United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2012 No. 95

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 21, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

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

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of our Nation where respect and understanding are the marks of civility, and honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

Give them the grace to see the best in those with whom they find disagreement, and the courage to move together with them toward solutions that best serve our great Nation.

Raise up, O God, women and men from every nation who will lead toward the paths of peace, and whose good judgment will heal the hurt between all peoples.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DELAURO 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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

REPEAL OBAMACARE IN ITS ENTIRETY

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, soon we will know if the Supreme Court will defend the Constitution and strike down ObamaCare, or let it stand.

The Founders worried about the growth of government and the yielding of liberty. Ben Franklin warned us about the fragility of limited government when he proclaimed that the Constitutional Convention had produced ''a Republic, if you can keep it.''

Now it is 225 years later and a moment of truth. We will soon know if our Republic will reaffirm its commitment to the Constitution or succumb to the consolidation of unchecked power and the erosion of our cherished liberties.

Although I hope that ObamaCare will be struck down, the Founders ultimately left the defense of the Constitution to the people. And I know that if the Supreme Court will not rise to the defense of the Constitution, the people will.

To all the patriots throughout the country who have dedicated themselves to the repeal of this law, let me remind you of the words of Thomas Jefferson, who once said:

The ground of liberty is to be gained by inches.

So I pledge to stand alongside all of you in that fight, inch by inch, to defend the Constitution, and repeal the ObamaCare law in its entirety.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY RESTORATION ACT

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

Ms. DELAURO. One year ago yesterday, the Supreme Court voted 5–4 in the case of Walmart v. Dukes to make it harder for workers to challenge discrimination in the workplace. Upending decades of judicial practice and precedent, the Court erected new unwarranted and challenging barriers for groups of private employees to challenge unemployment discrimination.

As a result, 1.5 million female Walmart employees were denied remedy for discrimination that resulted in smaller paychecks, limited professional advancement, and increased financial pressures for families trying to make ends meet. In fact, all workers throughout the country will find it more difficult to challenge any discrimination in the workplace because of the Court's decision.

Yesterday, I introduced the Equal Employment Opportunity Restoration Act, a thoughtful, careful, and effective legislative response to this flawed Supreme Court decision. It restores the rights of groups of plaintiffs to pursue

Printed on recycled paper.

actions against employment discrimination.

We need to see discrimination in the workplace addressed. We have to protect employees' rights to bring suit together. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Help restore the legal rights of ordinary citizens over corporations.

FIX HEALTH CARE THE RIGHT WAY

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, next week the Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of President Obama's health care law.

While we don't yet know the outcome, there are things that we do know. We know that no matter what happens, you'll still be able to see your doctor, the emergency room will still treat you if you're in an accident or have a problem, and the pharmacy down the street will fill your prescription.

We know that the American people don't want government bureaucrats making their health care decisions, but they do want us to address real problems like skyrocketing costs of care or the challenges that many people are having of finding a physician.

We all know this law must be repealed. In its place, we must adopt reforms that will lower the cost of care, increase access, and enhance the quality. This must be done in a transparent, bipartisan way.

No matter what the Ccourt determines, our work here has just begun. As representatives of the American people, we have a responsibility to fix health care in the right way.

BUSINESSES NEED STABILITY

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come from an energy State, a State that has done hydraulic fracking since the 1940s. It is a State that has beautiful lands, clean air, and clean water.

But energy requires a tremendous amount of capital, and so it needs consistency in its laws and its regulations. In this day and age, that's a problem apparently because Federal regulations continue to change.

It shouldn't be an issue. We're a Nation of laws, not a Nation of leaders. As a Nation of laws, we center around what is consistent and stable so business can invest. When that is destabilized, no one knows what to do, no one knows how to invest, and jobs don't grow.

Let me just give you a few examples. The recess appointments done by this President just a few months ago destabilized the NLRB and CFPB. The Boeing rule that was put down just 2 years ago now by the NLRB telling Boeing where they can and can't build. The immigration laws that are coming out right now begin to destabilize because no one knows when the law is going to be enforced and when it's not going to be enforced, and who gets a waiver and who doesn't. The Defense of Marriage Act that now is not going to be enforced anymore by this administration. The HHS decision that comes down and tells a religious group what they can practice as their doctrine and what they can't practice. And then yesterday, a requirement for executive privilege based on Fast and Furious.

The Missouri Senate has experienced this. Hosanna Tabor v. EEOC was a 9–0 Supreme Court ruling, kicking out the Obama administration trying to redefine what is a minister. It is time for stable regulations, stable rules, and the law to come around to Congress again.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE AND FAST AND FURIOUS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the government continues to hide the evidence of the Fast and Furious gun running scheme.

The attorney general says he doesn't know who authorized this reckless and deadly operation, but he still conceals documents to show what occurred. The President claims he was not involved, but minutes before Congress began the process to hold the Attorney General in contempt, the President—''the leader of the most transparent administration in history''—desperately asserted executive privilege to withhold the documents from Congress.

According to The Washington Times, when the President was a Senator, he said this about the previous administration:

> There has been a tendency on the part of the administration to try to hide behind executive privilege every time there is something a little shaky taking place. I think the administration would best be served by coming clean on this. There doesn't seem to be any national security involved.

Mr. Speaker, that was then, and this is now. And this President conveniently does exactly what he criticized others for doing.

So the saga of the Republic continues, and that's just the way it is.

□ 0910

AMERICA'S HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT PROGRAMS

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, unless we act now, the highway and transit programs will expire in a few days, endangering our roads, bridges, transit systems; and everyone who uses them will experience a decline in what they view as America.

So I would like to list the reasons we need to move quickly to pass a highway bill that is not simply an extension. One, we must raise America's standing in the world of infrastructure from 24th place to first. Three months ago, the Senate passed a responsible, bipartisan 2-year transportation bill that would save or create 2 million jobs. We have 2.2 million construction and manufacturing workers out of work; $1,060 is how much we could save each family in transportation costs if we could come to an agreement. H.R. 7 was called by my friend Secretary LaHood ''the most partisan transportation bill that (he had) ever seen, the worst transportation bill.''

Mr. Speaker, I have more points. I will try to get them in later.

DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 H.R. 4480.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROE of Tennessee). Pursuant to House Resolution 691 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. 4480.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 0911

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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 20, 2012, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 112–540 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 112–540.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ____1. ELIGIBILITY FOR NEW LEASES AND THE TRANSFER OF LEASES.

(a) ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not offer new leases under a plan required by subsection (k) of section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by section 102 of this Act, to a person described in paragraph (2) unless the person has renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the person to require the payment of royalties if the price of oil and natural gas is greater than or equal to the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(2) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person referred to in paragraph (1) is a person that—

(A) is a lessee that—

(i) holds a covered lease on the date on which the Secretary considers the issuance of the new lease; or

(ii) was issued a covered lease before the date of enactment of this Act, but transferred the covered lease to another person or entity (including a subsidiary or affiliate of the lessee) after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) any other person that has any direct or indirect interest in, or that derives any benefit from, a covered lease.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED LEASE.—The term ''covered lease'' means a lease for oil or gas production in the Gulf of Mexico that is—

(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) issued by the Department of the Interior under section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note; Public Law 104–58); and

(C) not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(2) LESSEE.—The term ''lessee'' includes any person or other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is in or under common control with, a lessee.

(3) NEW LEASE.—The term ''new lease'' means a lease issued in a lease sale under this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or any plan, strategy, or program under this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, much of this bill deals with new giveaways to Big Oil. The issue that I'm raising right now is to deal with a continuing longstanding giveaway.

The Big Five oil companies made a record profit of $137 billion last year; and in the first quarter of this year, they continued to capitalize on the pain that Americans are feeling at the pump, raking in $368 million in profits per day.

Oil companies are not paying any royalties to the American people on oil produced in the Gulf of Mexico from leases issued between 1996 and 2000. Zero. No royalties. They're pumping this oil for free without paying the taxpayers a single dime. Now they got this giveaway because of an incentive back in 1995 to companies to drill for oil when oil was selling for less than $20 a barrel.

In recent years, the amount of free oil these companies have been pumping has gone through the roof as more of these faulty leases have gone into production. In fact, right now, more than 25 percent of all oil produced offshore on Federal lands is produced royalty-free, no payments to the taxpayers for the use of their land. These oil companies are getting a complete windfall on 25 percent of all the oil they produce offshore in the United States. They do not pay the American people one penny for this right, regardless of the fact that now oil is selling at about $80 a barrel.

The number one entitlement program that should be on the chopping block for Congress shouldn't be Medicare. It shouldn't be Social Security. It shouldn't be health care for children. It should be the free drilling entitlement that oil companies are enjoying on public lands.

According to the Interior Department, American taxpayers stand to lose about $9.5 billion over the next 10 years from this giveaway alone, this giveaway to Big Oil. The Government Accountability Office projects that all of this free drilling will cost us as much as $53 billion over the life of these leases. My amendment would recover those revenues because they belong to the American people. These oil giants already receive $4 billion a year in tax subsidies. They don't need an additional $1 billion or more per year in free drilling.

The amendment would offer oil companies a choice: they can choose either to continue to produce royalty-free oil in the gulf but not be able to receive new leases, or they can agree to pay their fair share and be able to bid on new leases under this bill. And this amendment would not force companies to give up their leases. It would just simply impose a condition on future leases.

The Congressional Research Service has agreed repeatedly that this amendment would not be an abrogation of contracts or constitute a takings, as some of my colleagues have suggested it might. As CRS has stated:

> As a general matter, the United States has broad discretion in setting the qualifications of those with whom it contracts.

These oil companies are the most profitable companies in the history of the world; yet they receive, as I said—and it's worth repeating—$4 billion a year in taxpayer subsidies. They don't need to be drilling for free on public lands as well.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are serious about paying down the deficit and realistically financing necessary investments in this Nation, then there is no excuse for not supporting this amendment to recover roughly $1 billion a year that is rightfully owed to the American people.

It's time to end this taxpayer rip-off, this giveaway to Big Oil.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Well, I respect the relationship that I have with my friend and colleague from New Jersey. I appreciate the fact that Mr. HOLT is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources. I appreciate the fact that he came to Denver recently for a field hearing that the subcommittee had on hydraulic fracking.

So I do appreciate the work he does on the subcommittee, but I have to disagree with him on this amendment. And I would urge opposition to this amendment.

It's identical to one that failed on this House floor by a bipartisan vote earlier this year in February. And I have to remind my friend and colleague that this issue has been repeatedly settled in the Nation's courts of law with the courts determining that rewriting the terms of these leases to include price thresholds, which the Clinton administration apparently forgot to include in the leases, would be a direct violation of contract law.

Specifically, the U.S. Supreme Court found that the Department of the Interior did not have the authority to rewrite these contracts that were issued during the Clinton administration under the 1995 law. And I will also remind the gentleman that the Department of the Interior has lost this issue in the district court, appellate court, and the Supreme Court.

□ 0920

If this amendment passed, the issue would most certainly be challenged once again in court, where the Department would use taxpayer dollars to lose again.

Ultimately, this amendment seeks to force U.S. companies to break a contract negotiated under then-current government law or else be denied the opportunity to do business in the United States. The amendment aims to back companies into a corner and attempts to force them to break a legally binding contract.

Again, this amendment has failed on the House floor before, and I would urge continued opposition and a ''no'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chair, this amendment breaks no contracts. We are here because the Congress, well over a decade ago when prices were less than $20 a barrel, decided this giveaway made sense. If it

made sense then, it certainly does not make sense now.

Oil companies drill one-quarter of all offshore oil for free. If the other side is serious about addressing the deficit, this is revenue that should be received.

Please support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would urge opposition once again to this amendment, as we have done before in the House, and I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 112–540.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—ADVANCING OFFSHORE WIND PRODUCTION

SEC. ____1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited at the ''Advancing Offshore Wind Production Act''.

SEC. ____2. OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL SITE TESTING AND MONITORING PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF AN OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL SITE TESTING AND MONITORING PROJECT.—In this section, the term ''offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project'' means a project carried out on or in the waters of the Outer Continental Shelf administered by the Department of the Interior to test or monitor weather (including wind, tidal, current, and solar energy) using towers, buoys, or other temporary ocean infrastructure, that—

(1) causes—

(A) less than 1 acre of surface or seafloor disruption at the location of each meteorological tower or other device; and

(B) not more than 5 acres of surface or seafloor disruption within the proposed area affected by for the project (including hazards to navigation);

(2) is decommissioned not more than 5 years after the date of commencement of the project, including—

(A) removal of towers, buoys, or other temporary ocean infrastructure from the project site; and

(B) restoration of the project site to approximately the original condition of the site; and

(3) provides meteorological information obtained by the project to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) OFFSHORE METEOROLOGICAL PROJECT PERMITTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall by regulation require that any applicant seeking to conduct an offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project on the outer Continental Shelf (as that term is defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.)) must obtain a permit and right of way for the project in accordance with this subsection.

(2) PERMIT AND RIGHT OF WAY TIMELINE AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit and right of way for an offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project within 30 days after receiving an application.

(B) PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONSULTATION.—During the period referred to in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) provide an opportunity for submission of comments by the public; and

(ii) consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and the heads of other Federal, State, and local agencies that would be affected by issuance of the permit and right of way.

(C) DENIAL OF PERMIT; OPPORTUNITY TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES.—If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

(i) in writing, clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not approved and detailed information concerning any deficiencies in the application; and

(ii) an opportunity to remedy such deficiencies.

(c) NEPA EXCLUSION.—Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) shall not apply with respect to an offshore meteorological site testing and monitoring project.

(d) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—The information provided to the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to subsection (a)(3) shall be treated by the Secretary as proprietary information and protected against disclosure.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, today, the House is taking an independent and important step forward to develop domestic sources of energy, create American jobs, and reduce our reliance on foreign sources of energy. And I'm a strong proponent of an all-of-the-above energy policy.

As a scientist by trade, I understand the need to achieve a balance to foster development of American energy while at the same time protecting the integrity of our environment. We can achieve efficiency and protection, and this bill helps us achieve both goals.

Offshore wind energy is an important component, furthering development of clean, renewable American energy sources. Unfortunately, the process is often unnecessarily slowed for years by bureaucratic hurdles in the permitting process and numerous other delays. The Cape Wind project in Massachusetts only recently received Federal permitting approval, a process 10 years in the making.

The U.S. built the Hoover Dam in 5 years during the height of the Great Depression. Within a decade of President Kennedy's call to put a man on the Moon, the U.S. had won the space race. Americans have proven that we can accomplish great engineering and technical feats in small periods of time. However, today it's frustrating that this administration cannot point to one wind turbine operating offshore in Federal waters. They can, however, point to layer after layer after layer of regulations, bureaucracy, and red tape.

While it is critical that energy development is safe and environmentally friendly, the process must become more efficient. This amendment facilitates the development of an all-of-the-above energy strategy by streamlining the process for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to develop offshore wind power.

My amendment will speed the production of wind energy, as it sets a 30-day time line for the Secretary of the Interior to act on permits for all weather testing and monitoring projects in the United States Outer Continental Shelf. This amendment will also streamline the environmental review process for these small wind testing towers.

This amendment also requires coordination with the Department of Defense and other affected agencies so the projects do not disrupt national security or other critical projects. This provision is especially important for the Commonwealth of Virginia, with its active defense community.

This amendment is identical to H.R. 2137, legislation I authored that passed out of the House Natural Resources Committee last July. This effort has been endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Ocean Industries Association.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment creates a brand-new, burdensome permitting scheme that would complicate the process for obtaining a permit to construct a meteorological tower offshore and undermine offshore wind development. Let me say that again. This will actually make it harder to build an offshore wind project, not easier.

This amendment is similar to H.R. 2173, which was reported out of the Natural Resources Committee last year. When moving this bill through committee, the Republican majority was unable to find a single wind industry witness to come to testify on this bill, and that is because the industry that the majority is trying to help with this bill doesn't think that the measure is helpful.

So the wind industry does not support this bill. I'll just make that clear, if you are interested in helping an industry to grow. The bill has not been endorsed by any offshore wind companies or trade groups and those kinds of

companies that have popped up all over the country now. None of those companies are endorsing this bill.

I'm going to read a statement that is part of the legislative hearing record on this amendment. It is from Jim Lanard, the president of the Offshore Wind Development Coalition. Here's what he says on behalf of the coalition: Streamlining approvals of towers or buoys to test wind speeds offshore is an important goal. We believe that NEPA will allow this goal to be achieved.

So NEPA clearly is not the enemy here. But in case there is still doubt, he says: Disregarding the bill's NEPA exclusion, we believe—this is, again, Mr. Lanard speaking for the Offshore Wind Development Coalition—we believe that current practices are adequate for the approval of these towers or buoys.

This bill represents a fundamental misunderstanding of what the offshore wind industry really needs. A company is simply not going to invest millions of dollars engineering and constructing a huge meteorological tower on the Outer Continental Shelf unless they have a guarantee that they'll be able to use that area to build a wind farm.

To be very clear, the industry wants a lease before they invest millions of dollars into a project. To get a lease, we should and we do require consideration of the impacts of development on the environment and the competing uses of these public waters. We should and we do require coordination with the other agencies using the Outer Continental Shelf, like the Navy, the FAA and FCC. This amendment would dismantle that process.

This amendment says sorry, wind industry. You may have sunk millions of dollars into your meteorological tower, but it's time to tear it down. We let you build it without fully considering the impacts. And no wind farm either.

Plain and simple, this bill certainly reduces the likelihood that we will see wind constructed off the shores of our country. The companies affected by this bill were not consulted before creating it.

I have a document here from the Navy commenting on this bill. Essentially, it says the 30-day limit on consultations in the amendment is problematic. The Federal Aviation Administration has expressed similar concerns. The Federal Communications Commission has expressed similar concerns. This bill will make it harder to construct offshore wind projects, and maybe—and I think this is what it's all about—that's the point after all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleague, Representative MARKEY, that this administration has not yet seen the completion of a single wind tower off the shore of the United States in over 3 years. Not a single one. This is a sincere and genuine attempt to cut through some of the red tape that's causing this kind of delay. How in the world can you have less red tape being bad for the construction of wind towers? This is truly a good solution. I applaud this legislation.

Representative WITTMAN has offered a bill that embodies the same concept that passed the committee by a bipartisan vote earlier this year. This is a good bill, a good amendment from that bill, and I would urge its adoption.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that President Bush's Interior Department sat on offshore wind regulations for 4 years. Do you want to hear that again? President Bush's Interior Department sat on offshore wind regulations for 4 years. Did not promulgate them. President Obama got them done in his first 6 months. The Obama administration passionately believes in new wind. In fact, there's 35,000 new megawatts onshore, and they desperately want it offshore as well, and the process is working.

We agree that during the Bush years, the Cape wind process did not work, but there were no rules that were promulgated. Obama did it. The project is now approved for Cape wind, and it should move forward. There's nothing wrong with the process, and I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind folks that this bill does accommodate concerns that may be raised by the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies to make sure that all those thoughts and ideas are put into place in considering this permitting process. But it streamlines it. That's a simple, thoughtful process that gets to the point much quicker. So instead of taking 3 years to permit a tower, now it goes to 30 days. It seems to me it's counterintuitive to say that longer is better. In this case, since there are no active mills, windmills offshore, wind turbines offshore, it seems to me that we ought to quicken the process. This clearly does, yet it allows for proper due diligence, proper consideration of all of the different concerns. And this amendment, indeed, facilitates the development of an all-of-the-above energy strategy by streamlining the process with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to develop offshore wind power and also to support good-paying American jobs. Let's not forget about that.

I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment and expedite offshore wind energy development, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 112–540.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE VIII—SERVICE OVER THE COUNTER, SELF-CONTAINED, MEDIUM TEMPERATURE COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATORS

SEC. 801. SERVICE OVER THE COUNTER, SELF-CONTAINED, MEDIUM TEMPERATURE COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATORS.

Section 342(c) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6313(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) The term '(SOC-SC-M)' means a medium temperature commercial refrigerator—

''(i) with a self-contained condensing unit and equipped with sliding or hinged doors in the back intended for use by sales personnel, and with glass or other transparent material in the front for displaying merchandise; and

''(ii) that has a height not greater than 66 inches and is intended to serve as a counter for transactions between sales personnel and customers.

''(C) The term 'TDA' means the total display area (ft^2) of the refrigerated case, as defined in Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute Standard 1200.'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) Each SOC-SC-M manufactured on or after the date which is 6 months after the date of enactment of the Better Use of Refrigerator Regulations Act shall have a total daily energy consumption (in kilowatt hours per day) of not more than 0.6 x TDA + 1.0.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my bipartisan amendment to H.R. 4480 with my colleague from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY).

Like this legislation, the amendment we offer today would ease expensive and burdensome energy regulations and help save American jobs.

By placing service-over-the-counter refrigerator units—which is a fancy

way of saying refrigerated display cases like you see in grocery stores and delis—into their own product classification, we can remove a burdensome regulation that could put this entire industry out of business.

Currently, these deli display cases are in the same classification as commercial reach-in refrigerators, similar to those you have in your home. This means that they must also meet the energy efficiency standards of those refrigerators. But that doesn't make any sense. These two types of refrigerators are designed for completely different purposes. Your refrigerator at home is only opened so many times. It has a light that comes on only when you open the door. These display cases are well lit. There's a lot of glass, which makes it harder to keep the energy efficiency at the same level as a reach-in refrigerator. And if you don't want to reach in and grab your popsicle and just come up with a stick, we need to put this in a totally different classification.

In my district, it's going to mean the cost of about 1,100 jobs. Across the United States, it's about 8,500 jobs that would be lost if these people are put out of business. As this bill does and as this amendment does, we think that it helps save jobs.

So with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Westmoreland amendment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Let's just get to the heart of the question of energy efficiency. Back in 1987, I was the author of the Appliance Efficiency Act of 1987, which is the constitution for energy efficiency in the appliance field. Since that time, the efficiency of appliances has increased so dramatically that we have reduced the need for between 100 and 150 new coal-fired plants from ever having to be constructed in the United States. Why is that? Well, electricity that is not consumed results in less need for new coal-fired or any kind of fired electricity, saving the consumers, saving the environment, and just working smarter, not harder. If you can keep the popsicle cool with a more efficient refrigeration process, if you can have the toast pop up with a more efficient toasting process, if you can have every one of the appliances that we use, including the air-conditioning in this room—the air-conditioning in this room is just as good as it was in 1987 but it is 50 percent more efficient in its generating capacity than it was in 1987. That reduces the need to generate new electricity that is needed. That saves money, and it saves on environmental damage as well.

So right now we're about to consider something that deals with deli-style refrigerators. Now, we're having this conversation having had no hearings on this issue in the Energy and Commerce Committee. We've had no testimony from the industry, no testimony from the Department of Energy on what this amendment could mean in terms of its impact. And we've had no evidence of an incapacity to be able to comply with these rules except for the fact that no one ever wants to necessarily become more efficient if they have to go through the extra effort and have never been required to do so.

□ 0940

The reason that we have these energy efficiency rules is that we're doing it for the betterment of the whole country and moving industries along, making sure that we do not have to produce this additional new electricity.

So, I think that it's better if we save money and save energy at the same time. That's what efficiency is all about. That's what working smarter, not harder is all about. The evidence is clear, since 1987, that we've done it. We've moved every other device along and made it more efficient, so I just don't know the reason why we would need a provision like this.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, sometimes up here we have people that think they know more than the industry. This industry has jobs, it employs people, and they're trying to do the best they can with their technology. But we can't be up here and tell industry what's best for them if we don't know anything about refrigeration or the energy efficiencies that they're trying to do.

These folks are trying to do the right thing. They are trying to do it to the best of their ability, but with these regulations, they're unable to do it right now. All we're asking for is to save 8,500 jobs across this country. And with unemployment in Georgia above the national average, it's 1,100 jobs just in Georgia. So I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment, and let's save 8,500 jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself, again, as much time as I may consume.

You know, this is just a continuation of the Republican obsession and opposition—obstinate, obdurate opposition—to increased efficiency in our society. Just a couple weeks ago they brought a bill out here on the floor that would roll back the efficiency of light bulbs in the United States, even though the entire industry has already complied with it. They were still trying to roll back the efficiency of light bulbs. Now we have the deli freezer, and we'll move on to product by product that they don't believe it is necessary to improve its efficiency whatsoever. And they just respond one by one almost to an incomprehensible set of demands made by, as yet, nonexistent experts telling us that it's impossible to comply.

So, why don't we have a hearing? Why don't we get the evidence? Why don't we hear what every company in the United States says about deli freezers and then we can act upon it after we hear the evidence? But acting this way—you know, ''congressional expert'' is an oxymoron. We're not experts compared to real experts. We're only experts compared to other Congressmen. ''Congressional expert'' is an oxymoron, like jumbo shrimp or Salt Lake City nightlife. I mean, there is no such thing as a congressional expert. We should not be acting this way on the House floor trying to make ad hoc changes in efficiencies rules. It just doesn't make any sense.

Again, I oppose the way in which this is occurring, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the Westmoreland amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 112–540.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 10, strike ''The Committee'' and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee

Page 8, after line 13, insert the following:

(2) ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS.—The Committee shall conduct an analysis of how to shield American consumers and the United States economy from gasoline price fluctuations and supply disruptions in the oil market by reducing the dependence of the United States on oil.

Page 8, line 15, strike ''analysis conducted under this section'' and insert ''analysis conducted under subsection (a)(1)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, my Los Angeles district is home to one of the largest urban oilfields in the United States, the Inglewood Oil Field. My constituents suffer from anxiety and stress because of the oil drilling. In 2006, drilling operations were ramped up, and the release of harmful fumes forced nearby residents to evacuate their homes.

In April 2012, the County of Los Angeles conducted a study in which over 70 percent of residents living near the oilfields expressed concerns about exposure to emissions from the oilfield. Meanwhile, my colleagues, unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle continue to push for more domestic drilling and relaxed regulations.

The bill before us today is based on two claims that appear to have become articles of faith. The claims are that

gas prices will fall if we weaken environmental protections and if we open more areas for drilling in the United States. The problem is that there is no empirical evidence supporting these claims. Oil prices are set on a world market, and no amount of domestic drilling in the United States will have a meaningful impact on that price. This isn't spin from some interest groups; this is the conclusion drawn by experts. It has been corroborated by the Associated Press and the Congressional Budget Office.

The AP conducted a thorough study of gasoline prices and U.S. oil production over the last 36 years and found zero correlation between the two. In other words, changes in U.S. oil production had absolutely no effect on gasoline prices, but that doesn't mean there's nothing we can do to help American families burdened by high fuel costs.

CBO recently released a study on energy security. They found that boosting U.S. oil production will not protect Americans from gasoline price spikes. Instead, CBO found that the only way to protect consumers from these spikes is to use less oil. The reason for this is simple: Gasoline prices are linked to the global oil market. That's why Japan, which imports all of its oil it uses, and Canada, which exports more than 75 percent of the oil it produces, experience the very same gasoline spikes we experience.

The best way to save money at the pump is to drive right past it. The Obama administration has been helping consumers do just that. We know that efficiency works to reduce cost. The Energy Information Administration has found that the cost per mile of driving has fallen by more than 25 percent since 1980 due to improvements in the efficiency of our vehicles.

President Obama has already taken action to reduce costs further. The new vehicle efficiency and greenhouse gas standards for model years 2012–2016 will save consumers, on average, over $3,000 over the life of a vehicle, which is hundreds of dollars per year. The millions of Americans that have bought model year 2012 cars are already enjoying savings at the pump. In fact, the new standards are currently saving consumers 14 cents per gallon.

Furthermore, the energy efficiency sector is a booming job-creating field. In my district, CODA Automotive, an electric car company, recently opened their new headquarters. In a few short months last year they created 300 new jobs, and hundreds more will be created in the coming years. This is the type of job creation and cost savings that we should be focused on.

My amendment simply improves the bill by adding a provision that actually has something to do with gasoline prices. This amendment would require the newly created Interagency Committee to analyze how to protect American consumers from gasoline price spikes by reducing America's dependence on oil.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing that efficiency works and must be part of the solution. If not, this legislation will continue to ignore the only approach identified by CBO as helpful in protecting consumers from supply disruption and price spikes.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GARDNER. I have great respect for the gentlelady from California who joined this Congress in the class of 2010 election and served as Speaker of the House in California. It's great to work with you on the House floor, but unfortunately I am going to have to oppose the amendment.

The best way to reduce our dependence on foreign oil is to increase our energy opportunities right here in our own backyard. That's what the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act is all about. The components and pieces, the seven parts of this bill, are designed to reduce red tape to increase opportunity for American energy production—those productions occurring on our Federal lands, including renewable energy; the opportunity to create wind energy, solar energy on our Federal lands, making sure the Department of the Interior is planning for that, taking a look at.

But, again, the best way to reduce our reliance on oil imports is domestic production, the opportunity to increase that production right here in our own backyard. That's what this bill is about.

□ 0950

It's about creating jobs and opportunity for the American people. It's about making sure that we can reduce the price at the pump.

And let me talk just a little bit about reducing the price at the pump. The gentlelady from California mentioned the issue of CAFE standards, increasing efficiency in cars. Well, you know, you're only going to achieve those higher efficiencies through CAFE standards if you're able to afford a new car.

But we know that that is going to make cars more expensive. It's going to cost $1,000 in the near term. It's going to add $3,000 by 2025 to the cost of a vehicle. That's going to be higher if you talk to the National Automobile Dealers Association, the NADA.

