come into the inner sanctum of the White House, the State Department, the Justice Department. All that means is, we're in big trouble.

There are those over the years that have believed that our answers would come from prayer. Virtually every President, I guess every President, has indicated such that this Nation is best protected when it prays. That is why you would have such an amazing minister as Peter Marshall, as Chaplain in the United States Senate back in the 1940s, and this book that I have referenced previously is really profound, and I would, Mr. Speaker, like to finish up reading a couple of prayers that have been prayed in the United States Senate in the 1940s by U.S. Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall.

One prayer says:

''Forgive us, Lord Jesus, for doing the things that make us uncomfortable and guilty when we pray.

''We say that we believe in God, and yet we doubt God's promises.

''We say that in God we trust,'' which can be found right up above the Speaker's head, ''yet we worry and try to manage our own affairs.

''We say that we love Thee, O Lord, and yet do not obey Thee.

''We believe that Thou hast the answers to all our problems, and yet we do not consult Thee.

''Forgive us, Lord, for our lack of faith and the willful pride that ignores the way, the truth, and the life.

''Wilt Thou reach down and change the gears within us that we may go forward with Thee. Amen.''

That was one of Peter Marshall's prayers as Chaplain of the Senate in the 1940s.

□ 1420

I conclude with this prayer by Peter Marshall in the 1940s: ''O Lord our God, even at this moment as we come blundering into Thy presence and prayer, we are haunted by memories of duties unperformed, promptings disobeyed, and beckonings ignored.

''Opportunities to be kind knocked on the door of our hearts and went weeping away.

''We are ashamed, O Lord, and tired of failure.

''If Thou art growing close to us now, come nearer still, till selfishness is burned out within us and our wills lose their weakness in union with Thine own.

''Amen.''

It is important to note: Prayers for the individuals to adhere to, as George Washington said, have a humble imitation of the designer of our blessed religion. As Washington said, those are for individuals.

We get questions on, Well, how can you be a Christian and not want to give away all the government money to the poor and the needy? How can you be a Christian and not want to give away the government money to do all these other things and to end a Defense Department? have no soldiers? just be people of peace?

And I know that in this great country we have got virtually every religion being practiced that's known to man; but in the Christian religion, for those that believe the New Testament means what it says, Romans 13 is very clear. The government exists as God's minister so that they encourage good. Romans 13:4 says, but if you do evil be afraid. God does not give the government the sword in vain. It does say ''sword,'' and that is the purpose of government.

We took an oath to follow the Constitution. We are supposed to provide for the common defense. We are supposed to have an Army, a military, that protects this Nation so that people can practice the religion of their choice. Whether it's Islam peaceably, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, the human secularism that seems to have often overtaken Washington, you have the freedom to do that.

But the government's role is to protect the country, protect the people, keep people from coming in through our borders that want to harm us so that individuals can give from the blessings of their heart to help the needy, to help the poor, to help others.

You cannot find one reference in the New Testament that says government is to go about using and abusing its taxing authority, legalize stealing from people who have earned the money so that we can give it away to Congress' favorite charity or a government's favorite charity. The government is to provide protection, protect against evil, encourage good, and create an environment where good people can do good.

[From Fox News, July 7, 2011]

ONLY IN WASHINGTON: WHITE HOUSE SALARIES HAVE GONE BOTH UP AND DOWN

(By Kimberly Schwandt)

The White House released its annual salary report to Congress and like anything in Washington, it depends on who you ask if they went up too much, or are an adequate reflection of the tough economic times and have moved down.

The salaries, which can be seen here show that about a third of the employees make more than $100,000 per year and the lowest earn $41,000, except for three people who are working for no compensation, or $0 annual salary. Twenty-one employees made the maximum $172,000.

The White House backs the figures, saying that salaries went down an average of $150 per person and that total salary spending decreased in part due to the total number of staffers going down as well.

''President Obama is deeply committed to continuing to reduce costs in government,'' said White House Spokesman Eric Schultz.

