

to an agreement so we can put Americans back to work and so we can keep our railroads operating smoothly.

□ 1015

AMERICANS SUPPORT IMMIGRATION LAWS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, after days of a national media pounding the new Arizona immigration law and highlighting demonstrations against it, guess what? The number of Americans who describe illegal immigration as a serious problem actually increased; and 78 percent feel that the Federal Government should do more to stop illegal immigration, according to a New York Times poll.

Another recent poll found that 84 percent of Americans are concerned that illegal immigrants burden schools, hospitals, and government services; 77 percent say that illegal immigration drives down wages; and 89 percent, 89 percent, feel it is important to halt the flow of illegal immigrants, a USA Today poll found just a couple of days ago.

So despite the media bias against immigration laws, the American people still overwhelmingly want to secure the border, save jobs for those in the country legally, and reduce the burden of illegal immigration.

DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, the Secretary of Defense has asked Congress not to repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell until the Pentagon has another year to review the policy.

With all due respect, we've been reviewing the policy since its implementation in 1993. To paraphrase the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, here are some reasons why we can't wait:

Another year of dismissals will add to the 13,500 who have already been fired under the law since 1994. Another year will reduce the ranks of mission-critical troops and linguists, harming our national security. Another year will mean we will continue to allow young patriots to lose their lives for us but not allow them to live the lives they choose.

Our troops agree, our allies agree, and leaders of our Nation agree we must repeal this policy now. Dr. King wrote: "The time is always right to do what is right."

Madam Speaker, that is why we can't wait.

THE COOKIE LADY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, while they are courageously serving our great Nation overseas, America's brave men and women in uniform are receiving sweet treats from South Carolina's Ms. Janet Cram, the Cookie Lady.

Ms. Cram, a Hilton Head Island resident, has organized Treat the Troops, a baking program to send delicious cookies to troops in harm's way.

She doesn't act alone in this endeavor. Her friends, also known as Crumbs, help her prepare the packages and batter. Baking over 2 million cookies for our troops, Jeanette and her Crumbs started this process in 1990 during the gulf war.

America is in a new era in which our soldiers are working around the world protecting American families at home by preventing additional acts of terrorism. It is uplifting to know that individuals like Jeanette and her Crumbs are doing their part to help our troops and sweeten their days.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

Congratulations on the success of the National Day of Prayer. Welcome, Franklin Graham, to Capitol Hill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5019, HOME STAR EN- ERGY RETROFIT ACT OF 2010

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1329 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1329

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5019) to provide for the establishment of the Home Star Retrofit Rebate Program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each

such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1329 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 5019, the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, and provides that the bill be considered as read.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill itself. The rule makes in order the eight amendments printed in the Rules Committee report and waives all points of order against those amendments except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule provides that the Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or a designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of the rule for the Home Energy Retrofit Act and the underlying bipartisan legislation.

I would like to applaud Chairman WAXMAN, Representative WELCH, Representative EHLERS, and my fellow colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their hard work on bringing this important bill to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, as our Nation moves toward a more energy-efficient economy, it is critical that we adopt policies that enable us to become the world leader in promoting smart energy use and manufacturing energy-efficient products.

As our Nation continues its economic recovery, we must continue to focus on job creation. By increasing energy efficiency, we will not only create jobs and incentivize the emerging clean technology industry but also reduce carbon pollution and cut costs for customers.

H.R. 5019 would increase residential efficiency and create almost 170,000 jobs nationwide, thereby reducing the current 25 percent unemployment rate in the construction sector. Specifically, it would authorize a Silver Star rebate program, which would allow homeowners to buy and install more affordable energy-efficient products. The bill would do this by providing rebates of up to \$1,500 for the installation of energy-efficient improvements, including upgraded installation, duct sealing replacements, and installation of storm windows and energy-saving doors.

This legislation would also authorize the Gold Star rebate program, which would provide rebates of up to \$3,000 to those who make their entire homes at least 20 percent more energy efficient. As a result, the bill will have a meaningful long-term impact on energy use in communities across our country.

Recent estimates indicate that more than 3 million families would participate in a program like this. Such a participation rate would save these families \$9.2 billion on their energy bills over the next 10 years, or the power equivalent of 6.8 million gallons of heating oil.

Madam Speaker, my hometown of Sacramento is poised to be a national leader in clean tech and energy efficiency. Sacramento has received over \$200 million in energy efficiency and clean technology grants through the Recovery Act.

H.R. 5019 would build on the roughly \$11.8 million in Recovery Act investments that have already been delivered to Sacramento to support energy audits and energy efficiency retrofits in residential and commercial buildings. These allocations include \$7.8 million in Weatherization Assistance Program funding, \$19.9 million for the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, \$16.6 million in municipal financing to Sacramento County.

Madam Speaker, it is clear that the Home Star bill is in keeping with our Nation's commitment to improve the quality of our air, reduce our carbon footprint, lower families' energy bills, and create green jobs. These are all goals that my district has embraced.

Like many areas of the country, Sacramento has demonstrated great leadership on energy efficiency and clean technology. I have been organizing an effort in the Sacramento region to ensure coordination and to advance the energy efficiency and clean-tech industry.

It is imperative that we make energy-efficient products a brand that more and more Americans will purchase. We are lagging behind China and Germany in producing and exporting clean energy products, and that is simply unacceptable.

That is why I recently introduced H.R. 5616, legislation to boost clean-technology exports from the United States. The Home Star Energy Retrofit Act would further expand the market for energy-efficient products.

Madam Speaker, I again applaud Chairman WAXMAN's efforts to bring this bill before the full House today. As our economic recovery continues, it is important that we continue to support the Home Star program and other job creation proposals. H.R. 5019 does not represent the end of our work, but reflects another critical step forward for the American people and for our environment.