So if you're not struggling under the burden of higher gas prices, then I guess you can afford a new car. Maybe you can, I don't know. But the fact is, if we continue to allow energy increases to increase nearly 100 percent, as they have over the past 3 years, the American people, our constituents, will be priced out of the ability to even contemplate the purchase of a new vehicle, continuing their struggle to make ends meet, to heat and cool their home because of the cost of energy prices.

We know that we have opportunities right here in our own back yard: the Keystone XL pipeline, North American energy, energy from the Bakken oil fields of North Dakota. The cause of gasoline price fluctuation is already known.

The gentlelady from California mentioned the CBO study. The CBO study talks about demand as a factor in price, but seems to neglect that there is no supply connection. Supply matters. Supply and demand matters.

Let's take a look at natural gas. Production of natural gas right now, the price is at low levels because we have almost a glut of natural gas. As a result, the price of natural gas is low. Supply matters.

Secretary Chu testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that supply matters. It's not just a demand equation. You can't just turned around and say as more people consume oil that increases the price of oil without taking a look at the other part of the equation: supply. More supply. Secretary Chu said so.

With that, Mr. Chairman, the best way to reduce our reliance on foreign imports is to create American jobs with American energy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BASS of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 22 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 112–540.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It is No. 23.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 9, at the end of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 207. ENSURING FEASIBLE ANALYSES.

(a) DETERMINATION OF FEASIBILITY OF ANALYSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, if the Secretary of Energy determines that the analyses required under section 203 are infeasible to conduct, require data that does not exist, or would generate results subject to such large estimates of uncertainty that the results would be neither reliable nor useful, the requirements under section 203(a) shall cease to be effective.

(b) NO REPORT OR DELAY OF FINAL ACTION ON CERTAIN RULES IF ANALYSES ARE INFEASIBLE.—If, pursuant to subsection (a), the requirements under section 203(a) cease to be effective, then the requirements under sections 204 and 205 shall cease to be effective.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that we can all simply agree to this amendment.

Among this bill's many provisions is one that creates a new interagency committee to do the impossible. It is charged with conducting an analysis of the EPA air quality rules that have not been proposed, using data that does not even exist. I'm concerned that this new interagency committee is being set up to fail.

First, the bill before us requires the new committee to examine the potential impact of several EPA air quality rules on gasoline prices. There's one significant problem. These rules have not yet been proposed.

Now, we can argue about whether they have been initiated, contemplated, discussed, mulled over, considered and so forth. But the fundamental fact is that the rules and their requirements have not even yet been proposed. The committee simply has nothing concrete to analyze.

As a result, any report that this new interagency committee would complete would be the product of a series of best guesses, estimates, approximations, and assumptions that cannot possibly provide credible assessment of a potential impact of these potential rules on gasoline prices.

Moreover, it may not even be possible for the interagency committee to complete this analysis, as insufficient as it will be, without a significant investment of resources at the Department of Energy.

We asked the Energy Information Administration what it would take to complete such an analysis. EIA, which is better positioned than any other government agency to tackle this project, said that it currently does not have the analytic capability even to conduct the State or regional level breakdowns required by such a bill.

The agency also would have to collect or purchase new data, despite the bill's hollow assurances that this isn't necessary. And the Department of Energy would have to devote significant new staff and contractor time to be able to comply with the bill's requirements. In essence, this bill proposes to devote scarce taxpayer dollars to produce a report that will not be reliable, credible, or even valuable to anyone.

My amendment simply states that if the Energy Department determines that that analysis is not feasible to conduct, requires data that does not exist, or generates results that would not be reliable or useful, then the interagency committee does not have to complete the report. If it determined that such an analysis is infeasible, the 6-month delay of EPA rules then would not go into effect.

This amendment is a good-governance amendment that ensures effective use of taxpayer dollars. It's common sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I've enjoyed serving on the committee with the gentlelady from California, but I must oppose the amendment.

Talking about the process that we're going through on regulations, you know, this is the very heart of the bill, to understand the cost feasibility, what pressures regulations can put on the price of energy, the price of gasoline, and whether or not these regulations are going to cause price increases.

In fact, we know very well that they are going to cause price increases because we've had testimony from the Environmental Protection Agency admitting that some of these regulations, proposed regulations that they have on the books, or that they have promulgated contemplating will increase the price of gasoline and other prices in other energy areas.

These have real effects on consumers. In fact, if you just increase the price of gasoline by a penny a gallon, it will increase the daily cost to the American consumers and businesses millions and millions of dollars each and every day, one penny a gallon costing our economy millions and millions of dollars a day.

And so with this we're trying to actually say let's take a look at it to understand. We're not stopping them from going forward with their plans or developing rules. Certainly, we want to encourage the protection of our environment and make sure they're doing their job to protect our environment.

But we also need to have our eyes open and make sure that we have a chance to look before we leap when it comes to these regulations.

Delving down into the EPA's own process, though, if you look at what happens under the regulatory process, the cumulative impact analyses are feasible and already required by President Clinton's Executive Order 12866 and President Obama's Executive Order 13563. As recently as March of this year, just a couple of months ago, the White House issued a memo reiterating that ''agencies should take active steps to take account of the cumulative effects of new and existing rules.''

The EPA's own action development process, the internal process of the EPA, requires that the analysis start early in rule development. That doesn't say you wait until the rule is developed. It doesn't say you wait until it's all done, complete, out there. Early in the rule development process, action development process, taking a look at it.

This information's available. They've got the data. They've got the studies. It's time that they use that information to understand the impact that it will have on our constituents back home who are finding it increasingly difficult to balance the cost of energy with costs like paying for their home mortgage, putting food on the table. And that's why we have an opportunity, with this bill, to create American energy security and to create jobs in this country.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, so I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, as we know and as my colleague from Colorado has just illustrated, the bill creates redundant layers of bureaucracy and requires a study of key air pollution standards that are not even yet proposed by the EPA. This is clearly designed to postpone pollution cleanup.

My amendment is a straightforward amendment which simply says if the Energy Department's analysis of the EPA's air quality rules is not feasible or not useful, we should not be spending taxpayer resources on it.

I would note again that these EPA air quality rules that would be analyzed aren't even on the books yet. We shouldn't be wasting agency time and resources on tasks like the ones proposed here. This amendment is one of common sense. It is straightforward and very simple. So I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Again, analyzing rules is part of its job. That's part of the EPA's job. It's part of the DOE's job. The DOE has a budget in excess of $26 billion. In fact, we found out just a couple of days ago that one program at the Department of Energy is costing $1.2 million per job created. It has the resources to do it within existing funds. This isn't going to cost any new money. What it is going to do is to make sure that we're protecting the American consumers before cost increases occur. With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 112–540.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, strike ''and'' after the semicolon at line 2, strike the period at line 9 and insert ''; and'', and after line 9 insert the following:

''(G) the best estimate, based upon commercial and scientific data, of the expected increase in domestic production of geothermal, solar, wind, or other renewable energy sources on lands defined as 'available lands' by section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and any other lands deemed by the Territory or State of Hawaii, as the case may be, to be included within that definition.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds to title III, the Quadrennial Strategic Federal Onshore Energy Production Strategy, by providing another subsection, G, which basically mirrors the language found in the prior section, which addresses the Indian tribal lands. This particular amendment includes in that the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act lands.

As you are probably well aware, Hawaii is in a unique situation in that, in 1920, this Congress created the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act; and there is a special body of land, 203,000 acres approximately, which is under the control of Congress. Congress approves whether or not things can be amended in the act. Even upon statehood, that right was retained.

As such, this amendment seeks to have all of the alternative and renewable energy sources, including geothermal, solar, wind, and other renewable energy sources and lands, defined as ''available lands'' under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in the strategic review. We believe this is not expanding this. It has no implications other than the fact that there is a body of land which somehow has been forgotten and that falls under Federal jurisdiction.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept this amendment.

Native Hawaiian homelands are not managed as tribal lands by the Federal Government, which is why they were not included in the underlying legislation. However, Hawaiian homelands can provide another great source for domestic energy development; therefore, we are prepared to accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 112–540.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, strike lines 3 through 5.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I rise to introduce an amendment to the Strategic Energy Production Act. This bill is being pitched as an all-of-the-above energy bill when, in reality, it is an oil-above-all bill, which is full of giveaways to big energy companies.

Title IV of H.R. 4480 would impose arbitrary deadlines on the Interior Department's review of applications for permits to drill for oil and gas onshore. After 60 days, if the Interior Department has not completed its review of an application to drill, the permit would be deemed ''approved'' regardless of whether the Department ensured that the drilling was safe.

My amendment is quite simple. It would just strike this unwise and unwarranted provision. First, a little context would be helpful.

The United States is in the middle of a great drilling boom. In fact, the Obama administration has issued more drilling permits in the last 3 years than were issued in the first 3 years of the Bush administration. A recent Citigroup report suggests that the U.S. is already the world's fastest-growing oil and natural gas producer. In counting the output from Canada and Mexico, North America is the ''new Middle East.'' Meanwhile, the top five oil companies made $137 billion in profits last year. They are reaping the benefits of this revival, and they are doing just fine.

Oil and gas companies are currently sitting on 6,700 approved—and I underscore ''approved''—drilling permits that are not being used. Issuing more drilling permits more quickly is not the answer. What we should not be doing is tying the hands of Interior Department regulators by imposing an artificial and arbitrary shot clock in approving these drilling permits, especially when the risks of safety problems remain high. In fact, oil companies are already committing scores of serious safety violations when drilling on public lands onshore.

According to a recent Natural Resources Committee report, more than 2,000 safety and drilling violations were issued to 335 companies drilling in 17 States between 1998 and 2011. Overall, the analysis shows that only a very small percentage of these violations ever receive fines. In fact, of all of the fines issued, it only generated $273,000 out of the 2,000 violations.

Here is an example: on dozens of occasions, oil and gas companies began drilling on Federal lands without the formal approval to do so. Many violations were issued because companies failed to keep proper records or to conduct routine safety tests. Some significant ones include: in 2009, an operator in Mississippi was found operating a well without any blow-out preventer or any equivalent well-control equipment. In 2010, an inspector at a New Mexico well found that one of the valves in the blow-out preventer, which is responsible for mitigating excessive pressure and flow, was leaking.

We have many examples of when safety was not put first. Instead of preventing these sorts of safety violations, this bill puts profits first and safety and oversight last.

I am pleased that the majority has acknowledged the important role the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act play in the proper review of drilling permits and that it has included language to prevent permits from being deemed approved in cases where reviews under those laws are still ongoing after 60 days.

However, I think it is important for us to look at the unintended consequences. If this provision is enacted, it could actually lead to more applications for drilling permits being rejected because the Secretary may have no choice but to reject any application for a permit to drill that was nearing the 60-day time limit if the safety review were not completed.

□ 1010

The bottom line here is that the United States oil and gas production is at an all-time high.

Allowing for proper safety review of permits is a necessary safeguard for the American people, and this is a prudent step. Taxpayers deserve a process that ensures that any drilling on their public lands is held to commonsense safety standards. Let's not compromise the safety of drilling on public lands in a headstrong rush to give the oil and gas industry the free pass it demands.

I respectively urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I do oppose this amendment.

The legislation we're looking at today, H.R. 4480, aims to reduce bureaucracy and ensure much needed certainty to allow energy production and job creation to move forward. It will give permit applicants assurance that their permits will be processed by the government in a timely fashion and ensure that needless bureaucratic delays are not hampering energy production as they are sometimes today.

The Department of the Interior is plagued with delays in permitting energy projects on Federal lands. These delays result in developers abandoning Federal lands to develop energy only on private land. This hinders the creation of thousands of American jobs. This legislation simply requires that a decision on a drilling permit be made. It does not require an approval, but simply a decision. The government must answer ''yes'' or ''no.'' It's not acceptable for the government to stall, drag its feet, or even not respond.

These are decisions that State agencies are making in days, while the BLM is taking months. This amendment, however, would delete this deadline for the government to provide an answer. Under this amendment, the Federal Government could literally take forever to respond. A deadline is absolutely necessary to give energy producers the confidence they need to seek out Federal land for development rather than seeking to exclusively develop on private land.

An identical amendment to the one offered by the gentlewoman from California failed during the Natural Resources Committee markup, and it failed on a bipartisan vote. So I would ask for the same response here, that we vote this amendment down. I urge its opposition.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 112–540.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE __—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. _____. CERTAIN REVENUES GENERATED BY THIS ACT TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION TO LIMIT EXCESSIVE SPECULATION IN ENERGY MARKETS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TREASURY ACCOUNT.—The Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall establish an account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) DEPOSIT INTO ACCOUNT OF CERTAIN REVENUES GENERATED BY THIS ACT.—The Secretary shall deposit into the account established under subsection (a) the first $128,000,000 of the total of the amounts received by the United States under leases issued under this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or any plan, strategy, or program under this Act.

(c) AVAILABILITY AND USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amounts in the account established under subsection (a) shall be made available to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to use its existing authorities to limit excessive speculation in energy markets.

(2) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—The authority provided in paragraph (1) may be exercised only to such extent, and with respect to such amounts, as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore full funding, per the President's request of $308 million, to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The additional $128 million in funds would be raised through the sale of new leases.

The current funding level for CFTC sets the commission up for failure. If the current funding level remains as is, Wall Street will be able to continue the risky manipulation of derivatives that brought on the last collapse, and Big Oil will continue to enjoy inflated profits every year due to erratic and artificially swollen oil prices. The losers will be the American people, who will pay more at the pump, or even worse.

At this funding level, the House majority sets up taxpayers to pay for yet another costly bailout of Wall Street. Republican and Democratic experts agree that the CFTC needs to be fully funded. Republican Gene Guilford, President and CEO of the Independent Connecticut Petroleum Association, served in the Commerce and Energy Departments under Ronald Reagan. He has said that the funding level for CFTC is ''horribly counterproductive.'' It would ''weaken its ability to enforce the oversight laws necessary to protect the American people.''

According to Brooksley Born, the former chair of the CFTC, the commission is ''desperately in need of additional funding.'' This budget, she argues, ''would leave us all vulnerable to future financial crises.''

According to Gary Gensler, the current chairman of the CFTC, the agency is only 10 percent larger than it was in the 1990s, even as the futures market has grown to approximately $37 trillion notional.

And through the Dodd-Frank reforms, Congress has added oversight of the $300 trillion swaps market, which is even more complex, and increased the number of trades under their jurisdiction by 334 percent in 2011.

Gensler says, ''It is as if all of a sudden the National Football League expanded eight times to play more than 100 games in a weekend with the same amount of referees.''

We know for a fact that the risky behavior in the derivatives market is what precipitated the 2008 financial meltdown. It's still happening. We have seen it at MF Global and J.P. Morgan. We also know for a fact that excessive speculation in oil markets causes gas prices to oscillate wildly. Even the CEO of Exxon has said as much.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to help to make sure that the CFTC has the resources to do its job, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is trying to deal with the rising prices of energy by addressing the very important issue of supply and demand. While I think there's nothing wrong with looking into the possibility of market manipulation, I do think this bill is trying to address another very important part of the price equation, and that is supply and demand.

This issue has been studied, and it will continue to be studied. But I'll remind the gentlelady that we're dealing with an agency that has over $200 million already in its budget, and this amendment adding $128 million would be a significant increase in funding for FY12 for the CFTC budget. So I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

If you would just look at what the CFTC has said, going back in 2008:

The task force's preliminary assessment is that current oil prices and the increase in oil prices between January 2003 and June 2008 are largely due to fundamental supply and demand factors.

In 2009:

We find little evidence that hedge funds and other noncommercial (speculator) position changes cause price changes; the results instead suggest that price changes do precede their position changes.

So we can go on and on about what the CFTC has already said, but this bill deals with the issue of supply and demand.

With that, I would yield 2 minutes to a great leader from the State of Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) who has done tremendous work on this issue over at the CFTC and in commodity issues.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management that does have oversight of the CFTC.

I expected the arguments for this particular amendment to go a different direction, but it does occur to me that we are chastised, those of us on authorizing committees, Mr. Chairman, during the appropriations process, that trying to write policy in the approps bills is not allowed. Well, this is appropriating in an authorizing bill. It makes no sense whatsoever.

The Subcommittee on Agriculture on the Appropriations Committee goes through these spending requests in detail, over and over, in a few weeks of committee work, and then they will come to their conclusion. They have, in fact, come to their conclusion, and they will bring this bill forward next week.

It's a bit presumptuous to come in here to ask this body to spend another $128 million on an agency that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture has already spent plenty of time deciding how much that agency needs to spend over the coming year.

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

Ms. DELAURO. If I might just take a second to remind the gentleman from Texas that, in fact, this amendment was made in order. And in the body of the language, it does talk about it being subject to appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

□ 1020

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentlelady.

Back 10 years ago, about a third of all of the interest in the oil futures marketplace was controlled by speculators, but two-thirds was controlled by the airline industry, the trucking industry, industries that are dependent upon oil. Today it's just the flip. Today two-thirds of that oil futures marketplace is controlled by speculators, and only one-third is controlled by the airline industry, trucking industry, and others dependent upon the price of oil.

So what happened? What happens is, all of a sudden, you have this crazy volatility where experts say that upwards of 20 percent of the price of a barrel of oil in the futures marketplace is related to speculation. It's not related to anything in the real marketplace. And so what happens? Well, that has a dramatically negative impact on truckers, on the airline industry because there are games being played out there.

By the way, with the speculators, they make money on the way up and they make money on the way down. That's not true for ordinary companies because they're not in there playing a game. They are not speculators. They are not doing this as part of some kind of a casino that speculators thrive in.

And here's the rule: On the way up, the big guy cleans up; on the way down, the little guy gets cleaned out. And that's what we're seeing over and over and over again.

So the President has asked to increase the number of cops on the beat, the CFTC cops on the beat that can patrol to make sure that the games that are being played don't hurt the little guy. And what are the Republicans saying? They're saying they want to cut the President's request for more cops on the beat sixfold. And what happens then? Well, we're going to be deepsixing the hopes, the dreams, the aspirations of ordinary companies who are still going to see these games being played. The DeLauro amendment makes it possible to put the CFTC cops back on the beat.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, again, we have to understand that the best thing that this Congress can do to drive down the price of gasoline is increasing our supply opportunities right here, to drive down the cost of energy by increasing our production right here.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. We are not here as representatives of Wall Street, but we are representatives of the American people. We need the CFTC to oversee the risky behaviors to enforce the law. We are here to represent the American taxpayer, not Wall Street or big banks.

The current funding that's being pursued by the majority is reckless. I urge my colleagues to put Main Street over Wall Street and support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 112–540.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas?

Ms. BASS of California. I do rise as the designee for the gentlewoman from Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—OFFICE OF ENERGY EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING AND OFFICE OF MINORITY AND WOMEN INCLUSION

SEC. __01. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF ENERGY EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish an Office of Energy Employment and Training, which shall oversee the efforts of the Department of the Interior's energy planning, permitting, and regulatory activities to carry out the purposes, objectives, and requirements of this Act.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall be directed by an Assistant Secretary for Energy Employment and Training, who shall report directly to the Secretary and shall be fully employed to carry out the functions of the Office.

(2) DUTIES.—The Assistant Secretary for Energy Employment and Training shall perform the following functions:

(A) Develop and implement systems to track the Department's compliance with the purposes, objectives, and requirements of the Act.

(B) Report at least quarterly to the Secretary regarding the Department's compliance with the purposes, objectives, and requirements of this Act, including but not limited to specific data regarding the numbers and types of jobs created through the Department's efforts and a report on all job training programs planned or in progress by the Department.

(C) Design and recommend to the Secretary programs and policies aimed at ensuring the Department's compliance with the purposes, objectives, and requirements of this Act, and oversee implementation of such programs approved by the Secretary.

(D) Develop procedures for enforcement of the Department's requirements and responsibilities under this Act.

(E) Support the activities of the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion and any other offices or branches established by the Secretary within the Office of Energy Employment and Training.

SEC. __02. OFFICE OF MINORITY AND WOMEN INCLUSION.

(a) OFFICE OF MINORITY AND WOMEN INCLUSION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion not later than 6 months after the effective date of this Act, that shall be responsible for all matters of the Department of the Interior relating to diversity in management, employment, and business activities.

(2) TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that the responsibilities described in paragraph (1) (or comparable responsibilities) that are assigned to any other office, agency, or bureau of the Department on the day before the date of enactment of this Act are transferred to the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion.

(3) DUTIES WITH RESPECT TO CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—The responsibilities described in paragraph (1) do not include enforcement of statutes, regulations, or executive orders pertaining to civil rights, except each Director shall coordinate with the Secretary, or the designee of the Secretary, regarding the design and implementation of any remedies resulting from violations of such statutes, regulations, or executive orders.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall have a Director who shall be appointed by, and shall report to, the Secretary of the Interior. The position of Director shall be a career reserved position in the Senior Executive Service, as that position is defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code, or an equivalent designation.

(2) DUTIES.—The Director shall develop standards for—

(A) equal employment opportunity and the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the workforce and senior management of the Department;

(B) increased participation of minority-owned and women-owned businesses in the programs and contracts of the Department, including standards for coordinating technical assistance to such businesses; and

(C) assessing the diversity policies and practices of entities regulated by the Department.

(3) OTHER DUTIES.—The Director shall advise the Secretary of the Interior on the impact of the policies and regulations of the Department on minority-owned and women-owned businesses.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (2)(C) may be construed to mandate any requirement on or otherwise affect the lending policies and practices of any regulated entity, or to require any specific action based on the findings of the assessment.

(c) INCLUSION IN ALL LEVELS OF BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall develop and implement standards and procedures to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, the fair inclusion and utilization of minorities, women, and minority-owned and women-owned businesses in all business and activities of the Department at all levels, including in procurement, insurance, and all types of contracts.

(2) CONTRACTS.—The procedures established by the Department for review and evaluation of contract proposals and for hiring service providers shall include, to the extent consistent with applicable law, a component that gives consideration to the diversity of the applicant. Such procedure shall include a written statement, in a form and with such content as the Director shall prescribe, that a contractor shall ensure, to the maximum extent possible, the fair inclusion of women and minorities in the workforce of the contractor and, as applicable, subcontractors.

(3) TERMINATION.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—The standards and procedures developed and implemented under this subsection shall include a procedure for the Director to make a determination whether a Department contractor, and, as applicable, a subcontractor has failed to make a good faith effort to include minorities and women in their workforce.

(B) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—

(i) RECOMMENDATION TO SECRETARY.—Upon a determination described in subparagraph (A), the Director shall make a recommendation to the Secretary that the contract be terminated.

(ii) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—Upon receipt of a recommendation under clause (i), the Secretary may—

(I) terminate the contract;

(II) make a referral to the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the Department of Labor; or

(III) take other appropriate action.

(d) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report regarding the actions taken by the Department of the Interior agency and the Office pursuant to this section, which shall include—

(1) a statement of the total amounts paid by the Department to contractors since the previous report;

(2) the percentage of the amounts described in paragraph (1) that were paid to contractors described in subsection (c)(1);

(3) the successes achieved and challenges faced by the Department in operating minority and women outreach programs;

(4) the challenges the Department may face in hiring minority and women employees and contracting with minority-owned and women-owned businesses; and

(5) any other information, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for legislative or Department action, as the Director determines appropriate.

(e) DIVERSITY IN DEPARTMENT WORKFORCE.—The Secretary shall take affirmative steps to seek diversity in the workforce of the Department at all levels of the Department in a manner consistent with applicable law. Such steps shall include—

(1) recruiting at historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, women's colleges, and colleges that typically serve majority minority populations;

(2) sponsoring and recruiting at job fairs in urban communities;

(3) placing employment advertisements in newspapers and magazines oriented toward minorities and women;

(4) partnering with organizations that are focused on developing opportunities for minorities and women to be placed in energy industry internships, summer employment, and full-time positions;

(5) where feasible, partnering with inner-city high schools, girls' high schools, and high schools with majority minority populations to establish or enhance financial literacy programs and provide mentoring; and

(6) any other mass media communications that the Office determines necessary.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) MINORITY.—The term ''minority'' means United States citizens who are Asian Indian American, Asian Pacific American, Black American, Hispanic American, or Native American.

(2) MINORITY-OWNED BUSINESS.—The term ''minority-owned business'' means a for-profit enterprise, regardless of size, physically located in the United States or its trust territories, which is owned, operated, and controlled by minority group members. ''Minority group members'' are United States citizens who are Asian Indian American, Asian Pacific American, Black American, Hispanic American, or Native American (terminology in NMSDC categories). Ownership by minority individuals means the business is at least 51 percent owned by such individuals or, in the case of a publicly owned business, at least 51 percent of the stock is owned by one or more such individuals. Further, the management and daily operations are controlled by those minority group members. For purposes of NMSDC's program, a minority group member is an individual who is a United States citizen with at least ¼ or 25 percent minimum (documentation to support claim of 25 percent required from applicant) of one or more of the following:

(A) Asian Indian American, which is a United States citizen whose origins are from India, Pakistan, or Bangladesh.

(B) Asian Pacific American, which is a United States citizen whose origins are from Japan, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Taiwan, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, the Philippines, Thailand, Samoa, Guam, the United States Trust Territories of the Pacific, or the Northern Marianas.

(C) Black American, which is a United States citizen having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

(D) Hispanic American, which is a United States citizen of true-born Hispanic heritage, from any of the Spanish-speaking areas of the following regions: Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean Basin only.

(E) Native American, which is a person who is an American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut or Native Hawaiian, and regarded as such by the community of which the person claims to be a part. Native Americans must be documented members of a North American tribe, band, or otherwise organized group of native people who are indigenous to the continental United States and proof can be provided through a Native.

(3) NMSDC.—The term ''NMSDC'' means the National Minority Supplier Development Council.

(4) OFFICE.—The term ''Office'' means the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion established under subsection (a).

(5) WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS.—The term ''women-owned business'' means a business that can verify through evidence documentation that 51 percent or more is women-owned, managed, and controlled. The business must be open for at least 6 months. The business owner must be a United States citizen or legal resident alien. Evidence must indicate that—

(A) the contribution of capital or expertise by the woman business owner is real and substantial and in proportion to the interest owned;

(B) the woman business owner directs or causes the direction of management, policy, fiscal, and operational matters; and

(C) the woman business owner has the ability to perform in the area of specialty or expertise without reliance on either the finances or resources of a firm that is not owned by a woman.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 691, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as the designee to present Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE's amendment No. 27 to H.R. 4480, which would establish an Office of Energy Employment and Training as well as an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion that would be responsible for all matters relating to diversity in management, employment, and business activity.

This amendment simply recognizes the importance of developing a diverse and highly skilled technical workforce within the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior reviews permits, examines lease sales, and ensures that each application meets the highest safety standards. We should be focused on providing the Department of the Interior with trained technical engineers and other such necessary personnel to review drilling permit applications both carefully and thoroughly. Given the aftermath of the BP oil spill, it is easy to understand the importance of addressing all safety concerns prior to the issuance of oil and gas lease sales.

Since the disaster, Federal safety regulations have been tightened, spill

containment response capability has been enhanced, and lessons have been learned. These lessons must be understood by everyone involved in reviewing and approving each and every application for permits and lease sales. Responsible onshore drilling includes having our best minds working to carefully and diligently review each application. This amendment is intended to include both women and minorities in the process.

This amendment is designed to ensure that DOI is able to recruit, retain, and train skilled professionals, many of whom require a science, technology, or math background. The DOI would be encouraged to reach out to high school students, college students, and professionals.

It establishes an Office of Energy Employment and Training, which will oversee the efforts of the Department of the Interior's energy planning, permitting, and regulatory activities related to this act. This office will be responsible for issuing quarterly reports to the Secretary, which will include the amount of jobs created by the DOI, as well as reporting the types of job training programs that have been implemented or proposed.

This amendment also addresses the need to encourage diversity within the DOI by creating the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion, which is specifically designed to encourage diversity by reaching out to both women and minorities. Specifically, the DOI would have a director appointed by the Secretary of the Interior who will develop clear standards for equal employment opportunities and will address the need for increased racial, ethnic, and gender diversity at both the junior and senior management levels of the Department.

This amendment would require the DOI to take affirmative steps to seek diversity in the workforce of the Department at all levels. The Department of the Interior would be required to sponsor job fairs in urban communities and partner with organizations that are focused on developing opportunities for both minorities and women in the energy industry.

Again, it is the job of the DOI to ensure that all lease sales meet the highest reasonable standards for safety. This amendment is meant to ensure that women and minorities have a fair opportunity to participate in making these types of decisions within the Interior Department.

I support my colleague Ms. JACKSON LEE's amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I rise to oppose this amendment, reluctantly. I understand the gentlewoman's intentions of this amendment, and portions of this idea have strong merit.

Let there be no doubt that the Department of the Interior can do a better job of both hiring and contracting in these areas, but this debate today isn't the most appropriate place for us to consider these particular reforms.

Every provision in this legislation has been carefully vetted through the legislative process. The House Natural Resources and Energy and Commerce Committees have both held oversight and legislative hearings and committee markups on the underlying legislation.

This subject, while it is something definitely worth considering, has not had this level of review under the legislative process and would insert a major programmatic and bureaucratic change in a simple bill that is geared toward expanding American energy production and jobs. Also, as currently drafted, the proposal is over 12 pages long and would add significant new Federal bureaucracy.

If the gentlewoman is willing to withdraw her amendment, I will commit the Natural Resources Committee to work with her to address this subject, and if she will not withdraw, then I must reluctantly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BASS of California. I thank the gentleman for his offer, but given that I am the designee for Representative JACKSON LEE, I don't feel it is appropriate for me to withdraw the amendment.