However, some critics say they are spending too much, like Rep. Louie Gohmert, R–Texas.

''[I]n the White House, in looking at it, this administration's got over 450 employees. Now, under the Bush administration, there were over 100, about a fourth of the employees, made less than $40,000,'' he told Fox Business on Tuesday.

Fox News fact-checked, and the congressman's statements do pan out, with 102 of the 447 employees on the 2008 list having salaries of less than $40,000.

''I guess, you know, there's so much greatness when you associate with this White House you deserve to be paid more, I don't know,'' he said.

Gohmert added another sarcastic jab, ''Don't forget the 34—the 34 czars that are out there dictating policy and let's face it . . . when you're a dictator you need to be paid more.''

As the economy faltered, President Obama enacted a pay freeze earlier in his administration for top wage-earners.

Wednesday at a Twitter town hall, he referenced the freeze.

''So they haven't had a raise in two and a half years, and that's appropriate, because a lot of ordinary folks out there haven't, either. In fact, they've seen their pay cut in some cases,'' Obama said.

An analysis by the gossip website Gawker, that was widely circulated and posted on the Internet, compared the salary increases to those of what staffers got last year. The site found that 75 percent of staffers who stayed on got raises from 2009 to 2010.

And this year, the figure isn't quite as big—but of 270 staffers who have been at the White House for more than a year, more than 50 percent got raises with an average increase of 8 percent.

Fox double-checked Gawker's claim on how many got raises and found 267 staffers on both lists, indicating they had worked for more than one year. Of those staffers, 144 had received a raise in 2011 (54%).

It's worth noting that some of those raises were for promotions, not just for the regular yearly increases.

''To be clear, in the past year, the average salary of a White House employee went down, the total number of White House staffers went down, and the total amount spent on White House salaries went down. If pay increases were issued, they were given for a variety of reasons, ranging from promotions to additional work responsibilities,'' Schultz said.

Most employee survey data, like these by The Conference Project, projected about 3 percent raises on average for employees nationwide this year.

The White House is of course a different entity than the private sector so it's hard to exactly do an apples to apples comparison.

[From the Hill, July 6, 2011]

REPUBLICAN MOCKS WHITE HOUSE SALARIES

(By Judy Kurtz)

A Republican congressman on Wednesday criticized the White House for paying staffers too much in salary.

''I guess there's just so much greatness when you're associated with this White House that you deserve to be paid more,'' Rep. Louie Gohmert (R–Texas) said. ''Let's face it, when you're a dictator, you need to be paid more.''

Gohmert made clear his remark was meant to be sarcastic. However, he criticized the White House for paying 141 aides more than $100,000 per year. A report from the White House released Friday listed the salaries of 454 employees and showed that no staffer is paid less than $40,000.

''It sounds like the only thing that's truly shovel-ready is all the bull that they've been feeding to us over the last two and a half years,'' Gohmert said on the Fox News Business channel. ''That needs to be shoveled out in a hurry.''

Gohmert also slammed a White House stimulus report released last Friday that asserted the stimulus created as many as 3.6 million jobs in the first quarter of 2011.

''Who would ever dream that paying people $175,000 in the White House would be a bargain compared to how much they're paying to create private sector jobs,'' Gohmert said. ''[President Obama] has squandered so much money that you've heard the sucking sound coming from the private sector.''

Republicans claim the stimulus paid out $278,000 for every job it created. The White House called that a ''false analysis.''