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentlewoman from California for the extension of the time, my friend from the Rules Committee, whom I enjoy working with very much.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

Yesterday in the Rules Committee, the Democrat majority once again shut out good Republican ideas while rolling 15 Democratic amendments into the manager's amendment. These were 15 Democrat requests to add into the bill, and the Rules Committee saw fit to get that done for those Members of the Democratic Party. This is not the way to have an open, honest Congress, as our Speaker, Nancy PELOSI, promised in 2007.

Madam Speaker, what Republicans are going to talk about today is a number of issues, but perhaps key among them is the priority items that are on this floor today that is about more spending, more deficit spending, and against the ideas that this Speaker and the Democratic majority have talked about, about paying for bills.

□ 1030

I think what we are going to learn today, and as we move forward, is the Democratic Party is having problems making a decision about how they will pay for these bills because we have had so much massive spending, so many new programs, that this majority is incapable of setting any priorities. In other words, if you want something

else, the public was sold, that the Democrats would be open to taking it from somewhere else and constantly making prioritization. In fact, that's not true. What it's all about is just adding in more spending and more debt without regard for making tough decisions.

I disagree with that. I think it's a bad policy. I think if you say you are going to require bills to be paid for under PAYGO, you should do that. Once again today we see where that is not true with another bill on the floor that is about spending more money. One hundred percent deficit spending in this bill.

Today I am also going to discuss other issues. And it's really about the bill. This bill is too costly. It raises serious questions about the Department of Energy's ability to effectively implement this program. And it will allow the Federal Government to pick winners and losers in the private sector while all of these companies are trying to take care of making us more efficient, but then picking the winners and losers.

H.R. 5019 would authorize \$6.6 billion for what I am going to call a cash for caulkers program, \$6.6 billion of new deficit spending. This bill would provide tax rebates to participating contractors and vendors who would perform qualifying energy-saving measures that meet efficiency and insulation targets in Federal standards. That's a whole lot of words for a program that in essence is too expensive, unnecessary, and I believe a waste of taxpayer dollars, especially at a time when growing deficits are causing this country to have failing markets and confidence in this government.

Republicans strongly support legislation that promotes effective energy efficiency. But 150,000 jobs, as are being talked about, for \$6.6 billion on the back of the American taxpayer is not a good deal. It's not a fair trade. And to that point, the Democrats on the Rules Committee all voted against allowing my colleague Mr. LATTA, the gentleman from Ohio, from even offering his amendment on the House floor today, which would have suspended the provisions of this bill if it added to the Federal deficit. This majority doesn't even want to have a conversation about controlling spending. And that's why they will continue to shut out Republican Members as they come to the Rules Committee with wise, prudent, and conservative ideas.

This 2-year program will be administered through the Department of Energy, which has already proven to be a terrible manager of the \$4.7 billion from the economic stimulus weatherization program in which only 30,297 homes have been weatherized, about 5 percent of the stated overall goal of more than 600,000. These are all, I am sure, great ideas and lofty goals, but it's taxpayer spending, taxpayer money, and more deficit spending.

The Home Star Energy Retrofit Program will undoubtedly experience the

same administrative problems, implementation problems, and oversight problem for the Department of Energy. What a shame we just didn't give it directly to consumers rather than creating a program that then must be administered following Federal standards, Federal rules, and more and more and more participation from Washington, D.C. Allowing the Federal Government to get bigger and bloated and to control this process is not an efficient way to run this government or spend the American people's tax dollars.

Additionally, this legislation is not technology-neutral. It is not the role, I believe, of the Federal Government to pick winners and losers in the private sector, yet that's exactly what this bill does. This legislation lists 13 energy-saving measures that qualify for rebates of varying dollar amounts. That's right, we are going to tell people exactly how to do this and what qualifies.

There are many energy products that were left off the list or that will not qualify because of what are considered technical requirements. These are so numerous that we simply cannot effectively have a good program. It should be about effectiveness, saving energy, and allowing a consumer to be engaged in making these decisions so that we assure that the real cost and the delivery of that product was known and understood by the consumer, not just ordering something that came from the Federal Government, having somebody show up at your door, and then being reimbursed by the Federal Government, with the consumer being left out in the cold rather than a demand about what they were after and knowing what their needs are.

Over a year ago, Speaker PELOSI and the President promised that unemployment would not reach 8 percent or above. Since that time, 4 million Americans have lost their job. And that was a promise. We have now reached a 10.2 percent record unemployment rate, and continue to hover well over that promised 8 percent figure.

Madam Speaker, I believe the American people understand what this change has meant. It has meant a bigger Federal Government, record spending, and incredibly high deficits for as far as the eye can see and over the horizon. This is another example of the kind of political agenda that adds to that of the Speaker and the President that will, if all implemented, net lose over 10 million American jobs. Losing 10 million American jobs from a political agenda is a problem to the Republican Party.

We believe that the ability to make progress and work here in Congress for the best effort of the American people in the creation of jobs, not net loss of 10 million jobs, should be what this Congress should be focused on. You see, Madam Speaker, we think that America should be the employer nation. We believe that America has always led

the way, the leader in the world to making sure we are competitive, and to make sure that we have a smaller, more efficient Federal Government, with unlimited opportunity for freedom for citizens back home. This bill effectively takes the citizenry, the consumer, out of the equation and puts the Federal Government central not only in people's lives, but central in paying the bill.

We should work with the investor and the free enterprise system. That is what has made us the global leader for our grandparents, our parents, and this current generation. We only have unemployment and this horrible high debt because of the political considerations of the Democratic Party and their agenda. And the Republican Party is on record again today as saying enough is enough.