I would simply close by saying that the purpose of the amendment is to recognize the importance of developing a diverse and highly skilled technical workforce within the DOI, and all studies have indicated that there is a serious lack of diversity.

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

□ 1030

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, Representative GARDNER from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank my colleague from Colorado for giving me the time on this amendment.

I want to tell a little story. A year ago, I had the opportunity to visit a hydraulic fracturing site in my district, a county called Weld County in northern Colorado, and when you're dealing with hydraulic fracturing, what happens is about 2 or 3 in the morning the crews that are overseeing the hydraulic fracturing—at least in this particular area—get up, they go to their trucks that actually have this panoramic view of the well site so they can monitor everything that's taking place. They can monitor all the equipment. They have computers inside the truck that explain and expound upon what's happening in the operation at that point. It's filled with engineers.

And on this particular tour site that I went to, the hydraulic fracturing, the production engineer was a woman. And I'm pretty sure that I would have been rejected by her college for the engineering program before I even applied. So it was an incredible opportunity to learn from her the work that she was doing. There were many other women members of that particular crew.

And so I think the best way that we can get more women and more minorities hired and working in this country, whether it's energy or not, is to create more opportunity. More opportunity means more jobs. More jobs means more hiring. And when you have more hiring, we're going to put more people back to work: Men, women, minorities.

That's the opportunity that this bill presents. It's an opportunity to create jobs, an opportunity to lower the price of gas so that men, women, and minorities are able to afford the price of a gallon of gasoline to get to their job.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to debate my amendment No. 27 to H.R. 4480, the "Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012," which would establish an Office of Energy Employment and Training, as well as, an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion that would be responsible for all matters relating to diversity in management, employment, and business activities.

As well as establishing an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion for the purpose of addressing the need for diversity within the DOI and within the pool of businesses that the DOI engages.

Texas serves as proof that the energy industry offers tremendous potential to provide jobs and foster economic growth. As a matter of fact, in 2008, Texas was one of the few States that saw its economy grow; grossing the second highest revenue of all States at $1.2 trillion.

As the Representative of the 18th Congressional District of Houston, Texas, I can attest to the importance of a healthy energy industry. My district is the energy hub of Texas and is recognized worldwide for its energy industry, particularly for oil and natural gas, as well as biomedical research and aeronautics. Renewable energy sources—wind and solar—are also growing economic bases in Houston.

The energy industry and its supporting businesses provide my fellow Texans with tens of thousands of jobs, and have helped keep the State of Texas significantly below the national unemployment rate.

This prosperity can expand well beyond Texas, if the Federal and State governments will act decisively and responsibly to expand domestic energy productions in an environmentally conscious manner, and keep billions of dollars and countless jobs here at home. However I must place emphasis on the need to act both decisively and responsibly. It remains to be seen whether this bill truly accomplishes those goals. My amendment is designed to address the need for training and diversity in the Energy sector.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

My amendment recognizes the importance of developing a diverse and highly skilled technical workforce within the Department of Interior.

The Department of Interior reviews permits, and examines lease sales. Further, the DOT is responsible for ensuring that each application meets the highest safety standards.

We should be focused on providing the Department of Interior with trained technical engineers and other such necessary personnel to review drilling permit applications both carefully and thoroughly.

Given the aftermath of the BP Oil spill, it is easy to understand the importance of addressing all safety concerns prior to the issuance of oil and gas lease sales.

Since the disaster federal safety regulations have been tightened, spill containment response capability has been enhanced and lessons have been learned.

These lessons must be understood by everyone involved in reviewing and approving each and every application for permits and lease sales.

Responsible onshore drilling includes having our best minds working to carefully and diligently review each application. This amendment is intended to include both women and minorities in the process.

This amendment is designed to ensure that DOT is able to recruit, retain and train skilled professionals, many of whom require a science, technology, engineering, or math (STEM) backgrounds. The DOT will be encouraged to reach out to high school students, college students, and professional.

My Amendment establishes an Office of Energy Employment and Training which will oversee the efforts of the Department of Interior's energy planning, permitting, and regulatory actives related to this Act.

This Office will be responsible for issuing quarterly reports to the Secretary which will include the amount of jobs created by the DOT, as well as, reporting the types of job training programs that have been implemented or proposed.

This amendment also addresses the need to encourage diversity within the Department of Interior. By creating an the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion which is specifically designed to encourage diversity by reaching out to both women and minorities.

Specifically the DOT will have a Director appointed by the Secretary of the Interior who will develop clear standards for equal employment opportunities and will address the need for increased racial, ethnic, and gender diversity at both the junior and senior management levels of the Department.

This amendment would require the DOT to take affirmative steps to seek diversity in the workforce of the Department at all levels of the Department.

These steps would include recruiting at historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-service institutions, and women's colleges and other majority minority service institutions. The Department will be able to find qualified candidates from diverse backgrounds if they expand the pool of candidates from which they select candidates.

The DOT would be required to sponsor job fairs in urban communities and partner with organization that are focused on developing opportunities for both minorities and women in the energy industry.

Again, it is the job of the Department of the Interior to ensure that all lease sales meet the highest reasonable standards for safety. This amendment is meant to include encourage and ensure that women and minorities have a fair opportunity to participate in making these types of decisions the DOI.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting my Amendment No. 27 to H.R. 4480.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, 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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1059

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER) at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes a.m.

DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 691 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. 4480.

Will the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1100

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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, with Mrs. EMERSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 112–540 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112–540 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. AMODEI of Nevada.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. LANDRY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 19 by Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 21 by Ms. BASS of California.

Amendment No. 23 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 25 by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment No. 26 by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) 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 253, noes 163, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—253

Adams	Barrow	Black
Aderholt	Bartlett	Blackburn
Akin	Barton (TX)	Bonner
Alexander	Bass (NH)	Bono Mack
Altmire	Benishek	Boren
Amash	Berg	Boswell
Amodei	Biggert	Boustany
Austria	Bilbray	Brady (TX)
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Brooks
Bachus	Bishop (GA)	Broun (GA)
Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan

Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
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
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—163

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
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
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Heinrich
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

□ 1127

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

Messrs. RIBBLE, NUGENT, AL GREEN of Texas, CUELLAR, and SIMPSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 392, I was present but the voting machine did not record my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 392, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Chair, on June 21, 2012, I unfortunately missed one vote, rollcall Number 392. If I had been present, I would have cast the following vote on this amendment to H.R. 4480, Strategic Energy Production Act: Rollcall vote 392 (Hastings Amendment): "no."

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

WOMEN'S CONGRESSIONAL SOFTBALL

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Well, I wish I were standing before you this morning to announce the Congressional Women's Softball team's second big victory. Unfortunately, I can't share that good news with you, but I can share the news with you that our bipartisan team, with the Bad News Babes, the women members of the press corps, raised over $50,000 for the Young Survival Coalition. We're very proud of that.

We are proud, as congressional women, that we play in a bipartisan spirit, that we have built a bipartisan and bicameral camaraderie and a team spirit and friendship that we would never have had an opportunity to build if not for playing this game. I know we all feel strongly, hopefully, that we use the friendships that we build on the field and take those into the Chamber here so we can work together on the problems facing our country. That's such a tough and important priority for all of us.

We do want to congratulate, although not too enthusiastically, the Bad News Babes for their victory this year in the game, 13–10. It was heartbreaking. We kept it close. We were coming back in the last inning. We had a real opportunity but came up short.

We all, as women Members, want to thank the fabulous, indomitable Natalie Buchanan, who is on the leadership staff of KEVIN MCCARTHY, for coming out there with us every morning at 7 a.m.

Natalie, stand up.

She is on the floor with KEVIN MCCARTHY every day here. We love Natalie.

Tori Barnes, my cocaptain's daughter, is our coach year in and year out.

I also want to recognize, on my staff, Mackenzie Smith and Kate Houghton, who is on my staff but is battling leukemia right now and who we all played for on both teams. She's coming through and getting healthy.

Madam Chair, thank you for your friendship. Thank you to all the women, and thank you all, as a breast cancer survivor. Both the House leadership teams came out to the game, continued to support us, and it means so much to me personally.

I wish everybody a wonderful summer, and we will be back next year so we can take that trophy back.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 249, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—164

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)

Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
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
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—249

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
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
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Doggett
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Poe (TX)
Rivera
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scott, David
Velázquez

□ 1135

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 393, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 242, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—177

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
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
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
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
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—242

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

Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1140

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 394, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GENE GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) 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 174, noes 244, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—174

Ackerman
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
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
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—244

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
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)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
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 (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Doggett
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1143

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 395, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) 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 164, noes 255, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—164

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
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
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—255

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
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
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Bachus
Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

□ 1148

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 396, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 256, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—164

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—256

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

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1152

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 397, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 230, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

AYES—190

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
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)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—230

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1155

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 398, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. AMODEI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 257, noes 162, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

AYES—257

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

NOES—162

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1158

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 399, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 256, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]

AYES—161

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
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)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—256

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa

Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Herrera Beutler
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez
Watt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1201

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 400, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 173, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

AYES—244

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
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
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—173

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Bachus
Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1205

Ms. RICHARDSON changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 401, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 146, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

AYES—263

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

NOES—146

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Dicks
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Luján
Lummis
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Serrano
Simpson
Turner (NY)
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1208

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 402, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 250, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

AYES—168

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—250

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger

Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

□ 1212

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 403, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 161, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—256

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
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
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
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
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
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
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—161

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (NY)
Braley (IA)
Clarke (NY)
Dicks
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1215

Mr. CASSIDY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 404, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 404, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—186

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
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
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)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—233

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
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
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez
Watt

□ 1219

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 405, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 254, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—162

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
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
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
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
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—254

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall

Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Herger
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 406, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 255, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—162

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
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
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—255

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

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Herger
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

□ 1225

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 407, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 235, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—180

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
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
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
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
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
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
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (NY)
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Gallegly
Hanna
Herger
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1230

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 408, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCARTHY of California) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, 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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and, pursuant to House Resolution 691, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Slaughter moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4480 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ____1. PROHIBITING NEW LEASES FOR MAJOR OIL COMPANIES UNTIL THEY FOREGO TAX BREAKS AND BUY AMERICAN.

(a) FORGOING TAX SUBSIDIES TO QUALIFY FOR NEW LEASES.—A major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) may obtain a lease made available under a plan required by subsection (k) of section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by section 102 of this Act, only if that company agrees not to claim certain Federal tax benefits with respect to oil and gas exploration and production activities pursuant to that lease, including—

(1) percentage depletion allowances under sections 613 and 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(2) the domestic production activities deduction under section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.—A plan required by subsection (k) of section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by section 102 of this Act, shall encourage each major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that obtains an oil and gas lease made available under such plan to use only materials made in the United States in drilling operations and avoid outsourcing American jobs.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, with every decade that passes, the middle class has faced higher and higher prices at the pump. Meanwhile, the world's five biggest oil companies have reported record profits year after year. Between 2001 and 2011, the five biggest oil companies made more than $1 trillion in profits.

Despite these record profits, the majority continues to put the wishes of Big Oil before the needs of the middle class. Instead of balancing our Nation's budget by closing tax loopholes on Big Oil, they have repeatedly told the middle class that they should sacrifice the programs on which they rely to live.

Twice, the majority has passed the Ryan budget, which would end Medicare as America knows it. And picture this for your mother or your most elderly relatives. In its place, they would be given a health care voucher and sent into the marketplace on their own to find health care on their own. Meanwhile, they work hard and we call all the time for votes, not to protect the billion-dollar Big Oil subsidies from any cuts, but, again, to protect our vanishing middle class. I think this approach is not only wrongheaded and will hurt us all, but it's morally wrong.

A year ago, Speaker BOEHNER told ''60 Minutes'' that ending subsidies for Big Oil companies is ''certainly something we should be looking at.'' I couldn't agree more. He continued, ''We're in a time when the Federal Government is short on revenues. We need to control spending, but we need to have revenues to keep the government moving, and they ought to be paying their fair share.'' Speaker BOEHNER was absolutely right, and this is the time to do it.

By voting in support of my amendment, the whole House will finally have the opportunity to demand that Big Oil pay its fair share.

Last year, the five biggest oil companies in the world made a combined record profit of $137 billion. During that same time, thousands of middle class Americans slid out of the middle class and into poverty. While ExxonMobil was busy using at least 20 tax shelters to lower their tax rate to a mere 13 percent, over 20 million people were living on less than $9,000 a year. That's not America. I think we need to balance our budget by asking those who have benefited the most simply to pay a fair share, not by taking from those who have the least. Our country was never based on that.

With my amendment, the world's biggest oil companies would begin to pay their fair share. They would be barred from receiving new drilling leases until they gave up their oil and gas subsidies. In addition, my amendment would require each Big Oil company that obtains an oil and gas lease to use American-made products and hire American workers who are more than ready and willing to do the job. This amendment will do much of what we've been striving to do this whole term.

The amendment will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If we approve this amendment, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage.

It's up to us, ladies and gentlemen. We can return home this weekend and tell our constituents that finally we voted for the middle class, which is what they want us to do, or we can turn our backs on this opportunity before us and go home and explain why this Congress would vote to gut Medicare but won't ask Big Oil to pay their fair share.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit and stand up for the middle class and the suffering Americans.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GARDNER. The gentlelady is correct on one point: that it is up to us. It is up to us to protect and defend the middle class. It's up to us to work toward the development of American jobs. It's up to us to reduce the reliance on foreign oil. It's up to us to make sure that we have an opportunity to buy American from North Dakota, from Pennsylvania, from New York, from Colorado. We have an opportunity to buy energy from those States.

What about Ohio? What about Pennsylvania?

This will allow us to produce energy in this country, to buy energy from this country instead of growing our dependence on overseas energy, the Keystone XL pipeline, opportunities to look at our Federal resources for coal, for solar, for wind, traditional and renewable energy.

This bill is about American jobs, about lowering the price at the pump. We have seen over the past 3 years as gasoline prices have gone up nearly 100 percent.

We talk about putting people back to work. We talk about protecting the middle class. You know what will help people rise above it? You know what will help people move forward? It's making sure that they can afford the gasoline that they put into their tank, that they're not trying to sacrifice groceries for gasoline.

□ 1240

A one-penny increase and the price of gasoline will cost American consumers and businesses millions and millions of dollars a day.

You want to talk about things that we could do to help this country, it is an abundant and affordable energy policy, one that weans us off of foreign energy, makes sure that we are producing it here, and one that makes sure we are taking advantage of all of our energy—renewable, traditional—in the sense that we're not just looking at quick-fix politics, but we're looking at long-term supply solutions.

But once again, we are met with opposition that includes more politics, less energy; more rhetoric, less opportunity. This isn't about smoke and mirrors. This is about putting Americans back to work producing American energy and making sure that we are watching out for our constituents, lowering the price of energy so that they can improve their lives and that of their families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this motion to recommit. Let's move forward with American jobs, American energy, and support the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were 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 the bill, if ordered, and the motion to instruct on H.R. 4348.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 166, nays 243, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—166

Ackerman	DeGette	Kissell
Andrews	DeLauro	Kucinich
Baca	Deutch	Langevin
Baldwin	Dicks	Larsen (WA)
Barber	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Bass (CA)	Doggett	Lee (CA)
Becerra	Doyle	Levin
Berkley	Edwards	Lewis (GA)
Berman	Ellison	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Loebsack
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe
Bonamici	Farr	Lowey
Boswell	Fattah	Luján
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Braley (IA)	Fudge	Maloney
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	Markey
Butterfield	Gonzalez	Matsui
Capps	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)
Capuano	Grijalva	McCollum
Carnahan	Gutierrez	McDermott
Carney	Hahn	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	McIntyre
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Chandler	Heinrich	Michaud
Chu	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Cicilline	Himes	Moore
Clarke (MI)	Hinchey	Moran
Clay	Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)
Cleaver	Hirono	Nadler
Clyburn	Hochul	Napolitano
Cohen	Holden	Neal
Connolly (VA)	Holt	Olver
Conyers	Honda	Owens
Cooper	Israel	Pallone
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Pascrell
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	Jones	Pelosi
Cummings	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Davis (CA)	Keating	Peters
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kind	Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
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)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
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
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—23

Bishop (NY)
Cardoza
Clarke (NY)
Filner
Flores
Gallegly
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Kingston
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Rangel
Ross (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schweikert
Sewell
Smith (NJ)
Velázquez

□ 1258

Mr. ROE of Tennessee changed his vote changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall 409, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 163, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—248

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
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
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
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
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—163

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
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
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Bishop (NY)
Cardoza
Clarke (NY)
Dingell
Filner
Gallegly
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)

Lewis (CA)
Mack
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sewell
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Sullivan
Velázquez

□ 1305

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state for the RECORD that I missed rollcall vote 410 to H.R. 4480 taken on June 21, 2012, and I would have voted "aye" on the measure. This critical legislation promotes an American energy plan that will not only reduce our dependence on foreign oil, but also spur economic growth and job creation. Additionally, the legislation will protect American refineries by reducing unnecessary red tape and burdensome Obama Administration regulations.

Stated against:

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 410, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 410, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 4348 offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 260, nays 138, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

YEAS—260

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—138

Andrews
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Gibson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman
Bishop (NY)
Cardoza
Clarke (NY)
DesJarlais
Dicks
Duncan (TN)
Eshoo
Filner
Gallegly
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Higgins
Hinojosa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Mack
McCotter
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sires
Speier
Tierney
Turner (NY)
Velázquez
Webster

□ 1312

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 411, Coal Ash Instruction, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 411, the McKinley Motion to Instruct on H.R. 4348. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 411, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately delayed by a meeting and was unable to cast a vote on rollcalls 410 and 411 on Thursday, June 21, 2012. I would have voted "no" on both Final Passage of H.R. 4480 and the Republican Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4348.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House Chamber on Thursday, June 21 to vote on rollcalls 392 through 411. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 400, 403, 405, 406, 407, 408 and 409. I would have voted "nay" on rollcalls 392, 399, 401, 402, 410 and 411.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of June 21, 2012, upon request of a leave of absence, a series of votes were held. Had I been present for these rollcall votes, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 392—the Hastings (WA) Manager's Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 393—the Waxman Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 394—the Connolly Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 395—the Gene Green Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 396—the Rush Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 397—the Holt Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 398—the Connolly/Lewis (GA) Amendment; "no" on rollcall 399—the Amodei Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 400—the Markey Amendment; "no" on rollcall 401—the Landry Amendment; "no" on rollcall 402—the Rigell Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 403—the Holt Amendment; "no" on rollcall 404—the Wittman/Rigell Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 405—the Bass (CA) Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 406—the Capps Amendment; "yes" on

rollcall 407—Speier Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 408—the DeLauro/Markey/Frank Amendment; "yes" on rollcall 409—the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 4480; "no" on rollcall 410—Final Passage of H.R. 4480; and "no" on rollcall 411—Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4348.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5973, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5972, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–545) on the resolution (H. Res. 697) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5973) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader, to inquire of the majority leader 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 in pro forma session, but no votes are expected.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House may consider two appropriations bills next week, H.R. 5972, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, and H.R. 5973, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration Act.

Members are advised that the House will begin consideration of one of these two bills after the 6:30 p.m. vote series on Tuesday and should expect an additional late evening series of votes on amendments. Again, Mr. Speaker, that is on Tuesday.

The House is also scheduled to consider a privileged resolution finding Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General of the U.S. Department of Justice, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Finally, I expect the House to consider legislation dealing with both the expiring authority of our Nation's highway programs, as well as the pending increase in the Federal subsidized student loan rate.

Before I yield back, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure Members that we will accommodate both the congressional White House picnic on Wednesday night, as well as the congressional baseball game on Thursday evening. Debate may continue on appropriations amendments after the picnic and during the baseball game, but during those events no votes will take place.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Obviously, the gentleman has spoken to a number of very important pieces of legislation, and I want to talk about those. Then I want to talk about what I believe to be a diversion from the important business of this country. But I will get to, first, the highway conference.

On Friday, it will be 100 days since the Senate has passed a bipartisan bill, a bill which had 75 Members of the United States Senate for it. That conference has not yet reported out. I understand there is some activity on that.

The House overwhelmingly voted for the Walz MTI, and it said the conferees ought to report out a conference report by tomorrow. I don't know whether that's about to happen—today is tomorrow—but we will see whether or not it proceeds. Perhaps the gentleman can give us some information on that issue.

I've offered a motion, as the gentleman knows, to instruct to give the House an up-or-down vote on the Senate bill if we can't wait for a bill that comes out of conference. Clearly, if it doesn't come out of conference, it's going to cost us a lot of jobs. It will not protect the 1.9 million jobs the Senate bill protects, and it will not create approximately 1 million additional jobs.

As the gentleman knows, it is our view that we've been considering a lot of legislation which does not create jobs, does not impact positively the growth in our economy; but I think there is little dispute that the highway bill will in fact do that.

In addition, there has been a lot of talk about certainty. I agree with the premise that we ought to give certainty to the economy and to employers and employees, and to States and subdivisions and private sector contractors. Obviously, if we don't extend the highway bill, that will not be the case. In fact, it will be a very uncertain world in which they will be operating.

So can my friend tell me what the status of the conference is, if he knows? I will tell you, very frankly, that the Democratic conferees do not know the status of the conference.

And I will yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman the conferees continue to work in a bicameral nature. The discussions are proceeding between Chairman MICA and Chairman BOXER. And as the gentleman knows, I have said before, we are desirous of seeing a bill done, as the gentleman said, to afford more certainty to the folks who are relying on the funding of our Nation's transportation program. We certainly think it would be a huge benefit to producing a bill prior to the expiration of the program next week, but knowing full well most of us do not want to see any kind of shutdown in the funding, that we would be prepared in any way to make sure that does not happen.

□ 1320

But the intention is to allow these conferees to continue to do their work and, hopefully, we'll have a bill to vote on next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I hope the gentleman's correct.

My concern, and the concern on this side, continues to be the position—as Mr. SHUSTER, who is the one of the ranking members and whose dad, of course, chaired the Transportation Committee at one point in time. There was a story that SHUSTER acknowledged that the House GOP's leadership's inability to pass its 5-year, $260 billion transportation bill "weakens our hand in conference." And this is what concerned me, Mr. Leader.

But he added, "It's not an option to give away the House position."

Now, he was referring to, of course, a bill which has not passed this House, has not even been brought to the floor of this House. And that article went on to say, House Republicans say they are willing to walk away from the highway bill talks if they cannot get what they want.

Now, this was an interview—I see Mr. SHUSTER on the floor, and Mr. SHUSTER's a friend of mine. I'll be glad to hear what he has to say on that matter, and I'll yield to him.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And what I was referring to is we did send over a position on our extension, and that was the streamlining that we wanted in our original bill but was in the extension. So that's what I was talking about. That's the House position. And as far as I can tell, things are moving in a positive direction. But I guess we'll be debating your motion to instruct a little later.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I certainly hope that we are moving in a positive direction because we've been a long time getting to resolution of this matter.

Next I would like to ask—you indicated that student loans may be on the calendar as well. Can the gentleman tell me what his expectation is on that, if he knows?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, it has been our position all along that we do not want to see the expiration of the funding of the program to impact the students that right now are struggling, and we have presented to both the White House, as well as the gentleman's side of the aisle here in the Capitol, various ways of accomplishing that end in a responsible manner, in a fiscally responsible manner so that we're not digging the hole any deeper, we're not incurring any additional debt in order to do that, and thus far, have not seen a willingness on the part of the White House.

I am aware that there are discussions ongoing on the other side of the Capitol to see if there can be some resolution on this issue. And that's all I can say to the gentleman as far as I know.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I'm hopeful that we can resolve this in a way that is agreeable to at least the majority of both Houses and to the President of the United States because if we don't, as the gentleman knows, we're going to increase interest rates by doubling them from 3.4 to 6.8 percent.

Today's college students are leaving with an average of $26,000 in debt. This would add another $1,000 of debt to those students, and right now, with students owing more than $1 trillion, placing more debt on their head. And I would urge us, therefore, to come to an agreement, come to an agreement that both sides could vote for.

Obviously, as the gentleman knows, the House bill that passed was a pay-for that Democrats didn't vote for here, and I think it was well known that the Senate would not agree to that, so I'm hopeful that we do reach an agreement that will provide for its passage.

Now, let me ask the gentleman—we, of course, made the representation that we ought to be focused on jobs. We believe that's critically important, and we believe that ought to be the focus of this Congress. It's the focus of the American people.

We went through, in years past, distractions. You say, with just some 30 full days left between now and the election, that you're going to bring up a resolution that came out of committee, as I understand, yesterday, without much time for consideration or deliberation, a very, very serious matter.

Attorney General Holder, of course, has been involved in making sure that votes are not suppressed all over this country. He has, in my view, conducted himself in a way that brought credit to the Justice Department, to himself, and to this administration.

I don't know—well, let me ask the gentleman. How long do you expect to spend on this motion?

I don't think any of us have seen the final bill that's going to come to the floor or the resolution that's going to come to the floor suggesting that Mr. Holder be held in contempt. I don't think anybody outside of the committees has had an opportunity to consider this very weighty, important matter, very disruptive matter, if I would say, and distracting matter.

What procedure does the gentleman suggest is going to be pursued next week on this matter?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd respond to the gentleman, and I think the gentleman does know this is a privileged resolution of which he speaks, and it would be subject to the 1-hour rule, just as privileged resolutions were under their majority, Mr. Speaker, and we will expect to proceed accordingly.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. Which means that a matter of great weight is going to be brought to the floor within just a few days of being passed out of committee, with a relatively short period of time for either debate or for consideration.

There is, of course, precedent, and the gentleman's correct. It is a privileged resolution, and I understand the rules under privileged resolutions. But I do understand that this is a matter that's going to require a very careful, judicious, if I can say, consideration. And to bring it up at a time when we ought to be focused on jobs, when you're trying to do two appropriations bills, when you're talking about the highway bill and we're talking about the student loan bill, and to treat it as somewhat of a suspension bill provision, with little time to really have it discussed with the seriousness that the subject matter requires, I would suggest to the gentleman that this is going to be not only a distraction, but an unfortunate taking our focus off of creating jobs here in America.

I yield to my friend if he wants to make a comment.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, this is an issue of making sure that the American people are given an opportunity to have all the information surrounding the issues involved with the Fast and Furious program.

This is an issue that we feel, as has been indicated by the actions of Chairman ISSA, that in acting with all reason, asking of the administration and the Attorney General to produce certain documents, the Attorney General, having agreed to produce certain documents, then refusing to do so, Chairman ISSA, leading up to the vote in committee the other day had said all along, if the Attorney General had produced the documents, that there would be a postponement of the hearing.

And in the same fashion, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, the Democratic whip, if the Attorney General would do what it is he committed to do and produce the documents, we'll postpone the vote. We've not seen any indication of that. He has not done that. And that's why I've announced the vote.

Mr. HOYER. Let me ask the gentleman, does the gentleman intend to go the Rules Committee to get a rule, or bring the privileged resolution directly to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1330

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say that some of that is still in discussion, but this resolution does have privilege.

Mr. HOYER. With respect to another piece of legislation, I would like to ask the gentleman about the Violence Against Women Act, which, again, the Senate passed in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and which we passed in a relatively partisan fashion over here, where the parties were split.

Will the gentleman tell me whether or not he knows the status of that legislation and whether or not we expect to consider that anytime soon.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, as he knows, the Senate has the so-called ''blue slip'' problem with its bill, and that is about as far as I know as to the progress in the Senate.

As the gentleman knows, we passed the bill here in the House. We did so in recognizing the suggestions and incorporating the suggestions that the GAO had made as to how to streamline the grant programs on the Violence Against Women Act to allow for dollars to reach victims in a more expeditious manner. We wholeheartedly support the passage of that as the gentleman saw when it passed the House. We would like to see a resolution on this.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, we believe that the bill that passed the House on the Violence Against Women Act left out a lot of women. It reduced the scope that the Senate passed with, again, a bipartisan vote with, frankly, all the women on the Republican side of the aisle in the United States Senate voting for the Senate bill. We think the House bill restricted the coverage of that bill. It seems to me that we ought to be against violence against all women and other persons who may be subject to domestic violence. We would hope that that matter could be resolved, frankly, along the lines of making sure that all people are protected from domestic violence.

Lastly, may I ask the gentleman what he expects the schedule for the balance of July to be. Again, I would reiterate, as the gentleman knows, we have very, very few days left, less than 30 full days between now and the election following this week. There are another 8 days that are 6:30 days, or some number, either 7 or 8 6:30 days, so we don't have very much time to deal with

some of the pressing problems, including dealing with middle class tax cuts to make sure that working people in this country who are having a hard time making ends meet don't get an increase in their taxes on January 1.

Will the gentleman tell me what he expects the schedule to be in the month of July.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the gentleman and say to the gentleman that, again, if he looks at the schedule, we are scheduled and have been in accord with that schedule and in session more days this year than we were in a similar year last session. So I would say to the gentleman the schedule is right on track. The predictability, the certainty of this schedule, has allowed for the work to continue.

We will be here throughout July. Our intention is to continue to focus on job creation. We will be looking, obviously, towards the Supreme Court and what its actions may bring next week on the issue of ObamaCare. If we have to act in response to that to assure all Americans that we want and care about their health care, we will do so. If the Court does not strike down the bill in its entirety, the gentleman knows our conference is fully committed to the total repeal of the ObamaCare bill.

In July, we will continue to focus on that bill and its impact on employers. We also are very concerned about the overreach of the regulatory agencies in this town and intend to bring forward a bill with a series of provisions which will address the red tape that has begun to strangle the innovation and growth in this economy.