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAMPBELL (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending, in his role as cochairman of the Congressional United Kingdom Caucus, a working reception in his home State of California, in honor of their Royal Highnesses, The Duke and Duchess of Cambridge.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 11, 2011, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2338. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Modification of the Rules and Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0024; FV11-946-31R] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2339. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sorghum Promotion, Research and Information Program; State Referendum Results [AMS-LS-11-0040] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2340. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2011-2012 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0094; FV11-985-1 FR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2341. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Standards for Grades of Potatoes [Doc. #: AMS-FV-08-0023] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2342. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program; Amendment to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances (Livestock) [Document Number: AMS-NOP-10-005; NOP-10-04FR] (RIN: 0581-AD04) received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2343. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Softwood Lumber Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Industry Information Order [Document Number: AMS-FV-10-0015; PR-A2] (RIN: 0581-AD03) received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2344. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fresh Prunes Grown in Designated Counties in Washington and in Umatilla County, OR; Termination of Marketing Order 924 [Docket No.: AMS-FV-10-0053; FV10-924-1 FR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2345. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2346. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2347. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Securities of Nonmember Insured Banks (RIN: 3064-AD67) received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2348. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the third annual report on the Prevention and Reduction of Underage Drinking; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2349. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2350. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting extension of the waiver of Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act, Pub. L. 107-511, with respect to assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2351. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the forty-fourth Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-Up, covering the six month period ending March 31, 2011 in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2352. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank Topeka, transmitting the 2010 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2353. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — West Virginia Regulatory Program [WV-117-FOR; OSM-2011-0006] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2354. A letter from the Assistant Secretary — Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2010 Report to Congress on the Contract Support Costs of Self-Determination Awards; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2355. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Red Snapper Management Measures [Docket No.: 101124579-1236-02] (RIN: 0648-BA51) received June 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2356. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Chapman Valve Manufacturing Company (i.e., Building 23 and the Dean Street facility) in Indian Orchard, Massachusetts to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2357. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Bliss & Laughlin Steel Company located at 110 Hopkins Street, Buffalo, New York to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2358. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on

a petition on behalf of workers from the Wah Chang facility in Albany, Oregon, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2359. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's report entitled, ''2010 Annual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics'', pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2360. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Conneaut Festival Fireworks, Conneaut Harbor, Conneaut, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0214] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2361. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lorain Independence Day Fireworks, Black River, Lorain, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0215] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2362. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Put-In-Bay Fireworks, Fox's the Dock Pier; South Bass Island, Put-In-Bay, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0417] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2363. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Temporary Change to Enforcement Location of Recurring Fireworks Display event, Currituck Sound; Corolla, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0384] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2364. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; M/V Del Monte Live-Fire Gun Exercise, James River, Isle of Wight, Virginia [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0427] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2365. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Interim Guidance on Modification of Section 833 Treatment of Certain Health Organizations [Notice 2011-51] received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2366. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Under Section 956 for Determining the Basis of Property Acquired in Certain Nonrecognition Transactions [TD 9530] (RIN: 1545-BH56) received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MICA: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2018. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to preserve the authority of each State to make determinations relating to the State's water quality standards, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1938. A bill to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–140, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 398. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–141, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 398 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 2458. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to change the frequency of review of air quality criteria under section 108 of such Act and national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards under section 109 of such Act from 5-year intervals to 10-year intervals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish and maintain a national clearinghouse for records relating to alcohol and controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 2460. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to allow operation of foreign-flag cruise ships in the coastwise trade of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (for himself and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas):

H.R. 2461. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the treatment of certain physician pathology services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2462. A bill to limit the aggregate amount provided by the taxpayers of the United States for the bailout of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HALL (for himself, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. WU, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 2463. A bill to provide for the next generation of border and maritime security technologies; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2464. A bill to authorize a program to provide grants to nonprofit organizations that carry out child-parent visitation programs for children with incarcerated parents; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2466. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the employment tax treatment and reporting of wages paid by professional employer organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 2467. A bill to take certain Federal lands in Mono County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Bridgeport Indian Colony; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 2468. A bill to ensure that home health agencies can assign the most appropriate skilled professional to conduct the initial assessment visit and complete the comprehensive assessment for home health services for Medicare beneficiaries requiring rehabilitation therapy under a home health plan of care, based upon physician referral; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2469. A bill to protect consumers from discriminatory State taxes on motor vehicle rentals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2470. A bill to improve the electronic health information systems and capabilities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 2471. A bill to amend section 2710 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify that a video tape service provider may obtain a consumer's informed, written consent on an ongoing basis and that consent may be obtained through the Internet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROE of