The national debt continues to grow rapidly towards \$13 trillion, yet our Democrat majority friends are spending billions of more dollars again today on an excessive program that sets burdensome technical requirements, picks private sector winners and losers, and hands the reins over to the Department of Energy to dole out the funds as it sees fit. Shuttling our responsibility, not allowing the amendments in the Rules Committee for commonsense legislation, rolling 15 Democrat amendments into the manager's amendment, and a \$6.6 billion cost that will come directly from deficit spending, which means we have to go borrow and once again go to the world or the Chinese or others to say "please help us" is a bad way to run this business.

Madam Speaker, it is obvious to me that the political agenda is more that the Democrats want than the commonsense attributes of saying, enough is enough, let's know what we're doing.

So I am going to urge a "no" vote. I am going to urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, before I yield to my next speaker I just want to say the bill before us today is a strict authorization bill. There is no direct spending contained in it. CBO has said it will not add to the deficit because any money which is spent under the Home Star Program will have to be appropriated through separate legislation. This is regular order in the purest sense of the term: authorize first, appropriate later.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative MATSUI for yielding the time and for her leadership.

I rise today in strong support of the underlying bill, H.R. 5019, the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act, and I want to congratulate and thank Representative PETER WELCH for his leadership in bringing us to this place.

This is a timely, smart, commonsense bill that will achieve multiple

goals. Home Star will help our workers, help our economy, and our environment. Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, this is a jobs bill. And jobs are the highest of high priorities. It's estimated that the Home Star Program will create 168,000 good-paying construction, manufacturing, and retail jobs. And these are jobs that cannot be shipped overseas.

Home Star will help kick-start the construction industry, which has been one of the hardest hit industries during this economic recession. Today more than one in four construction workers remain unemployed. And today those in this Chamber have the chance to vote to change that. Home Star will also stimulate domestic manufacturing and grow jobs, which will strengthen our economy and strengthen our Nation.

There are sustainable building solution companies in my district and across this country that are ready and waiting for the Home Star initiative, employers who are ready to ramp up production, ready to put people back to work. And the positive ripple effects will be felt throughout the retail and distribution sectors.

Home Star will also help millions of families lower energy bills. Improving energy efficiency is one of the easiest, most cost-effective ways for homeowners to reduce energy waste. And Home Star will improve our environment, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and enhance our national security. Energy efficiency improvements will create jobs and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Household energy accounts for more than one-fifth of U.S. carbon emissions. And as we proved with the bipartisan, let me stress bipartisan and successful Cash for Clunkers program, it doesn't have to be jobs or the environment. It can be jobs and the environment. Home Star enjoys broad national support from business leaders, environmental and energy efficiency groups, labor unions, manufacturers, retailers, and construction contractors.

For these reasons I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the underlying bill because this is a jobs bill, and we need to make jobs the highest priority.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, jobs are the issue, and so is debt. And taking debt of \$6.5 billion to add to this deficit that we have got to pay for should be a priority. Spending five or six generations' worth of money in a year-and-a-half is not a good way to pass on a better America.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Bowling Green, Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

□ 1045

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak against the rule for H.R. 5019. I offered an amendment in full committee markup which would have prevented enactment of H.R. 5019 if there

was an impact on deficit neutrality. I withdrew that amendment in committee due to an exchange I had with the chairman, Mr. WAXMAN, where he told me we would continue to work on this amendment so we could pay for this bill before we brought it to the House floor. I do thank the chairman for meeting with me.

There has been no pay-for secured, unfortunately, and therefore I offered a similar amendment in the Rules Committee. The amendment was not accepted in the Rules Committee, and therefore we are not able to have open debate on the issue today on the House floor. It is frustrating that the majority has shut down the opportunity to have a debate on the cost of the legislation and the addition it would be to the Federal deficit.

Very simply, my amendment stated that the provision of this act, including the amendments made by the act, shall be suspended and shall not apply if there is a negative net effect on the national budget deficit of the United States. While this is an authorizing bill, I am concerned that the majority could not give any assurance that this bill will indeed be paid for. I'm very concerned about the \$6.6 billion price tag of this legislation. At a time when there is a national deficit crisis, it is not appropriate to add \$6.6 billion in spending to the deficit. As a Congress, we absolutely must stop this excessive spending.

President Obama submitted his administration's fiscal year 2010 budget proposal with a record-breaking cost of \$3.8 trillion. This budget proposal includes a \$2 trillion tax increase over the next 10 years and projected record deficits. This proposal will double our Nation's debt in 5 years and triple it in 10 years from the levels from fiscal year 2008. CBO has stated that under current spending levels, by 2020, American taxpayers will be paying \$2 billion per day in interest on the national debt. It also estimates that the debt will be \$20 trillion by that year. Our Nation's economic future requires that this Congress and the administration exercise serious fiscal restraint.

Also, we know there will be devastating effects on the economy due to the recently passed health care bill. The recent CMS analysis concluded that national health care expenditures will actually increase by \$311 billion. This analysis also shows the recently passed health care bill increased health care costs to 21 percent of GDP by 2019. Finally, CBO released figures showing that the "doc fix" will cost \$275.8 billion through 2020, and that is if rates are frozen at current levels. This is a 33 percent increase from the initial figure of \$207 billion.

I'm against this rule and disappointed my amendment was not approved by the Rules Committee for consideration today on the floor.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to congratulate my friend from Ohio for his very thoughtful remarks and pursuing as diligently as he did the effort to try and make in order his amendment which would have ensured that this \$6.6 billion, as Mr. SESSIONS has pointed out, is, in fact, paid for. Time and time again, we hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle that the sine qua non is to ensure that everything is paid for.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say that we continually hear that the penultimate, the highest priority is to ensure that everything that we have before us is paid for. Now, to his credit, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WAXMAN, proceeded to engage, as Mr. LATTA has just said, in the goal of trying to come to some kind of agreement.