We will also be very focused on a measure to stop the tax hike that is facing the American people this year. If you look at the enormity of the tax hike, it is something that is hanging over this economy, that is hanging over the mindset of small business people and working families. I don't think anybody would advocate raising taxes, especially in this economy.

That will be the outline of our work with, obviously, some other measures that may be brought up in July.

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

Let me just add, Mr. Speaker, that, clearly, when you look at the Congress to which he referred in terms of its productivity in the 2007 and 2008 years, we think the productivity was very much higher. I won't go through the litany of those figures; but I think, if the majority leader reviews them, he will see in terms of the productivity of the Congress that we moved America much further forward.

Having said that, I want to say that we hope that we will continue to focus on jobs. I know I share the gentleman's view—and I think all of us share the view—that we want to have reasonable regulations that help grow the economy, not impede its growth. We're for that. We may have a difference of opinion on what that does when we think of deregulating the protection of our environment, when we think of deregulating the safety of our financial markets. When we took the referee off the field, it had an extraordinarily negative impact on this country and on every taxpayer in this country and on every business in this country. It was not useful. It was not helpful.

I think we have a difference of opinion on whether or not we want to make sure there is a level playing field, a fair playing field, for all the participants in our economy—both businesses and consumers. Clearly, there was an effort that was being made to undermine the ability of the CFTC to fully oversee what was a market that went out of control. As a result, there were dire consequences to our country and its fiscal status.

So I am hopeful that we don't pursue a regulatory agenda, which is an agenda with the net result of taking the referee off the field. I don't think the American public wants that, and I don't really think that that's reasonable. Further, I think they think we really need to be focused on things that will immediately grow this economy. The highway bill would have done that. Unfortunately, that highway bill has stayed in limbo for too long a time. I am hopeful that we can move it.

Unless the gentleman has something further to say, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2012

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

MOTIONS TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hoyer moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to recede from disagreement to the amendment of the Senate:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. 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 materials on my motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

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

Tomorrow will mark, as I said a little earlier, 100 days since the United States Senate approved its bipartisan compromise highway bill in the United States Senate. There were 74 Senators who voted for that. Essentially half of the Republican Conference in the United States Senate voted for that bill.

There has been a bill in the House committee. That bill has languished in the House committee for many, many months—in fact, for about 4 months after the Speaker said he wanted to bring it to the floor. It has not come to the floor, apparently, because the Republican Party is divided on that bill, and they don't have the votes for that bill.

□ 1340

That measure passed the Senate 74–22, and it would have been, by the way, 75–22 had FRANK LAUTENBERG been there. He made that statement on the floor. That's three-quarters of the Senate, with the support of 22 Senate Republicans.

Americans are wishing that we would come together, reason together, and act together to give certainty to them, to the economy, and to their country. Unfortunately, the House bill that was passed was effectively a bill simply to go to conference. I know my friend—and he is my friend—Mr. SHUSTER from Pennsylvania will say that in the article that was written, that it was simply ''that House bill'' to which he was referring. I take him at his word that he was referring to that. But very frankly, others have said that there were items in the bill in committee that were critically important to them that ought to be in the conference committee report, and obviously the Senate would not agree to those.

This bill, to which I refer and which this motion to instruct refers, is supported by chambers of commerce in cities and counties across this Nation.

This is truly a bipartisan piece of legislation in the great tradition of transportation bills passed since the Eisenhower era. The gentleman who is managing the time on the Republican side, his father was a great proponent of infrastructure investment, a great leader in this Congress on infrastructure, and, in fact, participated—every time that I think he brought a bill out as ranking member, it was passed in a bipartisan fashion. Unfortunately, we haven't gotten to that point at this point of time.

Instead of taking up that bill, the Senate bill, and allowing us to have a vote on it here in the House—in my opinion, if the Republican leadership let its Members vote free of influence by the leadership, that bill would have

the majority of votes on this House floor. Speaker BOEHNER has said he wants this House to work its will. In my point of view, in my estimation, that bill has a majority support on the floor of this House. It would have, I think, every Democratic vote, just as the Export-Import Bank had every vote on our side of the aisle. That's why it passed overwhelmingly, not withstanding Republican opposition.

The caucus on the other side of the aisle, in my opinion, remains divided over how to proceed. House Republicans have, once again, turned an opportunity to invest in job creation into a partisan exercise in saying ''no'' to any legislation that might strengthen our recovery and lower our unemployment rate.

I'm not unmindful, and I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania will observe, that apparently there has been some progress made. The progress that has been made is unknown to the Democratic side of this aisle. Neither the ranking member knows what progress has been made, nor the ranking member of the subcommittee knows what progress has been made. But we're going to be told, apparently, there is some progress that has been made. I hope that's the case. But, very frankly, if that progress is not made, we ought to pass the Senate bill.

When presented with a real chance to lead, frankly, Republicans in my view too often have walked away. Whether it was keeping government going on continuing resolutions, whether it was on making sure that the most reliable and creditworthy Nation in the world did not default on its debt, whether it was on passing an Export-Import Bank to make sure that we created jobs and were competitive in this country, too often our Republican friends have decided not to go there.

Republicans are unwilling to act on must-pass bills, and in several cases played a dangerous game by holding bills hostage. As I said, this includes the debt limit crisis last summer and the debate over extending the middle class payroll tax last December. Over and over again, our Republican colleagues have proven themselves to be the ''Walk-Away Caucus.''

This Congress has been in session for only 60 days so far this year. Between now and the election, we're scheduled to be in session for 38 days, but only 30 of those are full work days. Between now and the election—that's 4 months from now. Thirty days between today—June 21—and the election in November.

With one wasted opportunity after another, they've earned the 112th a place in history as truly another ''Do-Nothing Congress,'' a phrase made famous by Harry Truman.

Mr. Speaker, my motion is simple. It instructs the House conferees to agree to the Senate's version that is based on bipartisanship and doing what's right for our economy. What does that bill mean?

The Senate bill leverages Federal funding to protect 1.9 million jobs. Why is that important? Because we lost 28,000 construction jobs last month alone. Why? Because we failed to pass this bill. In addition to the 1.9 million jobs that this bill would provide, it would provide another 1 million jobs as we expand transportation opportunities.

In my home State of Maryland, nearly 29,000 jobs are supported by Federal transportation investments. Those are jobs of families who are paying taxes, sending their kids to school, buying groceries, buying goods and services, and supporting our economy.

In Speaker BOEHNER's home State of Ohio, over 55,000 jobs are supported by this bill. And in Virginia, Republican leader CANTOR'S home State, almost 40,000 jobs are on the line. That highway funding expires July 1, just a few days from now.

For the sake of all these workers, for the sake of all these families who rely on these jobs, and for the sake of all those workers and families who would be advantaged by the passage of this bill and the jobs that it will create—not only save, but create—in Maryland and Ohio, in Virginia—my colleague Mr. MORAN is here—and across our country, let's pass this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, let's pass a transportation bill that isn't simply another short-term extension. Such extensions provide no certainty to the businesses that rely on sound infrastructure to move goods to market. Let's pass the long-term reauthorization we need that will help put our economy back in drive—not in neutral and not in reverse.

Don't take my word for it why this is so important and so urgent. Listen to President Ronald Reagan, who said in 1982—and I'm sure, frankly, the gentleman's dad would have supported these statements:

The time has come to preserve what past Americans spent so much time and effort to create, and that means a nationwide conservation effort in the best sense of the word. America can't afford throwaway roads or disposable transit systems.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's not too late for this Do-Nothing Congress to make a U-turn and get back to work. It's not too late to heed President Reagan's wise words. It's not too late to provide our businesses with the certainty they're asking for.

I urge my Republican friends to start working with Democrats to make the investments we need to grow jobs and strengthen our competitiveness before it's too late. Frankly, that's what the American people expect. Let's for once not disappoint them. Let's pass this motion, and work together to move this country forward.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

A lot of what Mr. HOYER said I agree with when it comes to moving a transportation bill. I think it is important to America, and our infrastructure is the backbone of our economy. We all know, I think, that in many places in the country it's crumbling, and we here in Congress need to do our job. But this motion to instruct the conferees to accept the Senate bill in its entirety is contrary to the purpose of having a House and a Senate conference.

I know my friend from Maryland has been one of the great defenders of this institution. To suggest that we should just up and take the Senate bill is a bit surprising to me that the gentleman would do that. As I said, he's been a real champion to make sure that the House maintains its position and he has always been a strong defender.

□ 1350

Also, I would just like to remind my Democrat colleagues, because we've been debating this bill for the past several months—my colleagues sometimes need to be reminded that when they controlled both the House and the Senate, they weren't able to get a bill out of full committee on any basis, partisan or bipartisan. So it has been a difficult road. And again, they saw the difficulties back when they were in the majority.

But it's our responsibility to sit down with our Senate colleagues and address areas where we have differences of opinion. And I might add too that there's a statement that just went out from Chairman BOXER and Chairman MICA, a joint statement, that reads:

The conferees have moved forward toward a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on a highway reauthorization bill. Both House and Senate conferees will continue to work with a goal of completing a package by next week.

So there's been movement.

I would urge the gentleman to retract his motion, not offer it, because I think there is a point when the chair of the conference and the vice chair of the conference are saying, there has been movement, that it is very positive. The Senate bill, though, if you will want to continue, the Senate bill includes provisions that I have serious concerns with; and I believe many on the other side of the aisle would have serious concerns about it.

When they get to study the Senate bill, you will find that it requires that all new passenger vehicles, all new passenger vehicles beginning in 2015, be equipped with event data recorders. These recorders are similar to the black boxes that are required in aircraft. While the intent of this provision is to collect safety information, I believe many of us would see it as a slippery slope toward Big Government and Big Brother knowing what we're doing and where we are.

So, again, I think if my colleagues on the other side—and we've talked about different ways to collect data—and those on the other side of the aisle have great concerns about allowing information to be collected by Big Brother. And privacy is a big concern for many across America.

There are also areas where the Senate bill does not go far enough. While the Senate bill includes a few provisions to streamline the project delivery process, it does not go far enough. And I believe we are at a time in our history—and the gentleman and many people around here mentioned my father and the good work that he did, and he did great work. But the times have changed in the sense that the last two highway bills that were passed, the economy was in good shape, the highway trust was flush with cash, and we had the ability, as Members of Congress, to direct money back to our States and our districts. So it's been a very difficult process, minus those three things.

Again, these streamlining projects, the Senate bill does not set hard deadlines for Federal agencies to approve projects. So they can just go on and on and on—and have. And that's why it takes 14 to 15 years to build a major highway project in this country.

I was just out in Oklahoma City a month or so ago. They just opened up the Oklahoma City Crosstown Express. It cost $680 million and took 15 years to build. If we're able to do some of these streamlining projects, we believe we can cut that time in half. So if you just look at that project in Oklahoma City, $680 million, on inflation alone we could have saved $60 million to $80 million on that project alone; $60 million to $80 million would go a long way in fixing infrastructure in Maryland and Pennsylvania and Virginia and New Jersey. So these are the kinds of revisions. That's just one, setting the hard deadlines.

It does not allow State environmental laws to be used in place of Federal environmental laws. When a State has a more rigorous environmental process, like California, like other States, why do they need the Federal Government's approval when theirs goes far beyond what we do here in Washington? Or if it's equal to the Federal Government, instead of going through a second environmental regulatory process, let's let the States use theirs—if it's equal to or exceeds the EPA standards.

It does not expand the list of projects that qualify for categorical exclusions. What are categorical exclusions? If you are going to replace a bridge with another bridge in the same footprint, if you are going to expand a roadbed in the current right-of-way, it would allow there to be an abbreviated, a faster review process so that we can get those bridges built faster, we can get those lanes added more quickly.

Again, what it comes down to is saving money. Time is money. I think we all know that. And it also does not expedite projects that are being rebuilt due to disasters. Again, we've seen it in Minnesota. When the bridge collapsed, in 436 days we were able to construct a major bridge crossing over that river in Minnesota.

Also, program consolidation is another important reform that the House has been pushing. The Senate has been pushing to add two new programs at a dollar cost of $3 billion a year. At a time when the highway trust fund is going broke, we should be focusing our limited transportation dollars on consolidating programs and eliminating wasteful programs, not creating new ones.

Funding flexibility for the States, another critical point that allows the States to fund the most economically significant highway and bridge projects in their State. The Federal Government should not mandate the States to plant flowers and beautification.

Even bike paths—and I have been a big supporter of bike paths in the past; but today when we have bridges crumbling, when there is safety in question, in good conscience we can't tell States to spend that type of money. But if they want to, they can. They can opt out. They can spend that money if they so desire. But again, I think this is not a time when the Federal Government should be telling States to spend money on projects that aren't going to be the most beneficial to their constituencies. We need to focus those resources.

These are issues that are not addressed in the Senate bill and should be addressed in this conference. And from the statement that I read earlier, I believe we are moving in a direction to adopt some of what I just talked about.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion. I would urge the gentleman, my friend from Maryland, to step back again at a time when we're getting so close. As the gentleman fully knows—he's been in this institution long enough and has negotiated many, many significant pieces of legislation—this is not a time for us to be out here talking about it, but to hunker down, make sure the conferees, the two chairmen are able to move forward to get a bill that's going to benefit America.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentleman, the items that he mentioned—some of which we may agree on, some of which we may not agree on—frankly, could have been included in the bill that the House could have reported out of committee and brought to the floor. That didn't happen. What we did was, with the inability to pass a bill that came out of your committee on the floor of the House, we then repaired to what was essentially a shell of a bill to go to conference.

The problem that I have with the gentleman's statement is I hope that the statement that ''we may be getting there'' is correct.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

But if we ''may be'' getting there, we're getting there because we've constantly done motions like this to get us to the issue. We are talking about some 2-plus million jobs. That's why the Chamber of Commerce is involved. That's why counties, States, and local municipalities are involved, saying, Come to an agreement.

Very frankly, the bill that we passed here had some things that didn't relate to transportation. What the gentleman has mentioned are items that dealt with transportation. Your bill, as you well know, had items in it which were clearly not acceptable to the President of the United States because they were unrelated to transportation.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

The gentleman hasn't mentioned any of those. I am pleased that he hasn't mentioned those.

I hope that the House Republicans have now decided that's not going to be the litmus test for whether or not we create jobs and save jobs in the transportation field and give certainty to contractors and to public entities.

At this point in time, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES).

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of Congressman HOYER's motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348, the surface transportation bill.

This motion to instruct conferees would ask the conference committee to end their differences and support the Senate-passed measure. Senate 1813, or MAP–21, was passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority with a final vote of 74–22.

Tomorrow marks 100 days since the Senate passed their bipartisan bill. We have just over 1 week before the extension expires. We cannot afford to pass yet another short-term extension. We need to create jobs here in America.

National unemployment is 8.2 percent, and construction unemployment is nearly double, at 14.2 percent. Summer has officially started, and the construction season is short. We have 1.2 million unemployed construction workers who are waiting for work.

□ 1400

MAP–21 is estimated to save 1.9 million jobs and create another 1 million jobs. We have the legislative solution to create jobs. It is the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put their differences aside and pass a comprehensive reauthorization. MAP–21 was passed on a bipartisan majority in the Senate. Let us do the same here in the House and put America back to work.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Just in response to my good friend from Maryland, I'm glad he brought up some of those other provisions, and they are job-creating provisions.

The RAMP Act will unlock the Harbor Trust Fund so we can invest in our

ports, which I know the gentleman has a major port in Maryland. But those dollars are going to rebuilding and dredging and doing the things we need to do to be competitive around the world. So that's a jobs act that's in the transportation bill. And I might add, ports are certainly transportation.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

We have also a reform in there on the coal ash, which is an element that goes into making cement. Of course, building roads and bridges, it's about cement and concrete. So there's another provision in it we believe will help our industries to be able to continue to make and produce cement to build our roads.

Finally, the Keystone pipeline. I think all of America—or most of America knows that's been paying attention, which is about 80 percent—believe it is a positive thing to bring oil and energy to America to help power this economy while creating 20,000 jobs and maybe as much as a hundred thousand jobs in indirect labor and jobs to this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Science and Technology Committee, Ms. JOHNSON from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I rise in support of Democratic Whip HOYER's motion to instruct the conferees, which directs the conferees to agree to the Senate-passed transportation bill, MAP–21.

MAP–21 passed the Senate by a strong bipartisan vote of 74–22, and it is critical that the House pass this legislation. We have been waiting a very, very long time. I'm from the State of Texas. There's no State in the Union that this bill is more important for. Our season is now to get highways started. And we have massive infrastructure needs, just like the rest of the country.

Tomorrow does mark the 100th day since the Senate passed the bill, and the current reauthorization will expire next week. And while I'm encouraged by the progress being made in the conference negotiations, we simply cannot afford to delay any longer for individual pleas, for individual needs. We all have needs.

This bill is not perfect. No bill we pass is perfect. But this bill is certainly needed to plan and to develop. We have to have time for the States to look at what they have available and plan for it. We cannot do this like any other bill. This is a transportation bill, infrastructure planning bill, and we simply must do something now.

In addition to it saving 1.9 million jobs, it creates a million jobs. It's a jobs bill. We've been talking about passing a jobs bill for the last almost 2 years, and nothing has passed yet. I am pleading that we all support this motion to instruct, and I encourage my colleagues to support it and let's get this bill done.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To not support Congressman HOYER's motion to the Senate transportation bill for which, many times it's been said, 74 Senators, including 22 Republicans, voted for, I would suggest, is to engage in nothing less than economic sabotage.

Well into the construction season, the unemployment rate in the construction industry is at least twice the national average, and another short-term extension will not bring enough certainty to an industry that is hurting as badly as this one is.

MAP–21 is the single largest jobs bill passed by either body in this Congress. In my home State of Illinois alone, MAP–21 will save or create nearly 70,000 jobs. Nationwide, the bill will save or create nearly 2 million jobs and spur 1 million additional jobs through the leveraging of transportation funds.

It is hard to understand, as we are ending the month of June and construction needs to be done all over this country, that we are still delaying the passage of a bill that would mean so much to the workers across the country and to strengthening our economy. I think that we need to support this motion right now, to support MAP–21, and to send it to the President's desk immediately.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I would say to our good friend from Pennsylvania that it is hard to believe that Chairman Bud Shuster would not be as troubled as we are by the state of the transportation bill. And he would be saying as we are: Just do it.

You have suggested any number of things where we would reach agreement, I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania, but this has been going on for almost 3 years. It was back in October of 2009 that we got a 1-month extension. Then, we extended it for 48 days; then 72 days; then 16 days; then 9½ months; then 2 months and 4 days; then 6 months and 25 days; then 6 months, and 91 days, and now we're talking about another 3-month extension.

Let's just do it. That's why there's instruction to accept the Senate bill. If we know what we need, then let's reach compromise and get it done. Because meanwhile, people are unemployed. The American people are hurting, and the American public is disgusted with the Congress.

When we had a 13 percent approval rating, I was wondering how we had so many family and friends. Well, sure enough, now it's dipped down to single digits. Why? Because they don't see us doing anything. They don't see us compromising.

In the Senate, we have a Senate transportation bill where people as conservative as Republican JIM INHOFE, the ranking member of Surface Transportation, has approved this. It passed. Three-quarters of the Senate approved this. Why can't we just accept this and get it done?

We're talking about almost 3 million jobs that would be saved or created. We are in desperate need of jobs. There are jobs in this country, and they're going to have a lasting dividend once we improve our roads and our bridges and our public transit systems.

We need to get this done. The American people have been waiting 2½ years for this surface transportation bill. That's why the motion to instruct is so important and why I support Mr. HOYER, because this is what the American people want. And the fact is that, while it maintains current funding levels for highway and public transportation, it consolidates highway programs, establishes a national freight program, and any number of things.

We can agree it's not perfect, but it's the best we can do. And the American people deserve it.

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

I appreciate the passion from the gentleman from Virginia, and I believe he is a supporter of infrastructure, as am I. I think you were referring to the former chairman. I was just emailing back and forth to him. He sees much agreement with what we're trying to do in the House. He sees the need for reform. And as I've been going through this process, I certainly talked to him about some of the things he wishes he would have been able to accomplish. And what we're doing in this bill are things he's applauding. If any of you don't realize, the chairman is still alive and well and still consults with his Member of Congress—when I ask and when I don't ask, I might add.

Again, I have to remind my colleagues, and be respectful when I do this, when you had the majority, six times you extended without passing a bill. And you had a majority in the House and Senate and White House. And I might add that, if you would have focused the stimulus bill on an infrastructure bill instead of spending it in all different ways that didn't have the kind of impact that you thought and, in fact, didn't have much of an impact at all, I think we would see a much different economy today if we would have focused on this because I know there are jobs out there, millions of jobs, in construction and construction-related businesses where we could help by passing a bill.

□ 1410

Again, just to remind my colleagues, the House and the Senate, chairman and vice chairman, have issued a statement. We are moving in the right direction towards a bipartisan, bicameral

solution, not just a Senate solution. Again, I know that the two gentlemen, the whip and of course Mr. MORAN from Virginia, have been great defenders of the House. For us to just give in to the Senate, I don't think I've ever seen them when they were in the majority just handing it off to the Senate. So I feel positive.

Again, I supported Mr. WALZ's motion to instruct a few days ago because he said get in there, hammer this thing out; come up with a bipartisan, bicameral bill. That's why I supported that. Again, on this, I just can't support this. I have got to vote against it, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' also.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a supporter of this institution. I am a supporter, as Mr. SHUSTER pointed out, of regular order. I do believe that the House has a right and a duty and a responsibility to maintain its positions—when it can get to a position.

Let me reiterate so the American people understand. Speaker BOEHNER said that the highway bill was very important to him. He wanted to see it reported out. The committee acted on a bill and never brought it to the floor.

I pause so the American people can understand, the House has been unable to take a position. Now my friend will say, oh, no, we did pass a bill, and that's correct. Admittedly, however, from everybody's perspective, it was not a full bill; it was a shell bill. It was a shell bill to go to conference. Did it have some provisions in there? Yes, it did. It had Keystone in there, which was clearly unacceptable to the President in the form that it was offered and unacceptable to the Senate in the form that it was offered.

Very frankly, my friend from Pennsylvania talks about his dad, who I know is very much alive and was a very good Member of this body. I will say that we did pass some extensions, all on a bipartisan fashion, as you well know. All on a bipartisan fashion. This was not done in a bipartisan fashion.

We could have forged a bill that would have had overwhelming support in this House, in my opinion. The Republican side of the aisle chose not to do that. And I've got a hunch that my friend sitting in the chair, Mr. SHUSTER, regrets that. He doesn't have to say anything about that, but I just have a hunch he regrets that. I regret it. I regret that we are not able to come together and reason together, but we take hard-line positions that if you don't agree with me, it's my way or no highway. That's regrettable. The American people know it's regrettable.

And I want to tell my friend from Pennsylvania, if it weren't 100 days ago, as of tomorrow, that a bipartisan—overwhelmingly bipartisan—bill was passed, and if this House had been able to pass a real highway bill, but we didn't have that opportunity. That bill was not brought to the floor. The gentleman knows that bill was not brought to the floor. It still languishes in his committee. Or perhaps it's been reported out and may be sitting someplace else.

The fact of the matter is that this motion is designed to say to 1.9 million people who may lose their job if we don't pass a bill next Friday, in a Congress that has been mired in confrontation and unwilling to compromise, and another million people who will have job opportunities if that bill passes, it is to say, let us act. And we have a vehicle on which to act, a vehicle that enjoyed the support of all Democrats and half of the Republican Conference in the United States Senate, a bill that had agreement between Senator BOXER from California, correctly I think described as a liberal Democrat from the State of California, and JIM INHOFE, correctly described I believe as a conservative Republican from Oklahoma. They came together. They reached agreement.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is probably absolutely correct; it's not a perfect bill. I don't know that I've ever voted for a perfect bill on the floor of this House, at least one that I thought was perfect. That's the nature of this body, that we come together and we compromise and everybody doesn't get what they want because maybe their region or their people or their businesses or their consumers don't see it the same way mine do. We compromise.

But the Senate bill, while it may not be perfect, enjoyed broad bipartisan compromise and support. Therefore, I think it is our best opportunity, because we've shown in this House that we have, for the last 6 months, been unable to come to agreement, and the Republican majority in this House has been unable to agree among itself to bring a full bill to the floor.

So, Mr. Speaker, that does not give much confidence not only to my side of the aisle but to those contractors, those construction workers, those States, those counties, those municipalities who know that they have to address the transportation challenges of their areas. It doesn't give them much confidence, and I've heard a lot about building confidence.

I believe that if we passed the Senate bill, we would create those jobs, retain the 1.9 million jobs, and give confidence to our economy and grow jobs. I hope that's what the other side wants to do. They talk a lot about it. And if the economy improved, of course, the administration might be advantaged as well. I hope that's not a consideration of anybody who considers these pieces of legislation. America expects us to come together and reach agreement. The Senate has done that. On this side of the Capitol, we have not. We ought to do it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my good friend from Maryland's Motion to Instruct House conferees to bring up the bipartisan Senate transportation bill. In the 10 most congested cities in America—including the Washington DC region which both Mr. HOYER and I represent—drivers spend more than 40 hours a year stuck in traffic. That's an entire work week lost to congestion, yet all the Republican majority has offered in response is more partisan gridlock.

Americans are waiting for road improvements, bridge repairs, and more transit options. The American economy is waiting for more robust job growth. The nation lost 28,000 construction jobs last month and more than 2 million construction jobs since the Great Recession began.

Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower knew investing in infrastructure would create jobs and spur the economy so he created the American interstate highway system. This March, the Senate passed a bipartisan transportation bill—with 22 Republicans on board—to alleviate gridlock on our streets and in the halls of Congress. But so far, House Republicans have refused to even bring it up for a vote, for fear that it might actually pass!

A robust transportation program such as the bipartisan Senate bill helps both American commuters, and the American economy, get moving again. If we are going to create jobs and ease commutes, the Republican majority must stop idling. I urge my colleagues to support Mr. HOYER'S Motion to Instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNNELEE). All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. 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 topic of my motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Black moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to reject section 31108 of the Senate amendment (relating to distracted driving grants), other than the matter proposed to be inserted as section 411(g) of title 23, United States Code (relating to a distracted driving study).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK)

and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

□ 1420

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

We began the 112th Congress by reading the U.S. Constitution as a body, and we require that every bill cite the section of the Constitution that allows Congress to consider the legislation.

My motion to instruct simply maintains this desire of the House by protecting States' rights under the 10th Amendment. The 10th Amendment reads:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I believe that the issue of laws related to distracted driving are best left to the States. That's why as a State senator in my home State of Tennessee I voted three times for a distracted driving law on the books today.

As a mother and a grandmother and a nurse, I strongly support absolute safety on our roadways. I also believe that there's no one in this Chamber who doesn't support safe driving laws. But this motion to instruct is not about safety; it's about the States' rights under the Constitution and stopping Federal manipulation of State law through taxpayer-funded distracted driving grants.

Now, the Senate passed a highway bill, Senate Bill 1813, that contains a provision that would grant the U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood $79 million to entice the States to enact and enforce Federal distracted driving laws, something that 39 States already have on their books—39 States have already enacted these laws.

I believe the States are great laboratories for determining what works and what does not work. That is why my motion to instruct keeps intact a study—wants a study to be conducted on all forms of distracted driving. This helps government and also the public better understand and identify the most effective methods to educate drivers and enhance States' understanding of these issues so that they can enact and tailor laws best suited to the individual needs of their States.

I'm offering a motion to instruct that simply strikes the distracted driving grant funding language contained in the Senate-passed bill, while calling for a study to be conducted on all forms of distracted driving. This helps government and the public better understand and identify the most effective methods to educate the drivers and enhance the States' understanding of these issues so they can enact and tailor laws best suited to the individual needs of their State. What is best for the State of Massachusetts may not be best for the State of Montana. And as the 10th Amendment to our Constitution was written, these laws are reserved for individual States.

Now, just as we must provide certainty to job creators, we must provide certainty to States on the highway bill. The only way to accomplish this task is to allow for focused use of taxpayer dollars that is produced in a multiyear transportation bill that restricts the highway fund to its intended use, that is, building and maintaining America's roads and bridges. Taxpayer dollars are so precious, they should not be used on anything other than the intended purpose.

I urge my colleagues to protect states' rights and support my motion to instruct.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

The motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) seeks to eliminate a distracted driving grant program included in the Senate surface transportation authorization bill. I oppose this motion because it ignores the significant safety hazard that distracted driving poses to drivers, commuters, passengers, and pedestrians.

Distracted driving is any activity behind the wheel that takes a driver's attention away from the road. The rapid development and ubiquitous use of technology such as cell phones, smart phones, and in-vehicle touch screens has made routine distraction an almost commonplace occurrence in every vehicle across America.

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in 2010 more than 3,000 Americans were killed in crashes involving a distracted driver and approximately 416,000 additional Americans were injured.

Distractions from technology can include texting, talking on a phone, or using a navigation system or other audio or visual equipment while in a vehicle. But because text messaging requires visual, manual, and cognitive attention from the driver all at the same time, it is by far the most dangerous distraction.

The Wireless Association reported that in June 2011 more than 196 billion text messages were sent or received in the United States, which is up nearly 50 percent from just 2 years ago over the same period. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration also reported that more than 100,000 drivers are texting and more than 600,000 drivers are using cell phones at any given moment in time. Sending or receiving a text takes a driver's attention from the road for an average of 4.6 seconds, which, while it may not seem like a long time, it's the equivalent of driving the length of an entire football field, taking the driver's eyes off the road. It's not surprising that, according to research done by Virginia Tech, a texting driver is 23 times more likely to be involved in a crash than a nondistracted driver.