Tennessee, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 2472. A bill to amend the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986 to prohibit health care entities from reporting certain professional review actions against health care professionals before adequate notice and hearing procedures are afforded to such professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2473. A bill to modify the project for the improvement of the Shallotte River, North Carolina, to change the authorized depth to 8 feet; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2474. A bill to authorize a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction at West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet (Topsail Beach), North Carolina; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2475. A bill to authorize a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction at Surf City and North Topsail Beach, North Carolina; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2476. A bill to amend section 156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5f) to require the Secretary of the Army to evaluate the feasibility of continuing Federal participation in a beach nourishment project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Department of Veterans Affairs Medal for Distinguished Public Service to honor veterans who make remarkable and distinguished contributions to their communities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received for services by a student at a work-college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the rehabilitation credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2480. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 2481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. RAHALL):

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Social Security benefits should not be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H. Res. 343. A resolution expressing disapproval of the decision by the Supreme Court in Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 344. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the States should enact a temporary moratorium on residential mortgage foreclosures; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H. Res. 345. A resolution condemning al Shabaab for its practice of child conscription in the Horn of Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 346. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a national World War I memorial should be established; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

76. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 784 urging the Congress to fully support the vital operations and joint force structure at Ellington Field Joint Reserve Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

77. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Iowa, relative to Senate Resolution 9 supporting the positive impact of the CSBG program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

78. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 26 recognizing May 2011 as Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

79. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 33 declaring June 2011 to be ''Save LIHEAP Month''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

80. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 523 honoring the legacy of public service to the community of the Campbellton Post Office; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

81. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 306 expressing support for the conservation of Castner Range; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

82. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 243 expressing opposition to H.R. 3424; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

83. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 memorializing the Congress to expedite a solution that will provide public alert and warning in situations of war, terrorist attack, natural disaster, or other hazards to public safety; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Homeland Security.

84. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 1694 congratulating President Obama on his proven and successful policies in the war on terrorism and in homeland security; jointly to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select) and Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 2458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to ''regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . .''.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 2461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1, the power to tax and spend for the general welfare and the implied power of the Necessary and Proper Clause, Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 2463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 & 18 of the United States Constitution.

Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 2465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and the 16th Amendment.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 2467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2469.

At121 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 12, 13, and 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 2472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: [The Congress shall have Power] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Military Regulation Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14

Necessary and Proper Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

General Welfare Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, which states ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes,'' and Article I, Section 7, which states ''All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.''

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 2479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 2481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 58: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 98: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 100: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 157: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 210: Ms. LEE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 389: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 452: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 499: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 531: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 539: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 602: Mr. MICHAUD and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 603: Mr. MICHAUD and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 604: Mr. MICHAUD and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 676: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 711: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 724: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 733: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 791: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 822: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 864: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 885: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 891: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 894: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 969: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 981: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 1031: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1057: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1058: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1116: Ms. HOCHUL and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1117: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1150: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 1195: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1208: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1234: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1236: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1240: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1244: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1259: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1265: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 1274: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 1327: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1341: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1364: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1406: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1418: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 1439: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1449: Mr. MARINO and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1465: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1533: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1537: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 1546: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1571: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1585: Mr. TURNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1588: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1676: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1683: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1697: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1700: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1706: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1744: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1776: Mr. WATT and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1780: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1792: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1840: Mr. OWENS, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1852: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1872: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1873: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 1897: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1916: Mr. WELCH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CHU, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1924: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1940: Mr. RUNYAN and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1985: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1996: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2011: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 2016: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2018: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 2020: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2032: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HURT, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2036: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 2051: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2056: Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 2068: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2082: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2086: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2092: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2095: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2124: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 2140: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2182: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2197: Ms. CHU and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2198: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2204: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 2223: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 2250: Mr. HURT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 2281: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2306: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2310: Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2313: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 2327: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2332: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2333: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2337: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2355: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2358: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2364: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2366: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2369: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LATTA, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. WEST, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. LONG, Mr. DREIER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MACK, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. REED, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KELLY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 2372: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2397: Mr. DOLD, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 2402: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2407: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2411: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2412: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2417: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MACK, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 2427: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2433: Mr. FLORES and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 25: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. CHABOT.