Now, the thing that I found very troubling—and, again, the American people, for the first time in a long period of time, are focusing on process. And what took place in the Rules Committee last night is, once again, an indication of the arrogance that we continue to see from the leadership of the Rules Committee and of the Democratic majority here in the House.

Let me say that Mr. WAXMAN, again, to his credit, came before the Rules Committee and said the following. Referring to Mr. LATTA, he said, He has submitted to you an amendment that he wishes to offer—these, again, are Mr. WAXMAN's words—and I would like to express to the Rules Committee that I support his right to offer that amendment. I'm sorry we weren't able to work it out to put it into the manager's amendment, but I just wanted to express that opinion to you.

Mr. WAXMAN was making a request of the Rules Committee. Now, I understand that a committee chairman does not in any way dictate the action of the Rules Committee, but clearly, since the chairman of the authorizing committee indicated that he wanted to have Mr. LATTA's amendment made in order, I found it very troubling when I asked the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee whether or not we would see the Latta amendment, they chose not to make it in order, and I asked why not. I brought up Mr. WAXMAN's words about his interest, his desire to see us consider the Latta amendment here on the House floor, and she responded to me by simply saying that Mr. WAXMAN simply wanted Mr. LATTA to have the right to testify before the Rules Committee on behalf

of this. Well, Madam Speaker, every Member of this House knows that every single Member who chooses to come before the Rules Committee to make their case on an amendment has the right to do that.

And so, again, the arrogance, the arrogance, to deny a Member who simply wants to take on the issue of fiscal responsibility and say, when we've got a \$6.6 billion package before us, after we've only expended \$368 million of the \$4.7 billion that was included in the stimulus bill for weatherization, we're going into this entire new program, and Mr. LATTA is saying, At least if we're going to do this, let's pay for it.

Very sadly, Madam Speaker, we have gotten to a point where the negotiations between Chairman WAXMAN and Mr. LATTA broke down and Mr. WAXMAN at least said, Let's have a vote on the House floor about this on this amendment. Again, the arrogance of the committee led the committee to conclude that, in fact, it could not be considered. And it's just plain wrong.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I just want to comment. It's not just the Democrats on the Rules Committee that said that the Latta amendment is unnecessary. The Congressional Budget Office has said so as well. Allow me to read directly from the CBO letter on the Home Star bill: Enacting the bill will not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. Instead, any actual funding for programs in the bill would have to be appropriated separately by Congress. The amendment essentially is attempting to offset funds that are not spent.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the principal sponsor of the bill, a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady from California. I appreciate her leadership in the committee and also in the Rules Committee. I want to thank Chairman MARKEY and Chairman WAXMAN for their leadership.

Let me talk a little bit about why Home Star makes sense. This is a partnership. Government is putting up some money but homeowners are going to make decisions about refitting their homes and insulating them. Businesses are going to make decisions about taking on those jobs. Our local retail outlets are going to sell the product. Ninety percent of the product they sell is manufactured in America. So it's creating jobs here.

It does the three things that need to be done. It helps us with economic recovery, putting 170,000 folks to work; helps homeowners save money; and it helps us move towards energy independence. A confident nation doesn't shrink from the challenges it faces; it attacks them directly. Energy independence, job creation, cleaning our air, those are all very important.

This is bipartisan, too. I want to acknowledge the extraordinary work that was done by VERN EHLERS in cosponsoring this legislation. I want to thank former Governor of Michigan John Engler, who was an outstanding advocate for this program. I also want to thank Mr. BARTON and the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, who made a good bill better by their contributions. Mr. BARTON insisted that we engage in this bill. He made positive suggestions that we included. Mr. SHADEGG suggested we add electric tankless hot water heaters. A good suggestion. We included it. Mr. SHIMKUS suggested geothermal heat pumps. We included it. Mr. BUYER included an important study to verify that this works. We did it. Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. MURPHY both supported this in committee. And I want to say that I appreciate the constructive engagement by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

There's been a concern expressed—and a valid concern—about spending. There's wise spending and there's wasteful spending. If we have a family that's on a tight budget and they blow what money they have to go on a vacation they can't afford, that's wasteful. But if that family foregoes the vacation and puts that money into renovating and insulating their home so that they can save some cash, not just this year but next year and the year after, that's wise spending.

This bill will be paid for. This is authorization only. The next step will require that we have a pay-for. The pledge is and the requirement on us will be to make certain that happens. So this will be paid for, but this is in the category, very much, of wise investment and solid investment.

I urge support for Home Star because it is a concrete step that's simple partnership between the government, with a light hand providing an incentive, a point-of-sale rebate that is going to give the upfront money to our homeowners that aren't buying new homes but want to save money by refitting and insulating the homes they have. It puts the local contractors to work. It's our local hardware stores that will make the sales.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Ennis, Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank my friend from Dallas.

It embarrasses me when my colleague from Vermont says nice things about me, since I'm opposing this bill. I will say before I list some of my concerns that there was a lot of input asked for and received by Republicans both in the committee and outside of the committee.

This is not a terribly bad bill, but it has one fatal flaw: It is not paid for. It,

in my opinion, authorizes and, if the authorization is actually appropriated, spends more money than we need to be spending in an era of \$1.5 trillion per year budget deficits.

Mr. LATTA of Ohio did offer a pay-for amendment at committee. It simply said that this bill must not increase the deficit. There was some discussion. Mr. LATTA was asked to withdraw. The chairman, Mr. WAXMAN, said he would work with Mr. LATTA. There were kind of desultory conversations at the staff level, until yesterday, after a markup of another bill, which at that time Chairman WAXMAN did sit down with Congressman LATTA and myself. There were fairly serious discussions yesterday afternoon. Those discussions were not satisfactory to either side.