The proposed grant program in the Senate bill is an opportunity to address the rapidly growing problem of distracted driving and to educate the driving public about the real and immediate dangers of distraction behind the wheel.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of American lives are at stake. And these are not statistics. These are people—like 21-year-old Casey Feldman, who was struck and killed by a distracted driver as she crossed the street in Ocean City, New Jersey in 2009. It's people like 56-year-old John Sligting, who was killed on his motorcycle when a teen driver talking on her cell phone missed a stop sign in June 2007. It's people like 13-year-old Margay Schee, who was killed on her school bus when a distracted driver rear-ended that bus in September 2008.

Although some on the other side of the aisle are skeptical of seemingly every Federal program, we must avoid the temptation to eliminate programs without considering the real impacts they have on the lives of our constituents and on communities all across America.

To the point the gentlewoman, my friend from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), raised in her opening remarks, the distracted driving grant program contained in the Senate bill is merely an incentive program, not mandatory. It's an incentive for States that have already passed laws and have them on the books. Therefore, there are no sanctions if States do not pass laws or participate. There are no penalties to not participate.

So, Mr. Speaker, to put it simply, this motion represents a giant step backwards in highway safety for all of America.

I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

I guess I, as well as others, are here today to plead the 10th Amendment. You see, texting while driving is dangerous, and it should be stopped. Careless driving of any form is dangerous, and it should be stopped. We should be grateful for every effort to educate our drivers as to the significance of this particular effort, but the question has to be: Are the efforts only to be done in this particular body?

A driver's license is a State certificate. Driving is a State privilege. And even though Congress has, in the past, overstepped our responsibility in involving ourselves in these areas—and that was wrong—that is certainly not justification for continuing that practice ever forward. The Commerce Clause does not necessarily expand to this area. The Senators, in their wisdom, have included a provision in there dealing with this issue. It's a noble concept. It's a worthy goal.

The approval or disapproval of texting while driving is not the issue. The issue is not should it happen; the issue is who, at which level, should decide if it happens and what the consequences should be.

□ 1430

The issue is, are we the only ones who have the opportunity of breathing the air of the Potomac River, the only ones smart enough to be involved in this issue, the only ones compassionate enough to be involved in this issue. I would contend to you that those who are in our States are equally competent to handle this issue.

It's been mentioned, 39 States already outlaw texting. Ten outlaw any kind of a handheld communication while driving. Thirty-two States ban all sorts of these efforts with novice drivers. My State of Utah has moved forward in this particular area. And yet the Senate has now put in $79 million to incentivize States to do what they're already doing.

We tried to pass a balanced budget amendment on this floor. It failed and I felt sad about that; but I realized also we can accomplish the exact same goals if we respect federalism, which, of course, was reinforced in the 10th Amendment. Federalism simply would require the Federal Government to concentrate on the core constitutional responsibilities given to us in that document and allow the States the flexibility to solve the other problems.

States do not have the kind of restrictions established in the Constitution that we have. States can be far more creative than a one-size-fits-all program from Washington. States can be much more effective in the way they run their programs. States can actually apply justice to unique circumstances within their State borders. That can never be accomplished by Washington. Our only ability is to make sure that everything is uniform. We can accomplish the same goal if we respect the authority of States.

$79 million is a high price to pay for the arrogance that only we here in Washington can do things well. The States are doing it. Not everything has to be ordained, funded, and controlled by those who sit on this floor. The States have every competence, every ability. We should support the 10th Amendment and recognize the States should do this. They will do a better job than we.

Mr. ALTMIRE. We have no further speakers. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The previous speaker talks about States being the innovators. I certainly agree on that.

This motion that we are talking about right now involves a State incentive program where States can qualify for Federal money for an optional grant that they may choose to participate in or not. If they do not choose to participate, they are free to pass any distracted-driver laws they wish or not. There is nothing in what is contained in the Senate bill that in any way inhibits or prohibits or disincentivizes States from passing their own distracted-driving laws. They are still free to do whatever they want to do and go as far or not as they want to go.

All the Senate language says is that if States choose to meet the higher Federal standards, they may qualify for potential limited grant money that will be made available. No State is sanctioned for not participating.

With that, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend and colleague from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for yielding time and also for bringing this amendment forward to instruct the conferees on the transportation bill.

If you look at what the amendment, what the motion to instruct, is saying, first of all, we recognize that 39 States have already put laws on the books to address problems with distracted drivers. It's a national problem. But every State, just as they have the right and the responsibility to create their own laws on issuing driver's licenses, each State has their own age requirements, their own speed limit requirements. Each State has to look at the unique problems that are posed by distracted drivers within that State.

In fact, in our State of Louisiana, we have a ban on texting while driving. And the legislature has gone back and forth on other forms of whether or not you can use a cell phone with a Bluetooth or with a speaker in your car if it's enabled to do that. And so technology changes, and the local States have the ability to be flexible enough to change their laws according to how it best suits their State.

Ultimately, by having a $79 million pot of money that would be up to the Secretary of Transportation to enforce as Federal distracted-driving laws, I think it gets away from the whole concept of the fact that States are the ones that are in charge of doing this, and the States know best what needs to happen in their States.

Driving laws in Louisiana are a lot different than they are in California or New York or somewhere else. That's what the 10th Amendment is all about. That's why you have elected officials at the State and local levels to handle the problems that are unique to each area. And the fact that you've got a $79 million pot of money that would only be put at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation, just for this purpose, instead of using the $79 million to build roads throughout the country, or to allow the States to do what they think is best to improve safety in other ways, there are many things that need to be done in each of our States to improve safety on the roads.

And if a State's done a good job of addressing their texting problems and the distracted-driving problems as it relates to cell phones and other things, somebody eating and sitting in their car, ultimately the States know best what to do. And if they've got more flexibility with the money—this isn't Washington money, by the way. They're paying into it. Every citizen back home, when they buy gasoline, is paying taxes. This is their money. It's not the Federal Government's money to say $79 million is only available for the things that we think are most likely to increase safety, when the States know what's better. Local people on the ground, people paying those taxes know what's better to increase safety. And you're not allowing them to use that money for the things that actually would improve safety even more.

So by limiting this $79 million to a fund that the Secretary himself in Washington would give out, let's let the States have that money back, money that they've paid in already, and let them do what they know is best to increase safety, whether they think it's putting guardrails on roads where the guardrails have broken off and they don't have the money to put that back in place, or whether it's to put railroad crossings. We have so many deaths by people who cross railroads where there's no crossing, and yet it's very expensive to build those.

States would like the ability to use the money to increase safety and stop the deaths that occur by spending it there. Yet this $79 million isn't allowed for that.

Let the States do what they know best because it's their money. It's the people's money. It's not Washington's money. And some Washington bureaucrat who thinks he knows best how to handle a problem at a Federal level that applies to all States when it works differently in every State, the challenges, the safety challenges that face our citizens are very different in each State, especially as it relates to driving on the road.

So, again, I want to thank the gentlelady for bringing this motion to instruct. I surely support the motion and also encourage everybody else in this Chamber to support it because, ultimately, if you've got $79 million that can be much better used to increase safety in other ways, why would you want to cordon it off and only allow it to be used for one way, when maybe 39 different States have 39 different ideas of how to do it better?

Well, we can learn from them for once instead of trying to have this top-down approach where Washington knows best. I think it could be handled much differently, much better at the local level. At the end it's their money anyway.

So I urge approval of this motion to instruct.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Yielding myself as much time as I would consume, I would, again, make the point that the program in question in no way sanctions, penalizes, disincentivizes, discourages or prohibits States from, in

any way, addressing driver safety. It in no way prohibits States from being innovative, from creating new technologies, new programs, doing things that are not recommended in the bill or this program. States are free to do whatever they want to do on this issue.

So to continually pound away at the point that we're somehow taking away the ability of States to be flexible is simply incorrect. It's not consistent with the program in question. It's not consistent with the language of the bill we are discussing.

With that, I would inquire of my friend—I have no more speakers on our side—is she prepared to close?

Mrs. BLACK. I am.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This is a worthy goal. As I've already said, I'm a nurse. I'm a grandmother. I'm a mother. I want safety on our roads.

I have served in the State legislative body where I have voted three times on distracted driving. We did our studies, we found what the problems were in the State of Tennessee. We were able to pass laws to make the roads safer.

□ 1440

Careless driving of any form must be stopped, and I applaud the piece in the bill that will create more study so that States can have more information about just what they need to craft in their State that will be identified as distracted driving.

Obviously, distracted driving does not just mean cell phones, and it does not just mean texting. There are other forms of distracted driving—a mother turning around to correct her small child who is sitting in the back seat. I personally have seen those kinds of accidents. Someone reaching for a CD to put in one's disk, I personally have seen the devastation from that action. There are many forms of distracted driving, and this study will help us and the States and the public to understand what those forms of distracted driving are. In my motion, that is left in place.

Again, we have to be very cautious about our dollars and how it is that we hand our dollars out. I talk about this almost like legislative candy, this $79 million, to incentivize or to entice States to do something, and 39 of them are already doing something related to distracted driving.

As a matter of fact, if we take a look at this whole discussion on the transportation bill, we know how precious every dollar is. We're talking about infrastructure and about creating jobs. This $79 million can be best used by its intended programs, which are to build roads and bridges and to make our roads safer by making sure that our roads and our infrastructure are in the best shape. States are already doing this job. We don't need to take $79 million and hand it out to States—using candy to get them to do what we want them to do.

Absolutely, safety is the major issue, but States can make that decision. States have enough knowledge to know what's best for their States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to protect States' rights and to support my motion to instruct.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. 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.

CONCERN OVER RE-LICENSING THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, FirstEnergy, which operates the Davis-Besse nuclear power plant, has consistently misrepresented to the public structural defects in the building that shields its reactor.

Their latest fable is that cracks in the circumference of the shield building were caused by a snowstorm that occurred in 1978.

In 2002, FirstEnergy covered up information about a hole in the head of a reactor that jeopardized the safety of millions of people, for which they were fined $28 million. FirstEnergy caused the blackout in August 2003, which put 50 million people in the dark, because they were too cheap to hire people to trim trees.

Can they be believed when they claim a snowstorm 34 years ago created cracks that appear today? Are buildings all over northern Ohio falling apart today because of the blizzard of '78, or is this just another in a series of desperate lies used to keep a plant going that should be either shut down or massively repaired?

How long before FirstEnergy's 34-year snow job is fully exposed?

THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE

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

CONCERN OVER RE-LICENSING THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the Speaker.

I spoke here a minute ago on the floor of the House concerning my deep and abiding concern about a nuclear power plant in the State of Ohio called the Davis-Besse nuclear power plant.

This power plant, from the time it was first licensed, has experienced a series of shutdowns, so much so that there was a period when the companies that originally owned it had massive losses because the plant was not up and running. They had so many difficulties that it became an embarrassment to the nuclear industry, itself.

We are now at a point when this plant is trying to get a new license for its nuclear facility. There are over 104 nuclear power plants in America. Some of them have achieved re-licensing. Others are in the process of applying.

One of the things that we have to be concerned about, because we are talking about nuclear power plants, is the structural stability of the plants, which includes the shield building and reactor, and that the structural stability of these plants is going to be assured.

□ 1450

In the case of FirstEnergy, they have a shield building, and there have been questions raised about its structural stability. Unfortunately, FirstEnergy went out of its way to tell one story to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and another story to the public. They told the public that the cracks that were seen in the shield building were not really substantive, but they told the Nuclear Regulatory Commission another story.

Understanding that we have a lack of candor on the part of a nuclear reactor permit holder here, we have to be very concerned about their public statements, about their private disclosures, and about the implications for relicensing.

These cracks in the shield building, which are in the circumference of the building, they're telling the Nuclear Regulatory Commission the reason these cracks occurred is because there was this blizzard in 1978, where the wind direction was—if I'm correct—primarily out of the southwest, that this is responsible for the cracks. But the cracks are around the whole building. They're not able to explain that.

Nor do we know whether or not their sister reactors on the other side of Lake Erie at the Perry nuclear power plant have, in fact, been adequately inspected to see if the same winter storm adversely affected them. If the winter storm did not adversely affect them at the Perry plant, then how is it that you had cracks only at Davis-Besse? And why were the cracks around the circumference of the building, instead of just in one area where the wind was driving the snow?

In 2002, FirstEnergy covered up information about a hole in the head of the reactor.

I want to ask my friend from Minnesota if he needs any of this time right now, because I can conclude.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I want to thank the gentleman for claiming the time. I guess I was about 4 minutes behind. And, of course, you've got to be on your toes around here.

I had come prepared to do a Special Order.

Mr. KUCINICH. I'm going to shortly yield and ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota would be able to have the balance of the time.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentleman from Ohio wants to, we can share the time, if you'd like.

Mr. KUCINICH. I ask the Chair if it would be possible for me to have unanimous consent to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is not required.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota will control the remainder of the hour and yields to the gentlemen from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would just ask for a moment to conclude here.

Why am I bringing this up about the Davis-Besse nuclear power plant? Some people would say: Why shouldn't you give FirstEnergy the benefit of the doubt?

This is a company that 10 years ago covered up information about the hole in the head of a nuclear reactor. They were this close to having a breach, a fraction of an inch from having a breach of the reactor. They had files that were in a photo, and Federal investigators weren't given access to that. It ended up where this company gets fined $28 million because they weren't candid with the government and could have put the people of Ohio and Michigan and Indiana and Canada and the water of Lake Erie in jeopardy.

Many people remember, particularly in cities in the east, that time in August of 2003, where all the lights went out in the east. Remember, some people were sitting on their door steps for the first time with no city lights, looking up at the stars, but it wasn't particularly all that beautiful because what was not beautiful is the fact that there was this massive loss of power all over America's east coast that came about because of a series of technical glitches, the root cause of which was that this company, FirstEnergy, wasn't properly trimming trees because they didn't want to hire the people to do it.

This is the same company that's telling us the reason why they have cracks in a shield building is because of a blizzard 34 years ago. Hello.

We have to be very careful before we let a company that operates so fast and loose with the truth be in a position to have a license to continue to operate this nuclear power plant. In the alternative, they're going to have to make massive repairs. If they won't make the massive repairs, then the NRC ought to do the right thing for the American people and have this shut down.

I do not want to see another Fukushima in the United States of America. I do not want to see the people in my district at risk. I do not want to see the people in Ohio put at risk because you've a got a company like FirstEnergy operating in the shoddy way in which they operate, misrepresenting conditions to the public, and telling the NRC one thing and the people another.

I can promise you, Mr. Speaker, I intend to stay on top of this.

I appreciate the opportunity here, and I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Minnesota, the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus of the Congress, a person who has done a lot to take the message of the Progressive Caucus across this Nation in a way that's been very dynamic, the Honorable KEITH ELLISON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. ELLISON. As I was listening to the gentleman from Ohio recite the facts and the details of this energy situation, I couldn't help but think to myself that we need massive investment in public infrastructure in this Nation. It's not simply a jobs issue, though it is a jobs issue. It's also a public safety issue.

The gentleman talked about Fukushima. That was a catastrophic event, but if we don't take good care of our Nation's infrastructure, a catastrophe will occur. I can testify to that, because I'm from Minnesota. In my State only a few years ago, we saw our bridge fall into the Mississippi River. Thirteen Minnesotans lost their lives, 100 fell into the Mississippi River 65 feet below and suffered severe back and spinal injuries.

Infrastructure, folks, is not simply a jobs issue. Infrastructure is not simply an economic issue. Infrastructure is also a public safety issue. We need to make a demand that our government focus on infrastructure investment at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm KEITH ELLISON. I'm the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus. I hope to be joined in this hour by other members of the Progressive Caucus. I think some members of the CBC will be joining me, as well, to talk about the situation involving Attorney General Holder.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we're the Progressive Caucus. We come with the progressive message. The progressive message is basically very simple, Mr. Speaker. It is the idea of liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, you know that every morning we in Congress come down to the well, and we're very honored to say the Pledge of Allegiance. And the progressive message of the Progressive Caucus is basically embodied in that pledge:

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.

We're indivisible.

□ 1500

Yes. It's true, we come in different colors. We come from different cultures. We come from different religious backgrounds. But we are one Nation. And yes, it's true that it's ''liberty and justice for all.'' No exceptions. Everyone. Old, young, black, white, Latino, Asian, born in America, people who came here to immigrate, people of different religious backgrounds. People who are straight, gay. Americans are Americans are Americans, and they have the freedom to be who they are and have the liberty to pursue happiness as they define it and within the law and consistent with the rights of all others. But that's where it ends.

This is the Progressive Caucus, and I'm here to talk about the progressive message. And, Mr. Speaker, our email is right down here: cpc@grijalva.house.gov. We encourage people to stay in touch with us because we like to hear what the people have to say. We like to hear their insights, their values, what they think is important. So we encourage people to stay in touch at cpc@grijalva.house.gov, the Progressive Caucus Web site.

Mr. Speaker, we've been here another week in Congress, another week where we are going to have serious problems going on within a short period of time. I believe today's date is June 21. Within 9 days, on July 1, what we are going to see, Mr. Speaker, is interest rates on student loans double. We are going to see an expiration of our transportation bill. And do you think we took up either one of those issues on the House floor today or yesterday or at any time since Monday, Mr. Speaker? Absolutely not.

We urge the Republican majority to think about what's going on with the American middle class. Student loan rates will double on July 1. This could affect literally thousands and thousands of American students, and yet we're not acting on these issues at all.

The Democrats have said, Yes, absolutely. Progressives have said, Yes, absolutely. We cannot let student loan rates double at a time when we see colleges all over America experiencing double-digit increases in tuition, when the price of an education has gone skyhigh, outpaced inflation manyfold. And now, when the Congress tried to fix it, we're going to let it go back to the bad old days and let student loan interest rates double, costing students perhaps as much as $1,000 a year.

And then even though the Republican majority agreed with the Ryan budget, which said we should just let the students have to pay more, they then saw the light and came back and said, Okay, we don't want the student loan rates to double either. But then, Mr. Speaker, what happened was they said, But we want to take the money out of women's health.

Of course we couldn't agree to that. We can't pit students versus women. We can't say we're going to help students but we're going to take the money away from women under the health care act, from cervical screenings and such. You can't do that. That wouldn't be right.

What if we asked the most wealthy members of our society, the richest Americans, to just do a little bit more so that students could have an affordable education? And our Republican friends said, No, never can we ask rich people to do a little bit more.

So now here we stand, Mr. Speaker, 9 days before student interest rates are about to double, and we saw no action on it on the floor this week. This is a horrible tragedy. This is a sad situation.

We lost 28,000 construction jobs last month. Congress still hasn't passed a highway bill. The highway bill is due to expire 10 days from now, 9 days from now, and our friends in the majority have not addressed this issue. This is a shame. It is a stain and it is a disgrace.

If you hold the majority in the House of Representatives, you have to focus on the needs of the people. And I hope the people are paying attention today, Mr. Speaker, because within this coming week, the student loan interest rates are due to double. Interest rates on student loans are due to double in 10 days, and the highway bill is due to expire in 10 days, but we have not touched these key issues on the House floor. And I'm just asking my Republican majority friends, why won't they pursue a ''jobs'' agenda instead of the ''no jobs'' agenda they've been pursuing.

The President laid out a great jobs bill, yet we haven't seen any action on it. Let's have a vote on it, Mr. Speaker, up or down. What is the Republican majority afraid of? Do they fear that there are a few Republicans who really believe that Americans need jobs, who will join with all the Democrats and put America back to work? Put it on the floor. I think that the American people want to vote on jobs.

So let me just say, Mr. Speaker—because I think it's so important that we have to restate certain things. If you just tuned in, student loan interest rates will double July 1 if Congress does nothing. This week, we did nothing. So the clock is ticking, and I am a little worried.

After losing 28,000 construction jobs last month, Congress hasn't passed a highway bill, and that bill is due to expire because the Republican majority won't pass a long-term transportation bill. This is a mistake, this is bad leadership, and the American people should know about it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I know you're thinking, Well, what did we do? If we didn't take care of the issues that are so pressing, what did the Republican majority do this week? They must have done something, because we were here.

Well, I'll tell you what they did. We authorized the killing of the sea lions in the Northwest. I don't think that's a key issue we need to focus on.

We waived 39 environmental laws within 100 miles of the border. We said, Don't worry about complying anymore with 39 of the environmental laws within 100 miles of the border. So if you're within 100 miles of a border, I guess clean air and clean water just happen. But of course any 6-year-old kid knows that's not true.

What else did we do? This area within 100 miles of the border where we waived 39 environmental laws, this includes areas in Minnesota, where I'm from, like the Boundary Waters Wilderness or Voyageurs National Park. These are beautiful, pristine national treasures. And in my opinion, it's a shame to say that environmental laws would not apply there.

Thank goodness these bills haven't been taken up by the Senate because the Senate clearly knows that this is bad policy. But it didn't stop the Republican majority from pushing it because the Republican majority believes that all problems will be fixed if we don't regulate industry and if we cut taxes on the very well-to-do. They're mistaken about that, but that's what they believe. And I give them credit for saying it all the time because it gives the American people a chance to know what choices they have in front of them.

What else did we do, Mr. Speaker? We required Federal agencies to give oil companies 25 percent of all public lands they nominate for drilling. I will say that one again. The House Republican majority required Federal agencies to give oil companies 25 percent of all public lands—that's our lands, my lands, your lands, Mr. Speaker—they nominate for drilling.

So they used to say, ''Drill, baby, drill; drill, baby, drill.'' They're not kidding about that. Even after the oil spill in the gulf, which hasn't slowed them down, they are still on this thing about letting drilling happen whenever, however, whatever they want.

I think that there ought to be some public lands that are pristine and nice for the American people. And yet the Republican majority passed a provision that required Federal agencies to give oil companies 25 percent of all public lands they nominate for drilling.

Now, if you think about that, Mr. Speaker, think about this. Regardless of the natural beauty, regardless of the environmental harm, regardless of the fishing or hunting damage, we would mandate that Big Oil gets one-fourth of whatever it wants. That is bad policy, but yet that was what was passed on the House floor this week.

What else did the Republican majority do this week, just so the American people know? We weakened the Clean Air Act protections. We required the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, to elevate cost concerns above all others.

So are you noticing a theme? The Republicans like to say, We have an all-of-the-above strategy for energy. They say, We want oil; we want wind; we want biomass; we want all this, all this, all this.

□ 1510

But if you look at what they actually put on the floor and voted through with the Republican majority, they don't have an all-of-the-above strategy. They have an oil-above-all strategy. Oil above all. There is a theme here. This ''oil above all'' was quite unfortunate. This Congress can do better. We should be taking action now, not delaying until it is too late.

And I just want to, Mr. Speaker, this week, as we all are concerned about student loan interest rates doubling on July 1 and we are all concerned about the expiration of the highway bill, knowing that workers will be laid off if that happens, it is a shame we didn't address these critical issues facing the American people. But instead, we spent our time deconstructing environmental and health protections for the American people. I am disappointed about that, but that is what we did. And I think the American people have a right to know about it. So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell them about it.

But I would like to talk a little bit about what we have been doing not just this week, as I just have, but talk a little bit more globally about what we have been doing this whole 112th Congress, because there is a theme, undeniably, that we have been pursuing. There is a theme that we have been working on. Again, it is: cut taxes for the wealthy, leave taxes for middle class, and cut regulation for industry. Cut important environmental and health protections so that industry can keep more of the money so they don't have to spend it on making sure the air is clean and the water is clean.

I'd like to talk a little bit about America's energy future because that has been a theme on the floor we've been fighting up and down. And I mentioned I want to talk about the whole 112th Congress. Because even though that has been a recurring Republican theme, if you ask the American people what they want us to talk about, what you'll see on this chart, Mr. Speaker, is a question. And the question is simple. It simply says: Do you think the government should be doing more to help improve the financial situation of middle class Americans, should it be doing less, or do you think the government is doing the right amount to help improve the financial situation of middle class Americans?

So just to put the question out there again, Mr. Speaker, because I kind of went by quickly and the type is kind of small: Do you think the government should be doing more to help improve the financial system of middle class Americans, should it be doing less, or do you think the government is doing the right amount to help improve the financial situation of middle class Americans?

Well, this poll, pretty recent, right back in April, only a few months ago, and what Americans have said, Mr. Speaker, 67 percent of them said: do more. Two-thirds said: do more. So they don't think the government is doing enough to help improve the financial situation of the middle class. And, Mr. Speaker, they are right. Because the American people know that if we were to pass a highway bill that would help the middle class. If we would help college affordability, that would help the middle class. If we would do things like invest in our Nation's infrastructure altogether, that would help the middle class. If we would stop selling off public lands, that would help the middle class. If we would help make sure that we have sane and sensible and reasonable environmental protections like there are, but the Republicans want to get rid of, that would help the middle class. But the Republican majority, their argument is that the government should do less.

Now they say smaller government, smaller government. Lower taxes, smaller government. They say it so much that I can repeat their mantras in my sleep. They are great at repetition. But the American people say the government should be doing more to help improve the financial situation of middle class Americans. Two-thirds of them think so.

So as we can't pass the Buffett rule, we can't do anything about student interest rates, we're letting the highway bill expire, two-thirds of Americans think we should not be doing that. We should be doing more, not less. So those people who talk about smaller government and all that, they are not where the American people are.

Fifteen percent said: do less. That must be the Koch brothers or something like that. And 14 percent say: do the right amount. So about 29 percent say to do less or do nothing more and 3 percent said they didn't know. Two-thirds said the government should be doing more. And they're right, the government should be doing more. So that's why I want that point to be in front as I discuss this issue of America's energy future. We talked about energy today, and I want to discuss that a little more.

We need an energy plan, Mr. Speaker, that puts the interests of the American people ahead of the interests of Big Oil. Republicans say they want an all-of-the-above approach to energy. They say that all the time. Again, I credit them for being able to repeat the same theme over and over again. Great discipline on their part. But the only thing they've presented is an oil-above-all approach; oil above all else. Oil above wind. Oil above biomass. Oil above solar. Oil above anything. And they've proven that is their belief by the bill that we were dealing with this week.

We should never mistake the interests of Big Oil and the polluters for the interests of the American people. We should always understand that oil is one way to power our country, and for the time being it is going to be a part of our energy portfolio. But we should not be giving them massive subsidies. We should not be giving them massive subsidies when they're making record profits. We should not relieve them of basic health and safety protections to make sure that our natural wonders don't get destroyed, our wildlife doesn't get destroyed, our recreational industries don't get destroyed.

The oil spill in the gulf is still fresh in my mind. And I'm outraged, Mr. Speaker, that BP was able to write off the cost of the cleanup. I don't think enough Americans know that BP was allowed to write off the cost of the cleanup of the gulf. In other words, they simply foisted that cost on the American people, which I think is terribly unfortunate.

So this week, the Republicans brought an energy bill to the floor that simply checks off from Big Oil's wish list. To me, it felt like if Big Oil was to have a wish list, the Republicans just played Santa Claus. And I don't think that's the right thing to do. I think what we should do is recognize the fact that petroleum will be a part of our energy portfolio, but we should minimize it. We should promote other sources—green sources of energy: wind, solar, biomass, conservation. We should be investing in innovative approaches, not just subsidizing the fossil fuel industry, as we do, to the tune of about $110 billion every 10 years.

So as I said, Mr. Speaker, this week Republicans brought an energy bill to the floor that simply checks off from Big Oil's wish list. It weakens public health protections. It forces arbitrary giveaways of public land. As I already mentioned, it puts energy drilling ahead of all other uses of Federal land. The oil, gas, and coal industries are already getting billions in corporate welfare. They will receive at least $110 billion in subsidies over the next 10 years. These subsidies have been won by decades of lobbying. Lobbying.

These subsidies have not been won because what they are asking Congress to do is such a great idea. They have had high-paid lobbyists come down here and work over Members of Congress to give them what they wanted. And it has accumulated to the tune of about $110 billion a year. So they have a lot of power around here.

But I think that we would not be serving the public properly if we just turned over public lands so they can drill on them and spill on them and make all these mistakes that we ultimately have to pay for because they have won themselves tax breaks which allow them to write off the costs of these spills.

In 2011, the oil, gas, and coal industry spent $167 million lobbying the Federal Government. That's $167 million paid to lobbyists by the oil, gas, and coal industry. Now why, if they're right, do they have to spend so much money trying to convince Congress they are so right? If you've got a good idea, we would be able to review the bill and vote your way, if you've got something in the interest of the American people.

□ 1520

But if you have something that's for the special interests, well, yeah, you know, you've got to pull out the guys in the monogrammed shirts and the $1,500 suits to come tell us why we've just got to give them this loophole—which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, they always promise will bring jobs but rarely does anything other than bring them a lot more profit.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker, the renewable energy industry also needs investment, not just the oil industry, which doesn't need it. Clean energy is the fastest growing job sector in the world. America should be leading, not getting left behind. As the world is investing in new energy production methods, America is investing and putting subsidies on fossil fuels.

Now, from a scientific point of view, Mr. Speaker, we call the oil, coal, and gas industries fossil fuels. Why? Because these fuels are basically derived from just hundreds of millions of years worth of time going by and organic matter, trees from a million years ago and so forth. This is what fossil fuel is made from. But I think there's another good reason to call oil, gas, and coal fossil fuels. It's because they're the old way of doing stuff.

We need some new ways of doing stuff. We need to invest in clean energy. If we want to stay the strongest economy in the world, we need to invest in industries growing the fastest. Experts say that investing in clean energy gets more bang for the buck, Mr. Speaker, in creating jobs than the fossil fuel industry.