H. Res. 66: Mr. GERLACH.

H. Res. 159: Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 179: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Res. 180: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Res. 207: Mr. GERLACH.

H. Res. 211: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H. Res. 226: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 296: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 317: Mr. FILNER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 91: Mr. REED.

H.R. 2109: Mr. TERRY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

16. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami, Florida, relative to Resolution 09-0101 urging the City Manager to develop a ''Complete Streets Program''; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 1, July 6, 2011, by Mr. MARK CRITZ on House Resolution 310, was signed by the following Members: Mark S. Critz, Joe Courtney, Michael H. Michaud, Kurt Schrader, Gene Green, Joe Baca, Hansen Clarke, Lloyd Doggett, Robert E. Andrews, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Bill Pascrell Jr., Brian Higgins, Charles A. Gonzalez, William L. Owens, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, John F. Tierney, Niki Tsongas, Michael F. Doyle, Gary L. Ackerman, Kathleen C. Hochul, Gerald E. Connolly, Danny K. Davis, Daniel Lipinski, David N. Cicilline, Rosa L. DeLauro, Kathy Castor, Dale E. Kildee, Marcy Kaptur, Tammy Baldwin, Russ Carnahan, Doris O. Matsui, James P. McGovern, Carolyn McCarthy, John A. Yarmuth, Peter A. DeFazio, Brad Sherman, Sander M. Levin, Anna G. Eshoo, Chris Van Hollen, Michael E. Capuano, Tim Ryan, Theodore E. Deutch, Sheila Jackson Lee, Nick J. Rahall II, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson Jr., Jason Altmire, Gary C. Peters, Steve Cohen, Paul Tonko, Shelley Berkley, Linda T. Sánchez, John B. Larson, Frederica S. Wilson, John Conyers Jr., Terri A. Sewell, Donald M. Payne, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, Yvette D. Clarke, Marcia L. Fudge, Carolyn B. Maloney, Chaka Fattah, Leonard L. Boswell, Steven R. Rothman, Bobby L. Rush, Steny H. Hoyer, Charles B. Rangel, James R. Langevin, Rush D. Holt, Jerry McNerney, Bruce L. Braley, Tim Holden, Robert A. Brady, Betty Sutton, Timothy J. Walz, Janice D. Schakowsky, Elijah E. Cummings, Timothy H. Bishop, Joe Donnelly, Mike McIntyre, Martin Heinrich, Frank Pallone Jr., Ben Ray Luján, Keith Ellison, Mike Quigley, George Miller, Wm. Lacy Clay, Mazie K. Hirono, Lois Capps, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Rubén Hinojosa, Grace F. Napolitano, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Eddie Bernice Johnson, Barney Frank, Nancy Pelosi, Diana DeGette, Xavier Becerra, Betty McCollum, G. K. Butterfield, Lynn C. Woolsey, Laura Richardson, Howard L. Berman, Henry A. Waxman, Al Green, John P. Sarbanes, John W. Olver, Jackie Speier, Jesse L. Jackson Jr., James E. Clyburn, Adam B. Schiff, Emanuel Cleaver, Silvestre Reyes, Jerry F. Costello, Donna F. Edwards, John D. Dingell, Mike Ross, André Carson, Ben Chandler, David Loebsack, Albio Sires, Nita M. Lowey, Jerrold Nadler, Eliot L. Engel, Gregory W. Meeks, James P. Moran, Steve Israel, C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Luis V. Gutierrez, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, and Christopher S. Murphy.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Vehicle Technologies Program of the Department of Energy.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. MCKINLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Page 24, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $39,000,000)''.

Page 28, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $39,000,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. COLE

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

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