The end result was that Mr. LATTA went to the Rules Committee and offered his original amendment that he had withdrawn in committee. In its infinite wisdom, the Rules Committee chose not to make the most important amendment requested, in my opinion, in order. They made an amendment in order by myself, which is an okay amendment. So I thank Congresswoman MATSUI and the other Democrats on the Rules Committee for accepting that amendment.

But the crux of it, in an era with \$1.5 trillion annual deficits, any new program, no matter how good, we should pay for it. If it's an authorization bill, we should put in the authorization bill that it should be paid for, that it will be paid for.

Now, the circuitous argument was: since this is an authorization bill, doesn't cost anything, you don't need a pay-for. Well, why not set the precedent? Let's make it a point as this Congress, if we really are concerned about the deficit, let's say, if we start a new program, we'll pay for it, and tell the Appropriations Committee and the Budget Committee we want this paid for. Now, Republicans want to pay for it by reducing wasteful spending.

I ask for a "no" vote on the rule.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you to my colleague, Representative MATSUI, for yielding the time, and to my colleague, PETER WELCH, for doing such a great job on this bill.

I want to talk a little bit about how this affects my home State of Maine.

Madam Speaker, with long, cold winters, some of the oldest housing stock in the country, and the highest reliance on oil heat in the country, paying heating bills can be a real struggle for many families in my State of Maine. Recently, I heard from a family with three kids who live in a 100-year-old home. From the street, their house looks like every other house in the neighborhood. In fact, it not only looks like every other house in the neighborhood, it pretty much is just like every other house in the neighborhood: old, leaky, and hard to heat.

□ 1100

By mid-December of last year, they had already gone through two tanks of oil to heat their 1,200-square-foot home, and they were wearing wool hats on the inside. Facing high heating costs and a new mortgage, they are forced to make tough decisions about improvements.

But energy-efficiency improvements can make a world of difference. Another Maine family told me that by removing inefficient fiberglass insulation and replacing it with cellulose insulation, they turned a drafty 200-year-old house into a snug and comfortable home.

Weatherizing homes isn't just good for the homeowners; it's good for the economy. For example, a company called WarmTECH in Yarmouth, Maine, is a strong supporter of this bill. According to the owners, with the creation of the Home Star program, they expect to increase their staff by at least 30 percent and purchase additional equipment.

Thankfully, my State is taking the lead on helping families save money by making their homes energy efficient. Maine has undertaken an aggressive campaign to weatherize every home in the State and half of all businesses by 2030. With the help of the Recovery Act funding, which I was proud to support, my State has created a program to provide rebates of up to \$3,000 for energy efficiency improvements, and it is in the process of setting up a revolving loan fund that will make it easier to finance those improvements and pay them off more quickly.

Improving our Nation's energy efficiency benefits our economy, our national security, and our environment; but much remains to be done, and this bill, the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act of 2010, is one more step in the right direction. By creating rebates and incentives that will make it more affordable to weatherize your home, this proposal will help families start saving money on their heating bills right away and at the same time will create good-paying jobs that can't be exported.

When people are able to invest in making their homes more energy efficient, that creates good business for contractors, energy auditors, and building supply stores. It stimulates the local economy, saves families money, and reduces our dependence on oil. This bill will allow 3 million families to save over \$9 billion on their energy bills over the next decade and create 168,000 of those good-paying jobs right here at home.

Madam Speaker, sometimes I think the word "investment" gets a little overused around here; but the Home Star program is, in the truest sense of the word, an investment, and it is an investment that will begin paying dividends immediately by creating jobs, saving working families money, and reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Auburn, Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm glad there is some bipartisanship here. I think the American people really want us to work together. I mean, that's the bottom line here: we all want to create jobs, we all want to be more energy efficient, and especially in this economy, I think people want to lower their energy costs so they have more money in their pockets.

I think our focus, therefore, is in the right place, but I think there is a more effective way to achieve these goals rather than a rebate check that's before us today. That's why the House should instead take up a bipartisan package of tax incentives that I authored. Again, this is a bipartisan effort by RON KIND, GEOFF DAVIS, EARL BLUMENAUER, CHRIS LEE, and TOM PERRIELLO.

This bill, H.R. 4226, Expanding Building Efficiency Incentives Act, is a more effective approach for several reasons. It puts incentives directly in the hands of the consumers through the Tax Code. It gives the people more choices to meet their needs. It's easier to administer. Tax incentives avoid the expensive and complicated "middle man" structure used to give rebate checks.

When I was the sheriff, we applied for grants. And I know that some of the grants were from the Federal Government; they passed through the State government. And as they passed through the State government, they cost an additional 20 percent in administrative fees, therefore reducing the amount of money that actually ended up in the hands of the sheriff's office or police chiefs across the country.

I think the administrative costs in this bill we're about to vote on today remove some of the incentives for homeowners. It includes commercial property and new construction as well as home retrofits. Forty percent of the energy used in our country is in buildings like office towers, warehouses, and shopping malls. If we were really committed to creating jobs and saving money through energy retrofits, let's tackle the problem head on, not just a piece of the problem.

Madam Speaker, I am a little disappointed—well, quite disappointed—that the Rules Committee didn't make in order our amendment to consider this bipartisan tax bill, and I ask my colleagues to provide the House with an opportunity to do so.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I just want to reiterate this again: what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle fail to recognize or refuse to admit is that the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act is an authorizing measure; it does not include any appropriated funds. Moreover, there are no earmarks included in this legislation. The Congressional Budget Office has said that enacting the bill would not affect direct

spending or revenues, therefore, PAYGO procedures would not apply.

This process is not anything new, and the Republicans routinely approved proposals that authorized programs when they controlled this Chamber and the administration.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN).