China has surpassed the United States in clean energy investment. China has surpassed the United States in clean energy investment, spending almost twice as much as we do, and the U.K. and Spain are not far behind.

Analysts believe that developing new clean energy techniques, like wind and solar, could support 20 million jobs by 2030 and trillions of dollars in revenue. And yet this week on the energy bill we were dealing with, that was not what we were talking about. On the land bill we dealt with, that's not what we were talking about. We are giving more and more to those who already have too much and an old industry. We need to, yes, recognize that oil is going to be part of our energy portfolio, but it shouldn't dominate it, and we need to invest in new energy where the job growth centers are.

Investing in clean energy creates three times as many jobs and more opportunities at every pay grade than traditional energy jobs. Yet we're subsidizing the fossil fuel industry six times the rate of supporting the renewable energy industry.

I offered a simple amendment. Last week, Mr. Speaker, I went to the Rules Committee and I offered a simple amendment to the Republican energy bill. It was a commonsense piece that was ruled out of order. And when I saw some of the things that were ruled in order, I was shocked. All my amendment said—that was ruled out of order and we weren't allowed to debate on the floor—is it is the sense of the Congress that the fossil fuel subsidies should be reduced to help control the budget deficit.

Now, my friends in the Republican majority are famous for harping on the deficit and the debt. They always talk about our children and our grandchildren. I don't know where they came up with that phrase, but it's remarkable to me that you can get all those politicians to say exactly the same thing all the time. I'm not saying there was some study group or poll. I'm just saying it is a remarkable coincidence.

My point is, though, you would think that if I said to you, Hey, look, let's have the $110 billion we give every 10 years to the fossil fuel industry, let's let that be part of deficit reduction, you would think that my deficit hawk friends would be all over that. But, unfortunately, we weren't even allowed to debate that because, of course, that might put some people on the hot seat.

We all want to reduce America's deficit, the Progressive Caucus included, but we want to do it in a way that promotes green jobs, reduces our dependency on fossil fuel and hydrocarbon fuels, and increases conservation and green energy. But by maintaining these subsidies, it increases the deficit by $110 billion every 10 years. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially the fiscal conservatives, agree that $110 billion in fossil fuel subsidies to profitable companies doesn't make any sense. We need a true all-of-the-above strategy, as President Obama has said, that invests in clean, renewable energy, not this oil-above-all bill that we saw this week. It's very sad and unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn our attention to another issue which I think is really important and we really need to focus some attention on, and that is the issue of Attorney General Holder.

Yesterday, Republicans on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee voted to hold Attorney General Holder in contempt of Congress. This was a sad occasion because Attorney General Holder is a great American and deserved better treatment than he got from the Republican majority House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Along with all Americans, I certainly mourn the loss of the Customs and Border Protection agent, Brian Terry. Mr. Terry was a public servant who deserved to live his life, and it is a horrible shame that he was killed in a gunfight in Arizona in December 2010. We all agree that the gun-walking policy, which was a policy started in the Bush administration, and that allowed thousands of guns to be bought by weapons traffickers should be investigated. This program has no signs of merit that I can see, and it is too bad.

But here's the thing. This is why it is unfair to hold Attorney General Holder in contempt. As soon as he learned of the tactic, this gun-walking thing, Attorney General Holder condemned the tactic and ordered the Inspector General to investigate. And since then, he has testified before Congress seven times and provided more than 6,000 pages of documentation as asked for.

At this point, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee was demanding a document, and the Executive, as is the tradition in every administration, said documents that basically are conversations between a client and a lawyer and basically are deliberative documents are not proper stuff for disclosure, and the President asserted executive privilege. And what happens then is the Attorney General gets hit with a contempt of Congress.

Instead of working in good faith to investigate what went wrong, it appears that Republicans on the committee, and maybe next week on the House floor, have used this strategy for political gain. Even after Attorney General Holder provided 6,000 pages of documents to Congress, House Republicans subpoenaed highly sensitive documents, including photographs of crime scenes and reports on a confidential informant, in order to score partisan political points. This is a misuse of the gavel.

And last week, they withheld funding for our Nation's law enforcement operations in retaliation. We should not withhold funding for our Nation's law enforcement operations simply to score political points. This is a mistake and it is wrong, and I just hope, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in need of law enforcement resources that doesn't get them because of this spat that the chair of the Oversight Committee has going on with Attorney General Holder.

There is an African proverb, Mr. Speaker, that I think you might appreciate. It says, when the elephants fight, only the grass gets trampled. And so when the chair of the Oversight Committee wants to fight with the Attorney General, only regular people who need law enforcement resources suffer.

So I'm sad that happened, and I hope today we can abandon this time of witch hunts. Last time, the Republicans went after President Clinton a few years ago. It didn't help them. They impeached him but couldn't convict him. It took up a lot of time. We clearly were not able to focus on the needs of the country. I hope that they learn a lesson and refocus on things like interest rates on student loans that are getting ready to go out and the transportation bill. These are things that we need to focus on, not this political stuff that they're trying to use to position themselves for the election. That's all I want to say about that for now, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1530

I want to talk a little bit also—to change the subject, Mr. Speaker—about money and politics. The Progressive Caucus passed a resolution to support something called Resolution Week. This is when municipalities, city councils all over across America passed resolutions asking Congress to initiate a process to overturn Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission.

Now, Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission basically came to the conclusion that money was speech and corporations were people. Corporations are not people. I've never seen a corporation put on a uniform and go to war. They've been contractors, but they are people who go risk their lives. They don't have children, they don't raise families. Corporations don't die. They have limited liability.

Basically, a corporation is designed to do one thing and one thing only—make money for its owners. And yet, the Supreme Court said that a corporation is a person, and persons have the right to freedom of speech, and so any money they want to put in any campaign, they can. What this has done is really turned our elections into auctions, and the highest bidder wins. Now, this is a shame. We need to overturn Citizens United.

The Progressive Caucus was honored to be part of Resolutions Week, when we saw officials passing resolutions across American cities asking Congress to overturn Citizens United. If we're going to get a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United, we need an awesome public display, awesome amount of communities rising up and demanding that this happen. And last week, we saw cities do it.

I'm proud that my city of Minneapolis, very honored that Minneapolis passed a resolution calling for the overturn of Citizens United; also honored that the city of St. Paul passed a resolution to overturn Citizens United, honored that Duluth, Minnesota did so several months ago. Also, New York, Los Angeles—Chicago is considering a bill, and there are many, many, many more. Over 1,600 elected public officials, both local, county, State, and Federal, have joined together and said this is bad legislation, and I was very honored that the Progressive Caucus was a part of it.

By organizing from the ground up, we can restore democracy to the people, for the people, and by the people. Several Members of Congress have already introduced constitutional amendments to overturn Citizens United.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as you may know, the traditional method to get a constitutional amendment—and again, there are now 27 constitutional amendments, we need one more to overturn Citizens United—Congress will pass something, then they will send it to

the States, and two-thirds of the States need to pass it, and then the President signs it, and then it's changed. The process, however, needs to be well supported by the public. So we have tried to start this grassroots movement, joining with other leaders like Move to Amend and others, to see Citizens United overturned.

We have several Members—as many as 12 Members of Congress have introduced bills to have an overturning of Citizens United. I was very honored that we are partnering with city officials, who are the closest unit of government to the people, very honored to represent 12 cities in my own district, all great public servants there. I hope that we can work together to say that money should not overwhelm the political process.

Mr. Speaker, one city official said, look, people may think this is some big national issue, but think about this: If a wealthy individual wants to have a development in a particular part of town where the elected city council says, You know what? This is zoned for parks or residential, whatever; it's not appropriate to go here, a wealthy individual could simply dump as much money as they want to in a city race to the opponent and give money to the opponent of the people opposing this project, and then basically buy off the city council. So this is something that local officials are correctly concerned about. The bottom line, though, is that we've got to move forward, and I'm proud that the Progressive Caucus is part of this effort. So this work we did last week I thought was great.

The Progressive Caucus has come up with an important declaration. Since we have all these constitutional amendment proposals—over 12 of them—we had to come in unity some kind of way, and what we decided to do is this: all join on a declaration. And the declaration says this, Mr. Speaker:

We declare our support for amending the Constitution of the United States to restore the rights of the American people undermined by Citizens United and related cases to protect the integrity of our elections and limit the corrosive influence of money in our democratic process.

So that's what the declaration says. Over 1,600 elected officials, two State legislatures, more than 150 cities and towns, all calling for repeal and overturning of Citizens United.

If I could make just an example, we've seen outside spending on campaigns up 1,600 percent since Citizens United came in—up 1,600 percent since Citizens United. Quite frankly, it's really something. It's gone crazy, and we've got to do something about it.

You might be thinking, Mr. Speaker, well, what do we do between now and when we pass the constitutional amendment? One thing we could do today is we could pass the DISCLOSE Act. This is a piece of legislation by Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN—a very dynamic leader, a gentleman from Maryland—and it requires public reporting of corporate campaign activity so that you can't have secret money.

Right now, you could have a situation where some billionaire takes their personal money, dumps it into a super PAC, and then the super PAC spends the money. We don't even know who that person is spending the money. So, under the DISCLOSE Act, we would find out the identity of some of these people. So we could do that right now. And by the way, some of the money we see creeping into American elections very well could be money from foreign sources. Senator MCCAIN very correctly pointed out that there's one wealthy individual who has been putting a lot of money into election campaigns, and he is a billionaire and owns a casino in China. He's using his wealth to influence American elections. So that's foreign money, if that's the way it is. So the thing is that we do not want people outside the United States trying to shape the elections in our country, and so this is the thing that we are moving forward.

Overturn Citizens United, amend and disclose—amend the Constitution and disclose secret donors.

I'll close this section on this point, Mr. Speaker: Corporations are not people. And in America, democracy should never, ever be for sale.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. With these last 11 minutes, I would like to take just a few minutes to talk about this college loan issue. I've talked about it a little bit already. I would like to elaborate.

College loan rates will double if Congress doesn't act by July 1. I've made that point, I'll make it again. This week, President Obama called on Congress to act. Remarkably, as I said several times tonight, Republicans in Congress are threatening to just allow the doubling of our student loan interest rates.

Americans owe more tuition debt, more student loan debt than there's credit card debt, and student loan borrowing is more common now than it would a decade ago. This is because States are sending less money to public universities, so public universities have to make up the money by increasing tuition, and that means students having to borrow more money.

At a time when the average student loan debt is about $25,000 and tuition prices continue to rise, students are borrowing more than ever to complete their degrees. Seven million undergraduates would be affected—that's 7 million, Mr. Speaker—by a doubling of student loan interest rates, raising the cost by about $1,000 per person. Our Nation's student loan debt burden is massive and now exceeds $1 trillion.

After initially blocking any solutions, Republicans are finally hearing calls. As I said before, they did make an offer, a counteroffer—I think I credit them for that—and they said, okay, we don't want to see a doubling of student interest rates, so we'll do something.

□ 1540

But when they came up, their pay-for, the way they want to pay for it, was to say that they wanted to cut health care services for children and breast cancer screening. So we're not going to hurt kids and women in order to help students, so we couldn't go with that deal.

We proposed that we ask the most well-to-do individuals and corporations to help. I guess what I'm saying is, if I went to a billionaire or a billionaire corporation and I said, look, we're about to see 7 million students' costs of education go up. Can you help, since you make so much? And it seems like what they're saying through their representatives is no.

This is outrageous. I think the truth is that America, a Nation that has made it possible for BP and ExxonMobil and GE and all these big corporations to do so well, should do well by America. I don't think that's asking too much.

It's not right to protect the richest people in America, and let everybody else get by the best they can. This Nation has made it possible for them to earn all that money, and I don't have any problem with people making good money. I just think that if you make good money, and you have used our police force, our military has protected you, our roads and bridges and our transit system have allowed you to move your goods and services around, our EMS system has made sure that if you get sick we'll come help you, our public schools have educated your workforce, then I don't think it's asking too much to say, put in the pot and help some kids have affordable education. I just don't think that's asking too much.

Now, somebody said to me, Well, Keith, in my day I paid my way through school. And I said, in your day school didn't cost $28,000 a year.

I'm 48 years old. When I went to law school, I graduated and I had $12,000 student loan debt. That's nothing compared to what students are dealing with today. They're graduating with twice that, on average.

So I just want to say, as I close out tonight, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority, elected by the people of their districts, are here, just like the Democrats are, to discharge the duties associated with their office and, that is, to promote the general welfare and to look out for the American people. I think making sure that student interest loan rates don't double is part of that. I think that making sure we have a decent highway bill that will help pay for the construction and maintenance of our roads and bridges and transit system is part of that. And yet this week we haven't done anything to do that.

The standard conservative line on the economy right now is that the government has done too much. But, yet, as I have already proven, the American people do not agree. Two-thirds say the government needs to do more than it's doing. So now I think the government has a duty to step up.

And, no, I don't think the government is the solution to every problem. And I know my conservative friends like to mischaracterize what progressives say about that. We don't believe government is the solution to every problem, but we do believe government is part of the solution to many problems. And if you cut it back and you scale it down and you make it too small and too weak to do anything to help people, then, of course it won't be able to help people, and that's a shame. The American people have a different set of expectations.

I just want to say, as we wind up and I begin to yield back, it's time in America where we recognize that there is an important balance between the private sector and the public sector, and the market fundamentalists who occupy this House on the Republican side of the aisle must begin to recognize that government has an important role to play. And if we abandon our role, America will be poorer for it.

If we don't step up to the plate and make sure that tuition interest rates are decent and reasonable and that we're making sure that we have a decent highway system, Americans will suffer. And we cannot allow that to happen in the richest, most powerful Nation in the history of the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I appreciate you giving me a moment to set up.

I have got to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I love coming to the floor after my good friend from Minnesota. I enjoy it every single time it works out in that way because he is an able representative of the Progressive Caucus which, I would argue, sits way over on the left-hand side of the political continuum.

And I would hope today, Mr. Speaker, I will be an able representative for the Conservative Caucus, which sits over on the right-hand side of the political continuum. And we absolutely disagree about what this Federal Government ought to look like.

I want to talk primarily about the President's health care bill in the Supreme Court, a decision that's coming down next week. But I want to start with where the gentleman from Minnesota ended, Mr. Speaker, and that is to say that conservatives believe that government is not the solution to every problem. That's certainly true. It's absolutely true.

But more importantly, there are different levels of government in this country, and we seem to forget that. Something happens, and my colleagues know this. You know, Mr. Speaker, you and I were part of the largest freshman class in modern times, and 99 of us came to this institution together and said it's not about how it has been run, but it's about how it can be run, and we can do better.

But something happens to people when they drive across the Beltway. That's that little interstate that goes around Washington, D.C. When they come inside the Beltway, something happens to them and they suddenly think they're the smartest person in the room. They suddenly think that if only all Americans would live their life the way they want other Americans to live their life, then everyone would be happier; and that's just not true.

I don't care how well-meaning anyone in this institution is, Mr. Speaker. There is not a man or a woman here that knows more about how my family should pursue happiness than my family does. There is no Member here from outside the State of Georgia who knows better about how Georgians should pursue happiness than those of us in Georgia do.

And I would say, as my friend from Minnesota finished talking about the student loan program, you may not know, Mr. Speaker—I know you all have a proud tradition of education in your home State and some very fine institutions of higher learning there. In Georgia we have what's called the Hope Scholarship. And for years and years, it allowed every single college student, college-bound student from the great State of Georgia, college graduates, B averages and above, every single one to go to State schools in Georgia for free.

You know how much Federal money we used for that program, Mr. Speaker? Zero. Zero.

Time and time again my colleagues come to the floor of this House, and they talk about what we need to do in Washington to help college students across America. Let me tell you something. You all came from your own State back home that has the power today to do those things. It does not have to happen in Washington. It can happen back home. It can happen at the city level, it can happen at the county commission level, it can happen at the State legislature level. Dadgummit, Mr. Speaker, it can happen at the family level, all of these decisions that we talk about in Washington, D.C.

And that takes us right into the health care bill, Mr. Speaker, because here's the secret. And I don't know if everybody in the House, Mr. Speaker, knows the secret and, that is, that as patently unconstitutional as the President's health care bill is, had the State of Georgia passed it for Georgians, it would have been perfectly fine. Hear that.

There are different powers that the United States Constitution allows State governments to exercise than it allows the Federal Government to exercise. The States have the power to mandate behavior. We see it regularly. We see requirements for what must be included in insurance policies, for who has insurance policies, that regulation of the individual market. But not the Federal Government.

So I want my friends in the Progressive Caucus to hear me clearly. I'm not anti-government. I want each role the government plays, I want it to play it as well as it possibly can. I want every government dollar to be spent as efficiently as it possible can. I want every government mandate to be as limited and efficacious as it can possibly be.

□ 1550

With that, Mr. Speaker, I take you back to President Bill Clinton, August 21, 1996. Why is that important, Mr. Speaker? You and I weren't even thinking about being in Congress in 1996. Why in the world is that important?

It's important because it was August 21, 1996, when President Bill Clinton signed into law Federal health care reform that passed this United States House, led by Speaker Newt Gingrich, a Republican from the great State of Georgia, 1996. Folks talk like health care reform hasn't ever come down the pike in this country, Mr. Speaker, in 1996, the House and the Senate and the President—Republicans, Democrats—all came together to pass health care reform.

Let me tell you what they passed in 1996. Here we go. It's from President Clinton's signing statement:

> This Act will ensure the portability of health benefits when workers change or lose their jobs, and it will protect workers against discrimination by health plans based on their health status.

Mr. Speaker, does that sound familiar? Does it sound like the very same words that would have come from one of President Obama's speeches when he was pushing his health care bill? Why is that? Why is President Clinton speaking these same words 15 years ago, and yet there are still health care solutions that Americans are searching for? I'll tell you why.

Because, in 1996, with Republican Speaker Newt Gingrich and with Democratic President Bill Clinton, folks came together, and they solved health care problems for every single health care plan that the Federal Government had the right to regulate. Hear that: every single plan that the Federal Government had the right to regulate.

In the State of Georgia, we have an office. It's a constitutional office. It's in the Georgia Constitution. It's called Commissioner of Insurance. We all vote on it. It's a statewide-elected office. We vote on it every 4 years. That individual has the right to control State-originated insurance policies, primarily the individual market and some

of the small business market. There are those policies that are regulated by the States, and every single State can solve that problem. Then there are those policies regulated by the Federal Government, and only the Federal Government can solve that problem.

That's what we did. Mr. Speaker, in 1996, Republicans and Democrats came together, and that's what we did. Hear the words of President Bill Clinton:

> This legislation will set into motion several key reforms. First, it will eliminate the possibility that individuals can be denied coverage because they have a preexisting medical condition.

Did you know that? Do you hear that, Mr. Speaker? Because I read it in newspapers all the time as if this is the first time we've ever talked about preexisting conditions. No. On August 21, 1996, President Bill Clinton signed into law:

> It will eliminate the possibility that individuals can be denied coverage because they have a preexisting medical condition.

That's true. It's the law of the land today. It was the law of the land yesterday. It was the law of the land 10 years ago for every single insurance policy legitimately regulated by the Federal Government.

Bill Clinton goes on:

> Second, it will require insurance companies to sell coverage to small employer groups and to individuals who lose group coverage without regard to their health risk status.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we talk about that as if no one has ever considered this idea. Not only has it been considered, but it is the law of the land. It was the law of the land yesterday. It was the law of the land 10 years ago. It was the law of the land when President Clinton signed it into law on August 21, 1996.

Finally, Bill Clinton says:

> Finally, it will require insurers to renew the policies they sell to groups and individuals.

This is from the President's signing statement in 1996.

In 1996, Mr. Speaker, we understood as a Nation there are two kinds of insurance policies in this country: those that the Federal Government regulates and those that the State regulates. Why is that important? It's important because we solved the problems that Americans asked Congress to solve in 1996 relating to those federally regulated plans. The problems that remain that Americans are crying out for solutions to are problems that can be solved any day of the week by any State legislature in the country for every single individual who lives in that State.

Mr. Speaker, that's what separates the Conservative Caucus from the Progressive Caucus. My friends in the Progressive Caucus ask sincerely, Can we come up with a solution here in Washington, D.C., that will apply to everyone in the country and put everyone under the same set of rules? And my friends in the Conservative Caucus say, No. The Constitution recognizes there are 50 different States, and each of those States is allowed to construct its own set of rules.

Why is that important? It's important because, when it comes to the Federal law of the land as it pertains to university students today, we are arguing about whether they should have a 3.4 percent subsidized interest rate on their loans or a 6.8 percent subsidized interest rate on their loans. That's the Federal Government solution. Do you want to burden people with debt at 3.4 percent or do you want to burden them with debt at 6.8 percent? That's Washington's answer.

But, Mr. Speaker, Georgia's answer is: Let's let everybody go for free. Let's find the money elsewhere. Let's make sure everybody who wants to go to college has a pathway to college.

Mr. Speaker, when the Congress nationalizes any section of the law, they kill the innovative spirit of every single State out there. That's why in 1996 we didn't reregulate the entire market—the Constitution did not give us that authority—but we reregulated the Federal side of the market and allowed States to continue to innovate and find their own solutions in their areas.

Unless you think I'm making this up, Mr. Speaker, I've brought a little bit of the Constitution down here with me today. Here we go with article I, section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution:

> The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

You know that phrase, Mr. Speaker. It's thrown around cavalierly all the time. It's the Commerce Clause:

> The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

Absolutely. Unquestionably.

What's more, the 10th Amendment of the United States Constitution:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

Mr. Speaker, this is important. If you haven't gone back and if you haven't looked at your history books recently, I would encourage my colleagues to go back and do that because the only reason the Constitution was ratified in this country was because of the promise that the Bill of Rights would be ratified right behind it.

Know that.

If you dispute that, Mr. Speaker, you've got my email address. It's Woodall@mail.house.gov. My Web address is Woodall.house.gov. Let me know where you think I'm wrong, because I've gone through it over and over and over again.

The United States Constitution would not have been ratified by the States without the addition, the commitment, that the Bill of Rights would be ratified right behind it. That's where the 10th Amendment comes from. No one was worried about State governments getting out of control in 1787. They were worried about a tyrannical Federal Government in 1787. I would say rightly so. That was their experience in Europe. Candidly, that's becoming our experience today, and I want to talk a little bit about that.

The 10th Amendment of the Constitution:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

That brings us, Mr. Speaker, right into this health care case. I want to take you, Mr. Speaker, back to the origins of this legal decision. It came out of Florida. It's called the ''Vinson decision'' because Judge Vinson was the lead judge, the chief judge, down in the Florida case that led to this case coming to the Supreme Court. Yet there was a dissenting opinion. It was a 2–1 decision there in Florida, and the dissenting opinion came from Judge Stanley Marcus.

This is what he said:

> Because the 10th Amendment reserves only those powers not already delegated to the Federal Government, the 10th Amendment has been violated only if the Federal law at issue goes beyond the limits of Congress' power under the Commerce Clause.

Now, we just looked at the Commerce Clause:

> The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

The dissenting judge says that the key issue is: Does the President's health care bill go beyond the limits of Congress' power under the Commerce Clause?

□ 1600

He goes on. This is from Judge Vinson, the chief judge on that case, writing for the majority:

> The existing problems in our national health care system are recognized by everyone in this case. There is widespread sentiment for positive improvements. This is obviously a very difficult task. Regardless of how laudable its attempts may have been to accomplish these goals in passing the act, Congress must operate within the bounds established by the Constitution. Again, this case is not about whether the act is wise or unwise. It is about the constitutional role of the Federal Government.

That's exactly what my colleague from Minnesota was talking about earlier.

There are a lot of levers of power that I found out as a freshman when I showed up here, Mr. Speaker. You know what I'm talking about. There are lots of levers of power that we can pull here. And the question is: Who do you want in a United States Representative? Do you want someone who's thrilled about pulling every single one of those levers of power, or do you want someone who is reluctant to pull those levers of power?

And that's the funny thing about a legislature, Mr. Speaker. It rarely attracts people who want to send power

away, the folks who want to send power back to the States. That's rare. The legislatures attract people who want to amass power and use all of those levers for what they would call the power of good. That's not what our Founding Fathers intended in the Constitution.

Going back to the majority opinion in the Florida case, the Vinson case. Judge Vinson says this:

> In closing, I will simply observe, once again, that my conclusion in this case is based on an application of the Commerce Clause law as it exists pursuant to the Supreme Court's current interpretation and definition. Only the Supreme Court can expand that.

Well, that's actually where Judge Vinson and I begin to disagree. I would tell you the Supreme Court doesn't have any business expanding the Commerce Clause. The folks who put together our Constitution didn't do it lightly. They did it deliberately. The Commerce Clause was drafted narrowly deliberately, and the 10th Amendment was drafted broadly deliberately. The danger that we face as a Nation is that there are well-meaning men and women in this Chamber who absolutely believe they have the answer to every problem that plagues every single American, and the temptation is to use their power as a Member of Congress to solve it. That's the temptation.

I tell folks when I'm back home in town hall meetings, I say, Don't ask me to go to Washington and legislate with my heart. Ask me to go to Washington and legislate with my head.

When I'm back at home digging into my own personal wallet, ask me to give out of my wallet with my heart. Because when I give out of the Washington, D.C., wallet, Mr. Speaker, I'm not giving out of my wallet; I'm giving out of everybody else's wallet. I'm giving out of every single wallet of every single American in this country. That is not what our Framers intended the Federal Government to do. But we're at risk.

I take you back to the dissenting opinion written by Judge Stanley Marcus. What he's talking about here is how he disagrees with Judge Vinson's conclusion that the President's health care bill is unconstitutional. In disagreeing he says this:

> In the process of striking down the mandate, the majority has ignored many years of Commerce Clause doctrine developed by the Supreme Court.

Not by Congress. By the Supreme Court. It has ignored the undeniable fact that Congress's commerce power has grown exponentially over the past two centuries and is now generally accepted as having afforded Congress the authority to create rules regulating large areas of our national economy.

> It has ignored the Supreme Court's expansive reading of the Commerce Clause that has provided the very foundation on which Congress already extensively regulates both health insurance and health care services.

What does that mean? It's a United States judge, an appellate court judge, in Florida. He's a thoughtful guy. By all estimations his opinions are thoughtful opinions. And when he looks at the current state of the law in America today, he sees that over the past two centuries, Congress and the Supreme Court have so expanded what that one line in the Constitution says about regulating commerce amongst the States, they have expanded that definition to allow Congress to regulate virtually any aspect of the United States economy.

Mr. Speaker, that's frightening to me. Not because I don't enjoy the company of the good men and women who serve in this Chamber, but because, as I said when I began, these folks know nothing about happiness for my family. They know nothing about my pursuit as a Georgian of happiness, of success. And every time we pass a one-size-fits-all solution in this Congress, it kills everything else.

Here's the difference. Again, Georgia embarked on a massive project to fund free college education for all of its graduating students. It was a huge project. It cost millions upon millions upon millions of dollars, and it could have failed. Had it failed, the only people who would have been punished by its failure are the 9 million of us who live in Georgia. And then we could have looked to the other 49 States for a better solution. But, Mr. Speaker, when the United States of America's Congress fails, when it passes a one-size-fits-all solution for everybody, 315 million Americans pay the price for that, and there's no place to look then for the next innovation.

When I was growing up, Mr. Speaker, there was a saying. When something was really hard to do, folks would say, golly, that's going to take an act of Congress to get that done. I don't know if that was a saying in your part of the world, Mr. Speaker, but that's what it would be. If something was really hard to do, they would say, oh, golly, that's going to take an act of Congress to make that happen.

That was an expression, because getting an act of Congress passed is hard. So when it's really hard to get a very bad act of Congress passed, it's really hard to get that same bad act repealed, and again we've killed innovation across the country when we do it. This dissenting opinion from this very thoughtful judge suggests that Congress's power now is plenary, unlimited, to control every single aspect of economic life in this country.

I challenge you, Mr. Speaker: What aspect of your life isn't economic? What aspect of your life isn't economic? And I don't mean that doesn't have money involved, because as you know in the President's health care bill, Mr. Speaker, there is no money involved. It says, I don't care if you don't have a health care insurance policy today, you must go out and buy one. Now, I'd say there's no economic involvement there. I wasn't going to go out and buy one. It forces me to go and do something I would not have done. That's the expanded version of the Commerce Clause as seen by supporters of the President's health care bill.

Going on again from this dissenting opinion:

> Both the Supreme Court and this circuit have said in determining whether the Necessary and Proper Clause grants the legislative authority to Congress to enact a particular Federal statute, we look to see whether the statute constitutes a means that is rationally related to the implementation of a constitutionally enumerated power.

That's a lot of legalese there, Mr. Speaker, but what it means is this: They've just said the Commerce Clause allows Congress to regulate anything that has to do with money and economic activity in America. And now they're saying the Necessary and Proper Clause of the Constitution gives Congress the power to pass legislation to implement anything that's then related to any of those things.

I asked you a second ago, Mr. Speaker, what in your life doesn't have to do with money? I don't think you were able to come up with many things that didn't have some sort of economic relationship at all. But now my question, as posed by the dissenting opinion here, is what in your life has nothing to do with economic activity or money and is in no way related to anything that has something to do with economic activity or money? Because the Necessary and Proper Clause, as they say in the dissenting opinion, gives Congress the power to legislate that.

I don't want that authority here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. I don't want that authority here. These are good men and women in this body who legislate in a thoughtful way, but they do not know what is best for 315 million Americans. The Constitution gives us limited responsibilities for which we must speak for a nation. War, for example. Trees, for example.

But I want you to read the Constitution thoroughly, Mr. Speaker, and I know you have, over and over and over again. You know as well as I do, there's not one word in there about mandating that every American citizen pay a fine if they refuse to purchase a health insurance policy.

□ 1610

I want to talk about those laws of unintended consequences a little further, Madam Speaker, because, as I said, I'm not antigovernment. Government has a role. In fact, that's where we are in America every single day, Madam Speaker. We're on that continuum between liberty and security. Liberty and security—yet you can't have both at the same time. We're always moving up and down that continuum.

If you go out here on the interstate, Madam Speaker, you can't drive 150 miles an hour. Well, you can, but you'll be punished. Why can't you do that? It's a free country. I hear people that say that all the time. Dadgummit, ROB. It's a free country. Well, it is a free country. But we have decided to trade

away, through government, our liberty of driving 150 miles an hour for the security of knowing that our children and grandchildren aren't going to die every time they get on the road. That's where we are. Every single decision of government bridges that continuum between complete liberty and complete security.

Kentucky, in 1993, began to try to provide for its citizens' security in the health care field. Again, as I told you, in 1996, the President signed into law that bill that regulates all Federal policies, but it left to the States all of those policies that are State-regulated.

Well, Kentucky tried to take some steps. They passed a health care law in 1994 that aimed to lower health care costs for all folks in Kentucky and to encourage uninsured individuals to purchase health insurance. There were some mandatory issue provisions. There were some rate regulation provisions.

This is what happened: They did the very best they could in the great State of Kentucky. But they had 43 insurance carriers in 1993. And after passing this law, they ran 41 of those out of the State. They had 43 choices that their citizens could choose from. Then they all got together and said, We want to help make it better for our citizens. And 41 of those companies said, We're not going to put it up with it. This is no way to run a business. We're leaving. From 43 insurance companies to two, this Kentucky health care law destroyed.

Well, what do you think happened? All those voters who said they wanted changes to the health care law, they weren't all that excited about the one that cost them 41 different choices. So Kentucky repealed that law, started over from scratch, and they are now growing the number of insurance companies back in that system.

That's awful for the men and women in Kentucky who had to struggle through that. But it didn't burden the other 49 States at the same time. And the men and women of Kentucky could then look to those reforms in the other 49 States to see how to improve on their health care model.

It's the law of unintended consequences, Madam Speaker. That's why it's bad to consolidate all of this authority here in the United States Congress. It's not that these men and women who work here aren't conscientious. It's not that they don't love their country. It's not that they don't love their constituents, and they do try to serve them well. It's that you cannot possibly predict every single outcome.

I'll give you one, Madam Speaker. You know, some of the President's health care law has already gone into effect. One of those provisions that's already gone into effect is mandatory issue of policies for children. But why? Because we all love children. There's not a man or a woman in this Chamber who doesn't love children, Madam Speaker. So the President, in his health care bill, said, Well, let's make sure then that every insurance company must issue an insurance policy to every child who decides they want a policy.

Well, we've kind of gotten confused about what insurance is in this country. Think about that, Madam Speaker. Think about all the insurance policies you have in your life. Which one are you really excited about utilizing? Is it your life insurance policy, Madam Speaker? You are really hoping that day comes when your maker takes you home, and you can bring that life insurance policy to fruition? No. Is it your car insurance policy? You are really excited about getting into an accident this afternoon so you can call your insurance company and have them pay for it? That's going to be great? No. Maybe it's your homeowners insurance policy, Madam Speaker. Maybe you are hoping a fire breaks out there tonight so you can go home and call that homeowners insurance company and collect on the full value of your policy. No. Insurance is for things you hope don't happen, but you want to be ready for them in case they do.

That's not so with health insurance. How many friends or neighbors do you have who have said, You know what? I'm going to put that procedure off until I get my health insurance? That's not insurance. That's discount health care. That's prepaid health care. That's any number of things. But it's not insurance. Insurance is for things that you don't know are going to happen.

Well, going back to the President's health care bill that mandated that all children get the policies that they apply for. Well, guess what? Some children are already sick. So when they go to apply for a policy, they're not applying for insurance. They're applying for free health care.

Insurance companies aren't charitable organizations. My church is a charitable organization. The United Way is a charitable organization. Insurance companies are not charitable organizations. They are in the business of providing a service for a fee.

So when the President's health care bill went into effect—a bill that I promise you, I am as certain as I stand here today, that the President intended to be a boon for children, that he intended to be helpful for children, that he intended to provide more services for children—it shut down every single insurance company in Georgia that offered child-only policies.

When you went to buy an insurance policy after the President's health care bill went into effect, the health care bill that guaranteed that insurance companies had to issue you a policy, you found that not a single policy remained because every single insurer in that marketplace had left. Madam Speaker, that's not surprising, those laws of unintended consequences. They're undeniable. And the President's health care bill is taking us down that road not just in child policies, not just in terms of guaranteed issue, not just in terms of the Federal mandate, but on issue after issue after issue.

The Supreme Court is going to make their decision next week. Well, they've made their decision. They're going to share it with the rest of us. But just to be clear, I hear what you might be saying: Well, Congressman WOODALL, you are one of those hardcore conservatives from the great State of Georgia. You just don't care about people. Because I hear that charge—not against me personally, but against conservatives in general. It drives me crazy. I will concede that there may be Members on the other side of the aisle who care about people as much as I do. But there is not one man or woman in this Chamber who cares about people more. Not one. All I'm saying is the Federal Government shouldn't screw it up for those people.

Because I have here, Madam Speaker, a chart of what every State in the Union was doing in 1996. This Chamber hadn't gone mad in 1996 when it decided, under a Republican Speaker and a Democratic President, to sign a health care law. It hadn't gone crazy. It chose to only regulate Federal plans because State plans were already being regulated at the State level.

Take a look: What kinds of things are you interested in? Are you interested in guaranteed issue, Madam Speaker? That guaranteed issue is when you say, I don't care if somebody's sick; you have to take them anyway. That's not a great insurance practice, but it's a heartfelt belief. It's called guaranteed issue. Well, let's see. Alaska's got it. Arizona's got it. Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, on and on and on. This isn't something that requires a Federal solution.

Are there people in this Chamber who want a Federal solution because it consolidates power in Washington, D.C.? Absolutely, there are. Are there men and women in this Chamber who want a Federal solution because they believe in their heart they care more about people than anybody else and so they want it to be their solution that people utilize? Absolutely, there are.

But hear this, Madam Speaker, and share this with your constituents back home. There is not one health care problem that the President aims to solve in his health care bill that your State legislature cannot solve itself at home today.

Madam Speaker, how many times have you heard somebody say, But I know this family, and they can't get insurance, and my heart aches for them. I hear that. I hear that regularly. And your State legislature can solve that for you today.

□ 1620

You don't need Washington, D.C.'s permission. Something happened in

this country, Madam Speaker, and it's not healthy. Folks call Washington, D.C., for solutions. I got a call the other day from a homeowners association. They said, I can't get a building permit put through the city council, and I want you to fix it for me. That's what folks believe. I get it. That is not what America is. The place to solve your city council issues is with your city council. And the place to solve your county commission issues is with your county commission. And the place to solve your State insurance regulation issues is with your State.

The President's health care bill was a solution in search of a problem that does not exist. Guaranteed issue is available today.

This chart goes on to talk about the portability issue: can you move from one insurance policy to the other without penalties. It talks about preexisting conditions: how to deal with if you're already sick and you've gone to apply for a policy today, when will they cover that illness. Every single issue that the President's health care bill purports to solve, States have already been at work on and in many cases have those solutions already. The President's health care bill erases them all in favor of a one-size-fits-all solution.

I just want to go back for a moment, Madam Speaker, to Kentucky's experience. Thoughtful men and women, people who care about their neighbors and their communities, did the very best that they could to address their health care crisis. And in doing so, they ran from 43 insurance companies helping people in the State, down to two, because the rest of them went out of business and went home. Left the State altogether. That's not what they intended to happen, but that's what happened.

When we talk about the Supreme Court striking down the President's health care law next week—and I feel certain that it will because as I look at my Constitution, it is so patently unconstitutional to mandate that Americans engage in some activity they might not otherwise. And that's the principle on which the entire house of cards is stacked. The entire bill must be struck down.

The question is: What next? And what I want the American people to hear, Madam Speaker, is that what next is happening in your State legislature today. It was happening a year ago. It was happening 10 years ago. You do not have to have an act of Congress to have your problem solved. You can do it right there at home. And States are.

But if you call your Congressman and you ask your Congressman to solve your problem for you, I promise you your Congressman is going to go to work to do it. But when they do it, they are likely to craft something that destroys the system it was meant to save. And then where will we be as 315 million Americans?

I'll give you a little insight into just what I'm thinking, Madam Speaker. I'm not trying to associate my thoughts with the whole of the freshman class or the whole of the Congress. But there was a study out the other day where they went to the Fortune 100 companies, Madam Speaker, and they said: What are you going to do if the Supreme Court upholds the President's health care bill and all of these mandates go into effect?

Well, only 71 answered that survey. And every single one of those 71 Fortune 100 companies said: we'll do better to cancel every insurance policy we have in our company and pay the fine than we will to continue to provide insurance to our employees.

Now, you remember the promise, Madam Speaker, that the President made: if you like your insurance policy, you can keep it. Well, the insurance policy I had didn't comport with the President's bill so they canceled it altogether. I did not get to keep my insurance policy. And what 71 of the largest companies in America have said is the bill gives them every incentive to cancel every policy and dump all of their employees out into the exchange.

Now this was reported in the news as if it was some miraculous discovery. I will tell you this. This is the secret I was going to share, Madam Speaker. I don't think it's miraculous news. I don't think it's a surprise to anyone who crafted this bill. This bill was never about solving these problems that the States are already solving. This bill was never about solving problems that the States already have the ability to solve. This bill was about moving us one step closer to having the Federal Government pay for every single health care bill in this country. A single-payer system. That's what the President said during the campaign he wanted. That's what he said in his entire career he wanted. And this bill that does in fact destroy the free market health care system that we have takes us one step further in that direction. You need look no further than that Fortune 100 survey to see that.

Madam Speaker, when the Supreme Court strikes down the President's health care bill next week, I want to encourage a deliberative process in this body. There is no rush to judgment in this body. It was a rush to judgment that got us here. You have to read the bill to know what's in it. We've all been down that road; 2,000 pages that nobody had time to read. Taxes and mandates that folks are still finding out about.

Let's talk about that, because I hope, Madam Speaker, that I've laid out a fairly persuasive case that while the health care system in this country is in crisis, it is in crisis because of Federal Government intervention—not in spite of it, because of it—and that States have the ability to solve each and every one of these problems. And States are in fact providing those solutions.

So what are we getting in the President's health care bill? Is it worth it? Because I've got to be honest with you, Madam Speaker, I hope you were as surprised by this as I was when you got here.

There's a real reluctance in this town to do cost-benefit analysis. There's a real reluctance to weigh the costs and the benefits and see which side it's on. Why? Because if I'm the brilliant guy who came up with the brilliant bill, it's brilliant. And so if it costs a whole lot more than it's worth, that's going to hurt my feelings, so I don't want you to release that data. I don't want you to do that research. Let's just implement my brilliant idea and see where it takes us. Nobody wants to do the cost-benefit analysis.

Well, again, the President's health care bill, which solves absolutely nothing that States can't do on their own, and there's not going to be a single person in the President's administration that disagrees with me about that, they would prefer a Federal solution; but they know full well the States can do those things on their own.

This is what it's going to cost us: $15 billion in taxes last year; $30 billion this year; $45 billion next year, all the way up to $320 billion in new taxes in this health care bill. When the Supreme Court strikes it down next week, it's going to be a $320 billion tax cut for American families because it's American families that are on the hook for these taxes in the President's health care bill.

I'll go on. The President said this bill is going to take premiums down for the American families. Now, Madam Speaker, I did not graduate with an economics degree, but I have ordered a lot of sandwiches at Subway. And what I have found is when I want to add guacamole to my Subway sandwich, they want to raise the price on me. And when I want extra cheese on my Subway sandwich at Subway, they want to raise the price on me. You cannot give the American people more benefits without there being a price somewhere.

So, yes, the President promised that this would bring down health care premiums. Here is his quote from June 9, 2008:

> We'll bring down premiums by $2,500 for the typical family.

That's this blue line, Madam Speaker, that I have. The President's rhetoric, We're going to bring down health care costs $2,500 per family. The red line here is the reality, Madam Speaker. The reality is health care costs are going up. Premium costs are going up. Why? Because we've mandated that insurance companies do all these new things.

Are you following universities, Madam Speaker? There's all this heartbreak down here talking about how to deal with student loan issues. Student loans are important. But what about student health care, Madam Speaker? Across the country, universities are

looking at canceling policies that they can no longer afford. They could afford them before the President's health care bill, but they cannot afford them after. Why? Because the President's health care bill with mandate after mandate after mandate does not take insurance costs down. It takes insurance costs up. And the American people pay that price.

□ 1630

It's all right here on this chart, Madam Speaker. At its core, when I talk to folks back home, folks care about access. I need access to insurance, and I don't have access. And they care about cost. I need access to health care services, but health care services are too expensive. That's what the whole health care debate was about. What can you do to help us with access? What can you do to help us with cost?

Madam Speaker, every State in the Union can provide you with access, and many of them have. And all of them will if their electorate demands it. Now, that's the funny thing about this health care bill, of course. The majority of the American people have always opposed it. There was never a time when the majority of the American people said, This is what we want. The majority of the people have always opposed it. It was Washington, D.C., that said, Well, you might not want it today, but once we implement it and force it upon you, you're going to be thrilled. You just don't know it yet. You're going to be happy.

Folks aren't happy still today.

Cost and access is what took us down this road. We see that access is within the legislative purview of every State in the Union, and we see that costs have been driven up and not down. It's not a partisan issue, Madam Speaker.

I'm from Georgia, so maybe I'm a little biased, Madam Speaker, but I'll tell you, I think Newt Gingrich has a reputation in this country. I know the Democrats do a lot of fund-raising by sending his name out as if he's a strident partisan. Well, maybe he is in other parts of the country; not in Georgia, but maybe in other parts.

It was Newt Gingrich and Bill Clinton that came together to reregulate the entire Federal health care marketplace doing away with preexisting conditions in a responsible and economically feasible way, requiring portability in an effective and economically feasible way, ensuring availability, using tools that make insurance more affordable instead of less.

Cost and access we came together on in 1996, long before my time, and implemented for every federally regulated policy in the land. What's left are those areas of State control.

Madam Speaker, I'm going to go back to the 10th Amendment because we don't spend enough time on the 10th Amendment around here:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

That is at the heart of our Republic. The Constitution lays out specific tasks that the Federal Government and the Federal Government alone must handle. And everything else, not some things else, not something else, everything else. It's not confusing.

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

And as we see in that dissenting opinion in the Vinson case, the courts have gradually acceded year after year after year to Congress's demand for more power. And as Congress has continued to legislate, courts have continued to endorse it. And then Congress legislates more, and courts endorse it more, and Congress legislates more, and you turn around and the 10th Amendment now means nothing.

What is that?

Going back to that dissenting opinion, the dissenting judge said Congress has so expanded the Commerce Clause, courts have so ruled on the Commerce Clause, that there is no aspect of economic life that Congress cannot regulate. And then he went on to cite the necessary and proper clause and said, and if there's no aspect that Congress cannot regulate, Congress can do anything that is reasonably associated, necessary, and proper to implementing that bill.

Folks, I don't think that's the America that you and I know. But no one loses their freedom overnight. You lose your freedom one fiber at a time, and you wake up one day and you say, golly, where did it go? It doesn't happen all at once. This has been time after time after time over decades. It's not a Republican problem; it's not a Democratic problem; it is an American problem.

And next week, it's happening right across the street, Madam Speaker. Right across the street, next week, nine men and women are going to reset the clock to what our Founding Fathers intended, setting limits on what the Federal Government can do in your life.

Madam Speaker, that inspires me. I'm not afraid. I'm inspired by that opportunity, that opportunity to be master of my own destiny. But I say to folks who fear that, to any of my colleagues on the left who fear the diminution of Federal power, there's a seat for you in your State legislature.

If you have the urge deep in your heart to control every aspect of an individual's life, I suggest you go back home and run for your State legislature because State powers are plenary; Federal powers are limited. And every single power not delegated in the Constitution to the United States, nor prohibited by it to the States themselves, are reserved to the States and the people.

Madam Speaker, that has always been the key to the success of this Republic. It has always been true that the finest innovations, the most creativity, is happening at the local level and working its way up, not happening in Washington, D.C., and working its way down.

When the Supreme Court strikes down the President's health care bill next week, Madam Speaker, Americans are not going to be without health insurance. Americans are not going to be without choices. Americans are not going to be thrown into a lawless environment. They are going to have the benefit of lower prices in the absence of the President's health care bill, of more certainty in the absence of the President's health care bill, and the authority to solve every single problem that ails them, vested in that institution closest to home, closest to the people, State legislatures across this country.

And if there's one thing I'm certain of, Madam Speaker, I've had those occasions where I have doubted the wisdom of this Congress, but I have never had an occasion where I've doubted the wisdom of the American people—not one. The American people have the authority to make these choices today. They do not need a Federal mandate to solve these problems. They don't need a Federal mandate to address these issues. They have that authority today. Our Founding Fathers made certain of it in the 10th Amendment.

And after that court case comes down next week, Madam Speaker, folks will go to work across this country, as they always have, to address the issues and concerns of the American voter, and they'll do that in all 50 of the great and independent States of this Nation.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As always, I'm privileged and honored to be able to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. And having heard some of the dialogue of the gentleman from Georgia just preceding me, it transitions in a way that I think it is fitting, and his focus on the 10th Amendment and the limitations of the Constitution that don't seem to be felt by many Members of the Congress that serve over on this side as a rule and the debacle that's been brought upon us, and now we've called upon the Supreme Court to unravel, and anticipate a decision as early as next week, no longer this week, I'm told, Madam Speaker.

As I watched this administration unfold, and we're into 3½ years or a little bit more into the Presidency of Barack Obama, I'm extremely troubled by the constitutional aspects of this administration.

□ 1640

I would frame this with the understanding that the President of the United States is a former adjunct law professor at the University of Chicago who taught constitutional law. He taught constitutional law to students that were to learn about this document that I carry with me in my jacket pocket every day, this Constitution that has, as essential components, article I, article II, and article III of this Constitution.

Article I sets up the legislature—that's us, Madam Speaker, here in the House of Representatives and down the hallway to the other end of the Capitol, the United States Senate. It invests in us all legislative authority. That's article I. It sets up the legislature, and it gives us our authority. And I'll talk about that a little bit more in a moment, Madam Speaker.

Article II sets up the executive branch of government. It establishes that there shall be a President who is the Commander in Chief of all of our Armed Forces and a Vice President. Beyond that, there's not a requirement that this Congress establish any other parts of the executive branch of government. It just says that we may, not that we shall. That is in the enumerated powers that this Congress has.

The third branch of government, of course, is the judicial branch of government. It wasn't originally established for the purposes of determining the intent of the letter of the Constitution. It did emerge, and for more than two centuries the landmark precedent case of Marbury v. Madison has not been successfully challenged, although occasionally it's been argued. So I concede to the Marbury decision.

I look over to the Supreme Court and look to the United States Supreme Court to be the branch of government that determines what the laws mean, that identifies and defines the laws that we pass here. But my disagreement—although I've had some with the Supreme Court in the past, Madam Speaker—is not with the judicial branch of the government. I'm looking for them to grant us a decision next week on perhaps two large cases that have come before the Court, the ObamaCare case and also Arizona's SB–1070 immigration case. I'm hopeful that they will read this Constitution and understand it as I do and as most of us that take an oath to this Constitution do.

But I'm very concerned about the President of the United States, the former adjunct law professor who taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago.

When I had a speaker on this Wednesday morning at a breakfast that I host each week on Wednesdays—what goes on in that room is Members only, but it's the Conservative Opportunity Society—when the speaker that I introduced announced that he received his law degree from the University of Chicago's School of Law, it was a bit of an apology for the President's interpretations. I'm hopeful that the very fine and excellent University of Chicago School of Law doesn't have now a bad reputation it has to peel off that comes from the interpretations of the Constitution that the President is making these days—who taught law there, of course I would remind you.

So I'm very troubled by the actions of the President of the United States. The most recent action that I'm troubled by is, let me say, the amnesty memorandum that he has directed Janet Napolitano to issue. This amnesty memorandum establishes several classes of people. One of those classes they've defined as this: if they were brought into the United States—or came into the United States is a more accurate way—if they arrived in the United States illegally from a foreign country before they were 16 years old and if they are still under 30 years old, and if they continuously resided in the United States for 5 years and if they received a high school degree, a GED, or were honorably discharged from the military—there are a couple other criteria there—then the President has directed Janet Napolitano, the Secretary of Homeland Security, who has in turn directed her subordinates—that being the Acting Director of Custom Border Protection, David Aguilar, and the Director of ICE, John Morton, and also the USCIS, Mayorkas—to recognize this memorandum and act as if the President had issued an edict that is actually a law.

Now, as Mr. WOODALL from Georgia spoke about the Constitution and what's happened to our 10th Amendment, I would suggest that the President seems to be usurping nearly all of article I, section 8 of our Constitution, the enumerated powers.

Now, I came here to speak of these enumerated powers in this way: if the President can manufacture law out of thin air—not whole cloth, Madam Speaker, but out of thin air—we get things like the immigration law that the United States Congress has established. It has defined categories of people, it has established numerous visas, it allows for the most generous legal immigration of any country in the world—and some say more legal immigrants coming into the United States every year than are allowed in all other countries in the world put together. I haven't seen that data to my satisfaction. That gets repeated here in this Congress so fairly often.

I am very confident that the United States is the most generous nation on Earth when it comes to legal immigration. A number between 1 million and 1.2 million legal immigrants come into the United States. That number of people happens to be something that would establish workers for every job that's been created for more than a decade here in the United States.

I have tracked the U.S. Department of Labor's Web site and I evaluated that, and I'll see that anywhere between 1 million and 1.2 million jobs have been created by this economy, and they're all taken up, at least in theory, by new legal immigrants.

Then we have 12 million to 20 million illegal immigrants, seven out of 12 of whom are out working, and the other five out of that 12 are presumably not working, or in the home perhaps. Those jobs are maybe not recorded by the Department of Labor because they aren't legitimate jobs from their statistical standpoint.

But imagine this, imagine an economy that generates over 1 million jobs a year, and imagine a country that would open its doors to over 1 million immigrants a year. Watch the economy create these jobs and watch those jobs being used by legal immigrants, and then turn a blind eye towards the illegal immigrants that are coming into the United States.

The people on the other side of the aisle see illegal immigrants as undocumented Democrats. It is a political equation for them. It's not an equation of what's good for America's economy, what's good for America's culture, what's good for America's society. It's what gives them political power. So they cynically turn a blind eye and encourage that laws not be enforced, erode the rule of law; and in the process of expanding their political base they're eroding the core of America and creating a greater and greater disrespect for the rule of law. That's chiseling away at one of those beautiful pillars of American exceptionalism; and the President leads the charge, Madam Speaker.

This lawless memorandum that was issued by Secretary Napolitano at the direction of President Obama has no basis in constitutional authority. The President of the United States does not have the authority to create law. He has no authority to pull it out of thin air. He cannot simply announce that he is going to require us to follow some directive, some executive edict and expect us to follow it. It is an unconstitutional overreach and a violation of the separation of powers.

Now, I have some experience with this. The President's move on this amnesty memorandum is a clear violation of the executive powers of the President of the United States. It is one of the enumerated powers that is given to the United States Congress in article I, section 8. If the President can manufacture immigration law, here's what he has done—I'll put this poster up.

Madam Speaker, this is the result of the President's action and, that is, first he created the categories that I mentioned—three or four categories of people that are classes of people. He has prosecutorial discretion to decide where they're going to emphasize the utilization of their enforcement resources. He can determine that they are going to put more people on violent criminals, more people on serious drug smugglers. I'm not sure they are, but he can determine that they are. I

haven't raised an issue with his constitutional authority to do that. I did bring an amendment a couple of weeks ago that blocked the Morton memos, which did say we're not going to enforce laws against individuals who have found themselves in the United States and haven't violated other laws.

And the President has argued before the Supreme Court that there is this careful balance, a careful balance theory that Congress has directed the executive branch to create and maintain a careful balance of various immigration laws so that the executive branch interest in the State Department and the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Commerce, those Departments find that balance so we don't over-enforce and offend our neighbors.

Congress did not direct the President or the executive branch to create or maintain any careful balance. That careful balance is a completely manufactured theory. Congress passes laws of all kinds under the authority granted to it in article I, section 8. And those directives to the executive branch are: keep your oath of office, Mr. President.

□ 1650

Executive branch, Eric Holder, keep your oath of office. And that oath for the President of the United States says, I do solemnly swear, to the best of my ability, to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me God. Those were the words of Barack Obama January 20, 2009, right out here on the west portico of the Capitol. Preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States so help me God.

And intrinsic with that oath of office, a little bit later, in article II, the Constitution says of the President, he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That means, enforce the laws. The President must enforce the laws. He must appoint people whose job it is to enforce the laws. He must direct that they do so. They take an oath to uphold the Constitution.

Eric Holder has an obligation to enforce the law. Janet Napolitano has an obligation to enforce the law, and their oath is tied to the Constitution in the same way. They understand that when they put their hand on the Bible and raise their right hand and say, I do solemnly swear, that includes, take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That's the obligation of the executive branch of the government.

The obligation of the legislative branch of government is to pass laws that be necessary and proper. In fact, Madam Speaker, among article I, section 8 of the enumerated powers is a Necessary and Proper Clause, which says to Congress, the legislative branch to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers. That's the full list of enumerated powers that come before it in article I, section 8, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States or in any department or officers thereof.

The Necessary and Proper Clause includes exclusive authority to pass laws as vested in the legislative branch in government. If it's exclusive, that means the President of the United States and nobody outside this legislature can pass a law.

The President believes he can do that. He believes he can create legislation out of thin air, and he did so by the effect of his memorandum that was released by Janet Napolitano last Friday and supported in a Rose Garden speech by the President of the United States about 2:40 p.m. last Friday.

And here's what we have. As a result of that is amnesty for whole classes of people. Between 800,000 and 1.4 million people granted a legal status in this country that, as of the morning, last Friday morning, when they woke up, they were subject to being put back in the condition they were in before they broke the law, that is, back to their home country where they rightfully belong and legally could reside.

The President changed that with an unconstitutional overreach that's a violation of this separation of powers, and I'm going to ask the court to resolve this disagreement. It will take some time. It will take some money. It will take some effort and some litigation brains. They are, I believe, ready to go on this, Madam Speaker.

But here's what the result is of the President's memo, and it's this: Created those classes of people, granted them executive amnesty by memo printed by Janet Napolitano, Director of Homeland Security, and directed the Director of USCIS, United States Citizenship Immigration Services, to create a permit that would allow those formerly illegal individuals to work in the United States for the duration of this permit that he would grant.

Now, I've just looked at a couple of these things. These are created by laws, acts of Congress. This is an employment authorization card. It's just a model or a sample of one. It doesn't actually identify a real individual. And this is the size of a credit card, and it says U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship Immigration Services, USCIS.

This is what the President has directed that USCIS create to hand to these one or so million people that get their new amnesty by executive fiat. Here is your employment authorization card. This is what will be produced, not by the direction of the United States Congress, not under the authority of article I of the Constitution that established this legislature, but under the arrogant, assumed power of the President of the United States to issue a memo that he thinks he has the authority to issue.

And by the way, power in this world has historically been what you're able to assert and retain. If anyone steps up and assumes power to do something and there's no one there to challenge them and they can get away with it, they have that power and they will hold that power, and it will be a precedent for that power until someone can challenge it and take it away from them, Madam Speaker.

And so the President has assumed this unconstitutional power to create entire classes of people, grouped in the hundreds of thousands, grant to them an employment authorization card, and grant to them a resident card.

Now, the resident card that the President has ordered USCIS to produce in an unlawful, unconstitutional fashion will likely look something like this. This is a copy of what we know as a green card. It's a lawful permanent resident card. LPR status is what we call it. It says right here, permanent resident card. And again, this is just a token individual, a model for the card.

But, Madam Speaker, they'll probably just strike out permanent resident and they might say temporary resident. It might have some kind of indication that later on he's going to make them a permanent resident.

If the President can manufacture authority to do this when it doesn't exist, if he can grant amnesty to people that fit the age categories that he says, that haven't committed violent or serious felonies, or too many strings of misdemeanors, if he can do that, then why can't he also grant amnesty to those that are over 16 when they came here, those that are over 30 today, those that have been in the United States for less than 5 years, those that may have committed felonies and he just wants to give them a pass?

We already have amnesty in this country for the President of the United States' aunt, who had been adjudicated for deportation, Auntie Onyango, and we already have the amnesty from the administration for his drunken uncle, Omar, who nearly ran over a police officer and had a 1.4 blood alcohol content. And then after he was brought to court, his punishment was to suspend his driver's license, and then the State of Massachusetts issued him a 45-day driver's license.

These laws don't apply to the relatives of the President of the United States. Apparently they don't apply to the President's preferred manufactured classes of people.

And by the way, the Constitution, according to his view, doesn't apply either to the President of the United States. This is what he has created out of whole cloth. These cards that you see here, this is a result of a deliberative act of the United States Congress.