Ms. BEAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the manager's amendment and the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act of 2010. I want to commend Chairman WAXMAN and particularly Congressman PETER WELCH for their leadership, making energy efficiency more affordable for American families in my Eighth District in Illinois and across the Nation.

Welcome signs of economic recovery and competitiveness in the global economy are directly related to the opportunities emerging as businesses become cleaner and leaner. The same philosophy holds true for American households. Investments in better building materials and technologies can pay for themselves in the form of energy savings, and then some. At the same time, Home Star is a jobs measure. It will provide timely and targeted employment to the skilled trades industry which is still reeling from the housing bust and economic recession.

Two amendments I authored, included in the manager's amendment, will enhance the job creation potential of Home Star. States will be directed to engage with community colleges to implement the retrofit program. These community colleges are excellent resources for worker education, training, and certification; and they collaborate with area employers to provide dynamic and affordable educational resources to meet workforce needs. The role of community colleges in our clean energy economy will only continue to grow in significance.

I also authored a provision with our colleague, Mr. DRIEHAUS, to expand rebate eligibility to replacement storm windows and doors, which will particularly help historic homes. To improve energy efficiency and maintain the historic integrity of a house, a homeowner may prefer to install storm windows and doors. This amendment will provide families more options to retrofit their homes in a manner that best fits their needs.

H.R. 5019 is a well-crafted measure that will create jobs and boost domestic manufacturing, while saving families money and reducing energy consumption.

I urge my colleagues to support the manager's amendment and this important underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Clarence, New York, (Mr. LEE.)

Mr. LEE of New York. I appreciate the opportunity to speak out on the

rule on the "Cash for Caulkers" legislation before us today because I believe this is the wrong approach. It's another government boondoggle costing taxpayers over \$6.5 billion. Even more frustrating is the fact that last year's so-called "stimulus," we haven't used up the billions of dollars that were allocated for the energy-efficiency programs. So, again, let's just keep spending money that we do not have in this country.

Americans can agree on one issue, that is, that we are facing an energy crisis that demands our attention, and that part of the solution means improving the efficiency of our energy intake. Today, we have an important choice on how we get this done.

Energy-efficiency improvements are best achieved through the use of voluntary, market-based programs through tax incentives which are provided directly to the consumer. I've had the pleasure to work with Representatives from both sides of the aisle on introducing H.R. 4226, a comprehensive, bipartisan package of energy efficiency incentives that will reduce energy costs, save energy, and create long-term energy jobs. For this reason, my colleagues and I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to provide a choice in how we move forward.

While the underlying bill and the substitute amendment both seek to make it easier to retrofit an existing home to achieve energy savings, only one of these bills will allow families and businesses to plan for future retrofit expenses and to make more effective home improvements.

The alternative legislation my colleagues and I supported is more effective in creating jobs and saving energy costs. It includes a predefined 5-year extension of proven successful tax incentives, not another government handout. Our alternative will make it more affordable for homeowners to retrofit their existing homes.

Furthermore, H.R. 4226 includes commercial retrofits, something the underlying bill does not provide. Commercial buildings are in as much need, if not greater need, than many residential buildings. H.R. 4226 would allow small businesses to save more, which would allow them to invest in themselves and create jobs, something that cannot be said about the bill before us today.

H.R. 4226 is an important step towards energy conservation, and it does so in a responsible and meaningful way. Contrast that with the underlying bill before us today, which amounts to a rushed cash handout to the tune of \$6.6 billion that just forces burdensome mandates on taxpayers already struggling to make ends meet.

Unfortunately, today's rule does not allow my colleagues the opportunity to vote on this approach. I encourage all of you to reject this rule and the underlying bill and to support H.R. 4226, which will increase energy efficiency in

both domestic and commercial structures in a much more effective, fiscally responsible, market-based approach.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I just want to say before I yield to my next speaker that this bill has been strongly endorsed by a broad range of business, labor, environmental and consumer groups. In fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Association of Home Builders have formally endorsed this bill. The National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, on behalf of its 6,000-member companies nationwide, also recently endorsed this bill. This bill is a perfect example of industry, consumer, labor, and environmental groups all working together to move our Nation toward a more energy-efficient economy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding and for your leadership in making sure this very good bill moved to the floor. I support the rule, and I want to thank Chairman WAXMAN, Representative WELCH, Representative MARKEY, and the committee staff for all of their very hard work in getting this bill to us today.

This bill is about more than home improvements. It's about reducing energy demand by expanding the use of cost-effective, energy-efficient technologies, for which my district and the State of California have long been a leader. This bill is about healthier homes and healthier communities, and it's critically important that we recognize that this bill is about the creation of good-paying, high-quality green jobs.

I am pleased that this legislation will incentivize targeted job training and financial assistance to low-income communities and the chronically unemployed, as well as the recruitment of small, women-owned and minority-owned businesses.

I commend my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and our staff, especially Congressman RUSH, who helped to champion the cause for these vital provisions.

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

Ms. MATSUI. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me just acknowledge the role of the Congressional Black Caucus in this and thank our leadership for working with us to make sure that these provisions were included because these provisions will ensure that we serve and that we empower and include those hardest hit by the economic recession and that no one is left behind in this bill, and will really look at how to achieve and rectify historical, environmental injustices. With that in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the rule and this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire, if I can, upon the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4¼ minutes remaining, and the gentlelady from California has 9½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

□ 1115

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I want to thank certainly my colleague from California for allowing me to go forward with this, and also say thank you to Chairman WAXMAN and Mr. WELCH for all of the work that they have done on the committee.

H.R. 5019 would make important advancements toward the twin goals of improving our country's energy efficiency and adding jobs to our economy. The energy efficiency measures that are covered under this bill will help to bring down energy costs for our families, reduce overall energy consumption, and reduce our Nation's dependence on foreign energy sources.

Another important effect of this bill, however, that is not addressed as much is the impact of the bill on the quality of life for our constituents. One quality of life issue that this bill will address is the issue of noise reduction. The technology used to make our homes energy efficient can also be used to reduce noise levels.

The amendment I have submitted would require the Secretary of Energy to study what effects the energy efficiency measures installed under this bill have on noise reduction.

My district is located in Nassau County, Long Island, New York, a densely populated area adjacent to John F. Kennedy Airport and several train lines. Due to the close proximity to JFK, many communities in my district are severely affected by noise from airplanes landing and taking off at JFK. Airplane noise can be heard at all hours of the day and night. We have also a lot of noise coming from the trains that run through my district, also at all times.

In this densely populated area of the country, railroad tracks are often close to homes, schools and businesses. This issue affects thousands of my constituents on a daily basis. Noise significantly affects our quality of life. Airplane noise can also have dangerous effects on the health of otherwise healthy individuals. Extended exposure to loud noise levels not only affects the hearing of adults and children, but has also been linked to an increase in blood pressure. And the noise prevents individuals from getting restful nights of sleep.

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

Ms. MATSUI. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Airplane noise has also been found to have an effect on children's education. Children who are exposed to prolonged periods of airplane noise learn to read at a slower pace than those not exposed to the noise. Noise significantly affects individuals with certain health conditions even more and we need to be very sensitive to the needs of them in future policies we pursue.

I am drafting legislation that would provide a tax credit to people who want to soundproof rooms in their homes or schools due to plane noise. Many of the items that individuals use to soundproof their homes—insulation and better doors and windows—are the same types of investments that this bill provides for. Therefore, the study I have included in this bill will help inform us about the best ways to move ahead with noise abatement activities and also see where we can double our value by achieving energy efficiency and decreased energy costs for consumers.

By taking action on this bill and the legislation I am drafting, we will do a lot to improve the quality of life for all our constituents. Once again I thank the committee, and I encourage everyone to vote for the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, 30 years ago President Carter declared the moral equivalent of war on foreign oil. We have done two things in those 30 years: we have slashed Federal investments in research and development for energy efficiency and renewables by 85 percent; and we have doubled our imports of oil.

In the past 2 years, we have corrected our top down investments. We are investing more in energy efficiency, but we have missed the most critical three words in the debate: return on investment. We need to find ways to make it easier for people to purchase energy efficient windows, to retrofit their homes, and that is exactly what this bill does. It gives consumers rebates of up to \$3,000, it lowers utility bills, and it creates jobs. It creates jobs by allowing people to go to their stores to buy their windows and equipment. That means somebody is going to need to manufacture that equipment and install that equipment. This is a way of creating jobs and enhancing our energy security. It is a way of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. This is a critically important bill from a national security perspective and an economic security perspective. I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The facts of the case are out on the table today. The Federal Government is going to run this program. It will determine the winners and losers. It will decide which of the technologies will be reimbursed. It will decide how this

program is going to work. We in essence take the consumer out of the equation. The taxpayer of this country, as the bill is written, will have \$6.6 billion in new deficit and debt that will be on the future of this country, our children and our grandchildren. We will continue to have less ability to effectively have jobs in this country as a result of the continuing debt.

We have heard this story before. We heard about how great the stimulus was. Well, the stimulus, which was called a jobs bill, was about anything but jobs. It was about big government and diminishing the size of the free enterprise system.

The health care bill, oh, it's all about jobs. And we found out just days after that was passed, whoops, you better add another \$600 billion to what the real cost will be because it was not included, despite the debate and all of the time on the floor. The health care bill was as much about health care as the stimulus was about jobs.

Here we are adding another promise from the Democrat majority: this is about jobs. But what this party fails to talk about is, okay, 150,000 jobs for \$6.5 billion worth of spending, new debt not paid for, not adequately enumerating the things that will really happen in the marketplace. We have already talked about the promises that were made during the stimulus, and of that only 5 percent has materialized out of the Department of Energy. The reason why is because people don't have money. People do not have money because they do not have jobs. We do not have jobs in this country because of the Democratic majority who has made a decision that their political agenda to diminish the size of the free enterprise system is just fine for them.

The three largest political agenda items of this Democratic Party, the Speaker and the President, net lose 10 million American jobs. That's why people do not end up having jobs and why people will not be able to buy into this plan either. Because people are unemployed. They are hurting. They are concerned about how they are going to take care of themselves. Quite honestly, Madam Speaker, this country is afraid. They are afraid of the massive debt, and we are going to pile on another \$6.5 billion today.

We talked about how and when the Democrats took control of this Congress, they promised little job loss, lower deficits, and we have only seen the opposite. Additionally, little to no progress has been made to providing real solutions to the high unemployment rate; 150,000 jobs won't cut it. We are getting ready to lose 300,000 more teachers' jobs because communities can't afford to have the teachers. They can't pay for them. And we are here today to vote on another \$6.6 billion, a spending spree for the Federal Government to manage and pick the winners and losers in the energy saving sector. It is bad policy.

Where are the jobs? Where is the ability of people to make decisions? Nope,

we are going to let the Federal Government decide this.

Madam Speaker, Congress, the Democratic Party, believes we can just spend our way out of this economic crisis. We need reforms. We need to work together. We need America to be an employer nation again. Ah, the old days with Republicans, all that debt they caused, not a drop in the bucket compared to what this 4 years of Democrat control has done.

I once again stand up for my party and say no, we are not going to participate in this. We K-N-O-W exactly what this Democrat majority is all about. One-party rule is bad for this country. Not accepting amendments from the other party is not good for the country.