The U.S. House of Representatives, the United States Senate have concurred that we want to give people who are in this country legally an employment authorization card when they qualify. We want to give them a permanent resident card, a lawful permanent status card, when they qualify.

And this green card, by the way, is a path to citizenship. Carrying this green card around for 5 years, being President of the United States, obeying our laws, that opens the door to United States citizenship, and after that 5-year period of time the green card can be converted, and often is, into United States citizenship.

What prevents the President from just granting citizenship to all of the people that he thinks might vote for him?

If the President has the authority to manufacture, out of thin air, this permit and this permit, Madam Speaker, under the same assumed arrogant authority, the President would be able to grant amnesty to 12 or 20 million people, instantly make them citizens, and march them off to the polls.

He's engaged in blocking the State of Florida and five other States from cleaning up their voting rolls; has sent his Attorney General, Eric Holder, to block Florida from cleaning illegals off of the voting rolls in Florida, and that's not the only State.

There's a database called the SAVE database that's in the control of Janet Napolitano, and Department of Homeland Security.

The Secretary of State of the State of Iowa, Matt Schultz, who is doing an excellent job of making sure that those of us who have a legitimate vote in the State don't see our vote diluted or offset by the vote of someone who is unlawfully in the United States, or not a citizen, or perhaps a felon, or deceased. We need voter registration lists that are free of duplicates, deceased and felons, and that certifies that they are citizens, and require a picture ID, and the Holder Justice Department, working with the assent, if not the encouragement of the Obama White House, is blocking the legitimate cleanup of the voter registration rolls in State after State after State.

□ 1700

This is the most unconstitutional reach by the executive in the history of the United States, and here are some things that the President could do if we let him assert his authority. I'll go all the way down through and just pick the most important ones.

In article I, section 8, the enumerated powers of our Constitution, the first power grants Congress, exclusively Congress, the authority to lay and collect taxes.

What if the President decided by executive fiat that he didn't want to collect taxes against people in the lowest bracket? Because, after all, that would be an income redistribution thing that he is likely to favor. Do you think those folks would feel good about the President of the United States and maybe go to the polls and vote for him?

Would that change the political dynamic in the country if they didn't have a tax liability? Probably. If that's his calculus, what prevents him from doing this? If he thinks he has the power to lay and collect taxes, he can always absolve people of those taxes as well.

What if Mitt Romney is elected President of the United States and he decides that, in order to stimulate the economy, he would just waive the taxes on U.S. capital that's stranded overseas in the trillions of dollars? What if he waived the capital gains taxes and let those resources come back into the United States tax free to be reinvested in the economy?

Does the President have the authority to waive taxes or does the President have the authority to lay and collect them? No, Madam Speaker, he does not.

The President of the United States has the obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. The authority to legislate is exclusively within the United States Congress—House and Senate—with the consent then of the signature of the President or of its overriding with his veto.

The President could, under the same rationale as he has here, lay and collect taxes or waive taxes on certain classes of people. What if he decided, I feel a little sorry for those people who I wrote into this memorandum, so I don't want them to pay taxes either. Would then America be outraged? I'd say we need to understand this Constitution better, and we will be more outraged.

What about borrowing money—that's another enumerated power—to borrow money on the credit of the United States? What if the President of the United States decided under the same authority he has assigned himself here that he is not going to pay any attention to Congress on whether we agree to lifting the debt ceiling and that he's just going to go by Executive order or by Presidential fiat and direct the Department of the Treasury to go ahead and borrow money beyond the debt ceiling this Congress has set? What would we say then, Madam Speaker?

How about this: to regulate commerce. Well, wait. They're already doing that. They're alleging that under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution that they can go ahead and declare that only one lung full of American air constitutes engaging in interstate commerce and that they can compel you to buy a health insurance policy that's written or approved by the Federal Government.

That's the decision that we expect from the Supreme Court next week. I think it's going to be a constitutional one. Barack Obama asserts that the Commerce Clause is so broad that Congress can reach across all State lines and declare that breathing one lung full of American air is enough to engage in interstate commerce, and therefore they can regulate all activities that they can declare to be interstate commerce. That means all activities whatsoever.

By the way, I will say, if the Commerce Clause is so broadened by the consent of the Supreme Court next week, then the Commerce Clause, itself, swallows all of the enumerated powers. Everything can be regulated within the Commerce Clause.

But I'm really here to focus on the separation of powers between the legislative and the executive branches. So I take us to naturalization.

The enumerated powers grant that power of naturalization ''to establish an uniform rule of naturalization'' to the United States Congress exclusively, not to the President of the United States. The President has argued that the exclusive rule of naturalization includes all immigration laws, that the Congress should be able to determine that, and that there is no 10th Amendment that applies.

That's another case before the Supreme Court that I expect we will get a decision on next week. But this stretch of the rationale that the President has sent does great offense to the Constitution of the United States.

Regardless, this Congress has the exclusive constitutional authority ''to establish an uniform rule of naturalization.'' The President can't write that. The States can't write that, but the States do have the authority to write immigration laws that mirror those of the United States Government's. The President can't write them as he intends to do. This is what he has created. Unconstitutionally, he has created these permits and these classes of people.

The President has also declared that the Senate wasn't in session when they were in session, and he committed his recess appointments. I am disappointed, frankly, Madam Speaker, that the United States Senate didn't step up and defend its authority to determine when they were in session, and to not adjourn and to be in a pro forma session. They did so so that the President could not insert recess appointments, and the President did so anyway.

If the President of the United States can declare that the United States Senate is not in session, then he can effectively abolish the United States Senate except for its being just simply a symbolic body. Now, there are countries around the world like that—in this hemisphere, I might add. I remember seeing the President of the United States in a glad double-handed handshake with one of those people a few years ago.

Then I mentioned S.B. 1070, this great overreach when the President had sent his Attorney General to sue Arizona. He was classically asked the question, Attorney General Holder, did you read the Arizona immigration bill? His answer was, No.

Congressman TED POE said, Here, you can read mine. It's only 10½-pages long. It's not that hard to study.

I'd read it. TED POE had read it. So had, I think, every member of the Judiciary Committee on our side. But the Attorney General had determined he

was going to sue Arizona because he was ordered to by the President of the United States. The announcement came in Ecuador from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. That's how we found out. They created a whole new legal argument called the ''careful balance theory'' in that Congress had directed the executive branch to create and maintain a careful balance between the various immigration laws.

We did no such thing.

There is no record of this. There is no statute of this. There is no dialogue in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that would direct such a thing. They asserted it because that was the only argument they could manufacture that suited their political position.

This is not an administration of law. This is not an administration bound by it. They are not bound by the Constitution. The President, himself, has stood before this Nation multiple times and has given the lecture about the separation of powers: Congress passes the laws. The executive branch carries them out. Then the Supreme Court, the judicial branch, interprets the laws. That's the President's lecture, and he cast it all aside and asserted an executive edict that he could create these things out of thin air.

If the President can do so, then, as we go on down the line, he can regulate commerce. He can do the naturalization. The President has already stuck his nose into bankruptcies, and the secured creditors for Chrysler saw themselves aced out while the White House was the only appraiser of Chrysler motors. They wrote the terms of the chapter 11 for Chrysler, and they were the only entity that was bidding on Chrysler's assets. They set the price going in. They wrote the terms of the bankruptcy, and they offered the price on the other side of it. And what did they do? They scooped the secured creditors' assets away and handed them over to the unions.

Congress sets the terms of bankruptcy, not the White House. Again, he has crossed the line.

We go on down the line.

What if the President decided that he could establish the currency of the United States? That's exclusively the Congress as well. What if he determined the euro were going to be the currency of the United States of America? What could we do? What would our alternative be? We'd take the gentleman to the courts, and ask the courts to determine the difference. In the end, the people will decide this.

With regard to intellectual property, he could waive copyrights, trademarks, and those types of laws, or he could create tribunals or wipe them out if he is going to assert an authority to rewrite article I, section 8.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate your attention. We must keep our oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the separation of powers. I intend to do so. I ask for everyone's help in this whole country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1710

MANAGING OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on a matter of the West.

There are major fires burning across the western United States. There's tremendous property damage and tremendous damage to the environment. Habitat for endangered species is being burned up in the hundreds of thousands of acres. The species themselves are being destroyed and killed in these massive wildfires. And the Chief of the United States Forest Service says, We need to introduce fire back into our forests.

Just this week as the Chief visited in my Rayburn office with me, I said, Chief, this is what it looks like when you reintroduced fire into the forests in the West right now.

The forests are chock-full of fuel. Decades of mismanagement by our Forest Service has allowed the fuels to build up to where it's a dangerous, explosive environment. The drought which actually occurs regularly in the West has caused those buildup of fuels to be explosive in nature, and when fire gets loose, this is what it looks like.

This is the town of Ruidoso, New Mexico, in my district, and these are the flames that burn that makes it look like Hades has taken over all of New Mexico.

Is this what you intended, Mr. Tidwell? Is this what you describe as allowing fire to run its course and accomplish management objectives in your forests? You're the one responsible, sir.

Thank God for the firefighters who will come out and fight to save the community. Thank God for the men and women who will stand in harm's way to stop this. But this should not be occurring.

This is the Lincoln National Forest, and right next door, the Mescalero Apaches have about the same acreage of forests. With 14 people, they're able to clean their forests out. They're able to harvest the timber. When the fire gets to the Indian reservation, it simply drops down on the ground and becomes a grass fire, the way that fires typically ran in New Mexico and throughout the West.

History shows us that in our forests, we generally had somewhere between 50 and 100 trees per acre in the arid West on our forest lands. They are grassy savanna lands mostly with widely scattered trees. It never became more than a grass fire, but our tree rings show us that about every 8 years, a very hot fire would come through, burning all of the grass and the underbrush, the ladder fuels, burning the small diameter trees while they are still small. But decades of putting out fires and decades of not harvesting any timber at all have allowed our forests to become explosive caldrons which are breaking into fire.

The shame is that this fire in New Mexico started as one-quarter acre, and for about a day it stayed about a quarter of an acre. And then it spread to 4 acres for the next 3 days. Still, no call for tankers, no call for those aerial drops of water or the slurry which puts out the fire. None. Not until the fourth day, late in the fourth day.

The Forest Service says they can't ask questions like this about those decisions. I think that the decisions locally are made by people who are trying to follow the policy of reintroducing fire into the forests.

Regional Forester Corbin Newman recently stated: Fire will have to take its natural course. And we're just trying to put fire back into its natural processes, he said.

This rings the same tone as was stated by Mr. Tidwell in my office this week, that we want fire to get back into the forest. Well, fire in the forest had a natural process when the forest was in balance. The forest is desperately out of balance right now.

This is not the first brush with disaster that we've had. And keep in mind that the Forest Service personnel themselves said they're worried about losing the entire town of Ruidoso, that it was at high risk, not just at risk but at high risk was their statement as we were briefed about the fire. But we had warning signs last year.

This is what it looked like last year in Ruidoso. High winds and a small fire began to throw embers throughout the town, and you can see the little spots of fires over and through the mountains that are in and around Ruidoso. We began to sound the alarm at that point to our Forest Service: Please clean the fuels out. We can't stand for this to run wild. This year, it has run wild and destroyed 242 homes in this area, and more outbuildings, more structures, beyond just the loss of homes.

This is not necessary. All that is required is for us to manage the forests properly. It's a call that is going out from the people who live in the forests throughout the West. They're watching their wilderness areas, they're watching the forest lands burn to charred masses, and the Forest Service personnel themselves, the specialists, are telling me that trees will not grow here for another 100 to 150 years.

How is it managing our forests to burn the trees for 150 years? How is that good for the environment? How is that good for the species? And how is it good for the people who live in this area?

Shame on you, Forest Service. Shame on you for dictating policies to

local managers who know better. Shame on you, Mr. Newman and Mr. Tidwell, for saying that we're going to reintroduce fire into our forests and let it run its natural course.

The forest in and around Lincoln County, some has been cleared and harvested. We're not saying to clear-cut our forests. What we're saying is that a balanced thinning program will go through and leave widely spaced trees.

This is similar to how it looks on the Mescalero Reservation and also it's similar to how it looks out at Fort Apache in Arizona.

Last year, the Wallow fire burned 500,000 acres in the Wallow area, the Wallow fire, in Arizona and New Mexico, but when it got to Fort Apache, it simply fell down on the ground and stopped right there because they had thinned their forest.

This is what a forest should look like in the West. There's not enough rain and not enough nutrients to support 2,500 trees per acre. This is the way forests looked in the West when fire had its way, when fire ran its course. Instead, our forests today are densely packed, 2,500 trees per acre, and this is the outcome when you see that. That's what the U.S. Forest Service looks like in most places, a deep contrast to what it should look like. And it is into this forest that the head of the Forest Service, the Chief of the Forest Service, is saying that we're trying to reintroduce fire into the wilderness and into our forests. It's a misguided approach. That idea that we're going to reintroduce fire is playing Russian roulette with our national forests and our wilderness. It's a game that is not working out too well.

We have two major fires in southern New Mexico right now. We have the Little Bear fire in Ruidoso, but over in the Gila we've got 300,000 acres of land that has burned there, a strong mix or combination between the Gila wilderness and the Gila National Forest. Again, it started as a small fire. It started as a small fire, and the Forest Service releases say that they are monitoring it, that it's achieving its management objectives. I'm sorry, but management objectives of using fire in drought-stricken areas of the West, in forests that are chock-full of fuels, is misguided at the very least.

The people who live and have lost much have suffered deeply. The Forest Service needs to be responsible for those losses. But additionally, they should be responsible for the loss in tax base to the local communities. They should be responsible to local homeowners whose value of their homes is going to be depreciated for decades. Those people who have moved close to the national forests want to be there with that natural beauty. Instead, they're going to be faced with a brush pile that doesn't grow trees for the next 100 to 150 years, according to their specialists.

□ 1720

So what are we to do? Are we to stand by and allow our forests to burn because of policies that originate in Washington? Are we to put at risk the lives of local people? Are we to put at risk the property values of local people? Or are we to call on common sense, just a pragmatic understanding that you cannot use fire to achieve the balance when the forests are full of fuel?

We have deep disagreements with our Forest Service on their policies. We have deep love for the people who manage the forest out in the field and for the firefighters who risk their lives. We're thankful every day that they're there 24 hours a day around the clock, 7 days a week, away from their families to protect us. But they should not have to protect us in this fashion.

It's expensive. It's expensive in the loss of our forests. It's expensive in the dollar cost of the fire. This fire in Lincoln County was running about $2 million a day to try to put it out. The one on the other side of the State in the Gila was running about $1 million a day.

But that is not the only problem that we face. Now that the trees are gone, when it rains, the rainwater is going to rush off the hills into the valleys; and it's going to rush down the valleys, and we're going to see flooding.

If you go to the Web page that we have for our congressional office, you will be able to see a dramatic video called the Dixon Apple Orchard flood. That's up now to just above the Santa Clara pueblo in northern New Mexico. People from that pueblo were waiting for the water that they knew would come, and they videoed several different spots. So take a moment and look at that, if you would, to see now the next calamity that is going to face New Mexico. Because when you burn the trees, there's nothing now to stop the water from rushing off the hill. It is going to carry topsoil with it. It's going to carry rocks and boulders, and it's going to flood towns completely off the face of the Earth.

One of the people fighting the fire out west in the Gila said that that area would have some of the most dramatic flood potential that he had ever fought fires in; that is, the canyons are so steep and so deep, and they come together, nine canyons come together, at Glenwood. All of that water is going to be pouring through the small town.

Mogollon, New Mexico, sits at right at the mouth of one of those canyons. It has high, high, steep canyon walls on both sides of it. It's at the bottom of the V. And those communities that have existed for decades—Santa Clara, which has existed for hundreds of years, is going to face flooding, not because of anything they've done, but because of the way that the Forest Service has managed its lands, the way that the Forest Service has managed those resources that we asked for them to take care of so that we all might enjoy the benefits and the beauty of our Nation's landscape. Yet we're not going to be able to see that, and we are going to be exposed to floods for decades to come.

What kind of sense does that make from Washington? People across America are beginning to say that our government is broken. They're saying it's broken because of policies that result in fires, like the one that we just showed the picture of. People are saying that this is not responsible, that a government who would say that we're going to reintroduce fire into the forest with this kind of result, what kind of responsibility is that? That's the question that we're here tonight to ask.

It's not reasonable to expect people to just stand back and say nothing. So we are accepting an invitation to speak at a public rally where people are going to express their concerns, their fears, and express their losses in this fire, a fire that we've had decades to prepare for.

Several years ago, we had a fire on the backside of Capitan Mountain, just in this same area. And the local forest supervisor said, Well, it was a small fire, 15 acres, and it didn't justify bringing in air tankers and more resources. It blew out of control and became a 58,000-acre fire.

It's that mindset that we're not going to address the fire situation totally that is putting the West at risk right now. In Colorado, in that fire, we actually lost the life of a citizen who couldn't get out of her cabin.

When are we going to start managing properly? That is the question that lies before us all—us as a Nation, us as a Congress, and the U.S. Forest Service and the head of the Agriculture Department, who manages them.

It's a tragedy, what's going on in the most pristine parts of our country, wilderness areas where fields have been allowed to burn and where we're going to see the absolute destruction. It's not a matter of if our forests will burn; it's simply a question of when they're going to burn.

Now, we can manage differently and we can manage better, but we absolutely have to make the commitment that we're going to give up the policies that are failing and move into a new thought process.

In visiting with the head of the U.S. Forest Service this week, I asked about a policy that used to exist to put out fires. It was called the 10 a.m. policy. That is, if we see a fire running at any time today, we're going to put it out by 10 a.m. tomorrow; and if we don't get it out by 10 a.m. tomorrow, we're going to put it out by 10 a.m. the next day.

The head of the Forest Service, Mr. Tidwell, said, yes, it was very successful; in fact, he said it was too successful. Too successful? How can you be too successful in putting out these fires? Too successful? That was his statement. Yes, it worked too well. Well, Mr. Tidwell, I want it to work too well because I don't want the forest to look like this. I don't want our communities to be greatly at risk.

This is your standard operating practice. This is the outcome. I want you to

go back to the 10 a.m. policy that says, Put it out by tomorrow at 10 a.m. Then let's go in and let's start clearing our forest and cutting the fuels out. Let's start actually managing those forests, and then we'll stop burning them up. Then they'll be healthy forests, widely spaced trees. They will have enough nutrients. The bark beetles won't be able to get into them because they will be big, healthy trees.

Right now, the bark beetles are killing millions of trees across the West because they're starved for nutrients. They're like children that don't have enough nutrition. They're weak. They're spindly. They're susceptible to not only fire, but disease and insects. And all of our specialists tell us, but we don't make a change.

We've got many mountain communities in New Mexico. All of them face this same risk. We're not going to stand idly by while our chief U.S. forester says it's time to reintroduce fire back into our forests. I'm sorry. I disagree with the concept that our wildernesses will become charred stumps, that our national forests will not grow trees for 100 to 150 years because the heat of these fires calcify the soil sometimes as deep as 3 feet. It turns it almost into a glass, where the trees can't get root. Only the grass and small shrubs that are able to get some rain at the top of the surface will penetrate this.

We've got an area like that close to Cloudcroft, New Mexico. There was a very hot fire in the early fifties. It still is only shrubs. We haven't grown that forest back. So I believe when the specialists tell me it's going to be 100 to 150 years, I have seen at least 50 in that one forest myself. So I know that they're saying partial truths, and I think it to be complete truths.

Why are we accepting this management process on our Nation's forests? It doesn't make sense. It is extremely costly to people. It's extremely costly to the government. We can and should use the resources of this country better and more fairly. We should allow our species to have forests to live in, not to burn them out and not to burn the species up.

The spotted owl lives in this area, and you can see what's happening to his habitat. You can see what's happened to the spotted owls who were actually here. They don't exist anymore. The Fish and Wildlife Service in the past has said that this fire runs less risk to the spotted owl than logging. How can you say that this is less dangerous than doing this?

□ 1730

The logic is completely missing. Actually, the spotted owl thrives in these circumstances. The Mescalero tell us that they have numerous pairs that are coming back into the reservation because they have widely spaced trees. The spotted owl actually roosts in the tree, uses its altitude to glide off, catch its prey, and come back up. It cannot do that in this forest, and it can do it in this forest.

So every argument that we are being faced with right now does not make logical sense as we talk about the policy here in Washington, D.C. It's a discussion that has now started in earnest in the West. The Eastern States, number one, don't have a problem with the drought. And number two, they don't have as much public land as we have in the West. It is the West that is burning up. It is us in the West.

I'm the chairman of the Western Caucus, and we are taking the lead in voicing our complaint, our frustration, and our fears for the population because of the management of the forest in the West. Again, our highest compliments to the foresters who live and work in the West. It is not them. It is the policies coming from Washington, D.C. It's the culture, it's the thought process that somehow tries to justify the actions which are causing these monstrous, massive fires.

We need to stop it today. We need to stop it now. We need to manage properly for the future so that all might enjoy these precious resources.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. CLARKE of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of pressing business.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2012, at 2 p.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Ron Barber, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco ''Quico'' Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. ''Gerry'' Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords*, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. González, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman*, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A.S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller*, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie K. Hirono, Kathleen C. Hochul, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lúcas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott,

James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Robert L. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner*, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu*, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6555. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acibenzolar-S-methyl; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0674; FRL-9349-3] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6556. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R10-OAR-2012-0112; FRL-9674-2] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6557. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Fees for Permits and Administrative Actions [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-0154; FRL-9672-7] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6558. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Small Container Exemption from VOC Coating Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0073; FRL-9677-3] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6559. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Agency, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts and New Hampshire; Determination of Attainment of the One-hour and 1997 Eight-hour Ozone Standards for Eastern Massachusetts [EPA-R01-OAR-2011-0879; EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0076; FRL-9675-9] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6560. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the South Coast Air Quality Management District Portion of the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Rule 1315 [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0140; FRL-9669-8] received May 22, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6561. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2012 Memorial Day Tribute Fireworks, Lake Charlevoix, Boyne City, Michigan [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0337] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6562. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Standard Numbering System, Vessel Identification System, and Boating Accident Report Database [Docket No.: USCG-2003-14963] (RIN: 1625-AB45) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6563. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone for Margate Bridge, Intracoastal Waterway; Margate, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0069] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6564. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation: Intracoastal Waterway, Chesapeake, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0330] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6565. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; James River, Hopewell, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0292] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6566. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Manchester Harbor, Manchester, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0344] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6567. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Niantic River, Niantic, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0305] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6568. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors, Baltimore, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0101] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6569. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; St. Croix River, Stillwater, MN [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0226] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6570. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Wells, ME [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0231] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6571. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lake Washington Ship Canal, Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0362] received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6572. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Spa Creek and Annapolis Harbor, Annapolis, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1120] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6573. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Coast Guard Exercise, hood Canal, Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0283] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6574. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area, Zidell Waterfront Property, Willamette River, OR [Docket No.: USCGF-2011-0254] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received May 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 697. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5973) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–545). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. REED, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5986. A bill to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 5987. A bill to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 5988. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement for a park headquarters at San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, to expand the boundary of the Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5989. A bill to increase access to community behavioral health services for all Americans and to improve Medicaid reimbursement for community behavioral health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. YODER, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. SCHILLING):

H.R. 5990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain farm rental income from net earnings from self-employment if the taxpayer enters into a lease agreement relating to such income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECK (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 5991. A bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Agriculture, 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. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5992. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to place certain lands in Skagit and San Juan Counties, Washington, into trust for the Samish Indian Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

H.R. 5993. A bill to prohibit the use of funds available to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Syria by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 5994. A bill to provide a demonstration project under which Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries are provided the choice of health benefits coverage and access to a debit style card for the purpose of purchasing qualified health benefits coverage and paying for other health care expenses; 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. DICKS:

H.R. 5995. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 5996. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, to carry out a 5-year demonstration program to fund mental health first aid training programs at 10 institutions of higher education to improve student mental health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. TURNER of New York, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 5997. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to codify authority under existing grant guidance authorizing use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5998. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force; 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. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5999. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide specially adapted housing assistance to blind veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 6000. A bill to require verification of the immigration status of recipients of Federal benefit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6001. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from granting a work authorization to an alien found to have been unlawfully present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6002. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 with respect to maintenance providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan):

H.R. 6003. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to prevent terrorism, including terrorism associated with homegrown violent extremism and domestic violent extremism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 6004. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to give preference to local contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 6005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for qualified long-term care insurance premiums, use of such insurance under cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements, and a credit for individuals with long-term care needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 6006. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States the option to provide Medicaid coverage for low-income individuals infected with HIV; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HALL (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 6007. A bill to exempt from the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 certain water transfers by the North Texas Municipal Water District and the Greater Texoma Utility Authority; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HOCHUL:

H.R. 6008. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that a State participating in certain grant programs takes into

consideration the training received by a veteran while on active duty when granting certain State certifications or licenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 6009. A bill to establish a program that will generate dependable economic activity for counties and local governments containing National Forest System land through a management-focused approach, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the income limitations for the student loan interest deduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6011. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve Medicare benefits for individuals with kidney disease, and for other purposes; 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. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LONG, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 6012. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide to owners of certain intellectual property rights information on, and unredacted samples and images of, semiconductor chip products suspected of being imported in violation of the rights of the owner of a registered mark or the owner of a mask work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the time period for contributing military death gratuities to Roth IRAs and Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 6014. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants for States to implement minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 6015. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the enforcement of employment and reemployment rights of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. KELLY:

H.R. 6016. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for administrative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 698. A resolution recognizing the significance of the 30th anniversary of Vincent Chin's death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 699. A resolution congratulating the University of Washington Huskies Men's Crew Team on winning the 110th Intercollegiate Rowing Association Championships (IRAs); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 700. A resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the enactment of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in Federally funded education programs or activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. CAMP:

H.R. 5986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 5987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 5988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8: Powers of Congress 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 Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 5989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 5990.

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. HECK:

H.R. 5991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 5993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation refers to the authorities of the US Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution and as such is Constitutional.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 5994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 5995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 5996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 5997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defense of the United States, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides Congress the power to make ''all Laws which shall be necessary and proper'' for carrying out the constitutional powers vested in the Government of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 6000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 & 4 of the U.S. Constitution dealing with the ability to regulate interstate commerce and exclude illegal aliens.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States:

[The Congress shall have Power] To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section VIII:

''The Congress shall have power to . . . regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes''.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:
H.R. 6003.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill, the Empowering Local Partners To Prevent Terrorism Act of 2012, is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 6004.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.
By Mr. COURTNEY:
H.R. 6005.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 6006.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:
Article I, Section 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. HALL:
H.R. 6007.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.
By Ms. HOCHUL:
H.R. 6008.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 14:
To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.
By Mr. LABRADOR:
H.R. 6009.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2
By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:
H.R. 6010.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, its subsequent amendments, and as further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:
H.R. 6011.
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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. MCCAUL:
H.R. 6012.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8:
''To regulate Commerce with foreign nations,'' ''to promote the Progress of Science and useful arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.''
By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:
H.R. 6013.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. SCHIFF:
H.R. 6014.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper Clause supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.
By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 6015.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. KELLY:
H.R. 6016.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 139: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 191: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 324: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 371: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 409: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 420: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 451: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 458: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 459: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HANNA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 687: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 718: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 750: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 860: Mr. CLAY and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 890: Mr. POSEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. ADAMS.
H.R. 891: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 942: Mr. PAUL, Mr. WOMACK, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1050: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1111: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1116: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1182: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1259: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1325: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1342: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1370: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DENT, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1416: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1464: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1475: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1489: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1612: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 1653: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1704: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1755: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1756: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1802: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1860: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1903: Mr. SABLAN and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1956: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2010: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2032: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2040: Mr. WEST and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2069: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2139: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 2140: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2206: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2236: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 2242: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2325: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 2335: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2479: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2492: Mr. YODER and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2494: Mr. TURNER of New York.
H.R. 2497: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 2637: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 2730: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2741: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2746: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2794: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2969: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2978: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 2989: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3015: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3040: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3044: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3086: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 3102: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3179: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 3187: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3197: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 3269: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 3337: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3423: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 3461: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3496: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3510: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 3591: Mr. ANDREWS and Ms. HOCHUL.
H.R. 3627: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 3643: Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 3658: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 3661: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 3679: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 3729: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3767: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3798: Mr. STARK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3824: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3826: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3839: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4070: Mr. HIMES and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4085: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4104: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4115: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4156: Mr. WALDEN and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 4164: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4180: Mr. BONNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 4190: Mr. MORAN and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4215: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 4235: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. WEBSTER.
H.R. 4238: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4259: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 4269: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 4277: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4309: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4322: Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 4350: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4367: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4372: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4385: Mr. MICA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 4402: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 5186: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 5284: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 5542: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 5545: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 5647: Mr. TONKO and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 5746: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 5749: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5781: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5796: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 5822: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 5840: Mr. RIVERA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5864: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 5865: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 5871: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 5893: Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
H.R. 5895: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 5905: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. CHU, Mr. BACA, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5910: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 5912: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 5924: Ms. BUERKLE.
H.R. 5925: Mr. JONES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 5943: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 5948: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5953: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 5955: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 5976: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 5983: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 5984: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 5985: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.J. Res. 86: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.J. Res. 111: Mr. MORAN and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. FORBES.
H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 134: Mr. PITTS.
H. Res. 609: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H. Res. 618: Mr. MORAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. AUSTRIA.
H. Res. 663: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MICA, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Res. 676: Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 687: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 689: Ms. Hochul, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTA, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5973

OFFERED BY: MR. CRAVAACK

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the amendments made by section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130).