I encourage a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, it is important that we not rewrite history today. The previous administration had the worst fiscal record in American history. When President Bush was inaugurated in 2001, he inherited from President Clinton a budget surplus projected to be \$5.6 trillion over the next 10 years. But over his two terms, through fiscally reckless policies, President Bush squandered that surplus and gave the country 8 years of deficits instead.

We have had to take evasive action to stave off a long-term economic disaster, and no one on my side of the aisle will apologize for boldly confronting one of the worst fiscal and economic crises in our country's history.

Madam Speaker, creating jobs is our top priority, to put more Americans back to work and truly turn our economy around. There is no doubt that the Home Star program will boost our domestic energy efficiency industry and further move our country toward a clean energy economy. By increasing energy efficiency, we will not only incentivize the emerging clean technology industry, but also reduce carbon pollution and cut costs for consumers.

The legislation before us will create nearly 170,000 new green jobs in this country. This bill will create three separate energy efficiency rebate programs to encourage home energy efficiency, cut down on the use of fossil fuels, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and increase energy security and independence.

As a result, the bill would have a meaningful, long-term impact on energy savings. Together with the ongoing investment by the Recovery Act, the Home Star program will substantially invest in our clean energy economy and spur job creation and economic growth in this country. This Congress must continue to invest wisely in proposals that will train our workers, create new good-paying jobs, grow our economy and rebuild the middle class. This legislation does just that.

This bill has been strongly endorsed by a broad range of business, labor, en-

vironmental and consumer groups. In fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Association of Home Builders have formally endorsed this bill. It is a perfect example of industry, consumer, labor, and environmental groups all working together to move our Nation toward a more energy-efficient economy. Madam Speaker, this is an important bill that will create jobs and move our Nation towards a clean energy economy.

With that in mind, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 1329 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 1295; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1722.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 182, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

YEAS—229

Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Holden
Adler (NJ)	Davis (IL)	Holt
Altmire	Davis (TN)	Honda
Andrews	DeFazio	Hoyer
Arcuri	Delahunt	Inslee
Baca	DeLauro	Israel
Baird	Deuth	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	Dicks	Jackson Lee
Barrow	Dingell	(TX)
Bean	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Becerra	Doyle	Kagen
Berkley	Driehaus	Kanjorski
Berman	Edwards (MD)	Kaptur
Berry	Edwards (TX)	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Kilpatrick (MI)
Blumenauer	Ellsworth	Kilroy
Boccheri	Engel	Kind
Boren	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boucher	Etheridge	Kissell
Boyd	Farr	Klein (FL)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kosmas
Braley (IA)	Filner	Kucinich
Bright	Foster	Langevin
Brown, Corrine	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Capps	Giffords	Lee (CA)
Capuano	Gonzalez	Levin
Cardoza	Gordon (TN)	Lewis (GA)
Carnahan	Grayson	Lipinski
Carney	Green, Al	Loebach
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	Loftgren, Zoe
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	Lowe
Chandler	Gutierrez	Lujan
Chu	Hall (NY)	Lynch
Clarke	Halvorson	Maffei
Clay	Hare	Maloney
Cleaver	Harman	Markey (CO)
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Markey (MA)
Cohen	Heinrich	Marshall
Connolly (VA)	Herseth Sandlin	Matheson
Conyers	Higgins	Matsui
Cooper	Himes	McCarthy (NY)
Costello	Hinchey	McDermott
Crowley	Hinojosa	McGovern
Cuellar	Hirono	McIntyre
Cummings	Hodes	McMahon

McNerney Quigley
 Meek (FL) Rahall
 Meeks (NY) Rangel
 Michaud Richardson
 Miller (NC) Rodriguez
 Miller, George Ross
 Moore (KS) Rothman (NJ)
 Moran (VA) Roybal-Allard
 Murphy (CT) Ruppertsberger
 Murphy (NY) Rush
 Murphy, Patrick Ryan (OH)
 Nadler (NY) Salazar
 Napolitano Sanchez, Linda
 Neal (MA) T.
 Nye Sanchez, Loretta
 Oberstar Sarbanes
 Obey Schakowsky
 Olver Schiff
 Ortiz Schrader
 Owens Schwartz
 Pallone Scott (GA)
 Pascrell Scott (VA)
 Pastor (AZ) Serrano
 Payne Sestak
 Perlmutter Shea-Porter
 Perriello Sherman
 Peters Sires
 Peterson Skelton
 Pingree (ME) Slaughter
 Polis (CO) Smith (WA)
 Pomeroy Snyder
 Price (NC) Space

NAYS—182

Aderholt Gallegly
 Akin Garrett (NJ)
 Alexander Gerlach
 Austria Gingrey (GA)
 Bachmann Gohmert
 Bachus Goodlatte
 Bartlett Granger
 Barton (TX) Graves
 Biggert Griffith
 Bilbray Guthrie
 Bilirakis Hall (TX)
 Bishop (NY) Harper
 Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA)
 Blunt Heller
 Boehner Hensarling
 Bono Mack Herger
 Boozman Hill
 Boswell Hunter
 Boustany Inglis
 Brady (TX) Issa
 Broun (GA) Jenkins
 Brown (SC) Johnson (IL)
 Brown-Waite, Johnny Johnson, Sam
 Buchanan Jones
 Burgess Jordan (OH)
 Burton (IN) King (IA)
 Buyer King (NY)
 Calvert Kingston
 Camp Kirk
 Cantor Kline (MN)
 Cao Lamborn
 Capito Lance
 Carter Latham
 Cassidy LaTourette
 Castle Latta
 Chaffetz Lee (NY)
 Childers Lewis (CA)
 Coble Linder
 Coffman (CO) LoBiondo
 Cole Lucas
 Conaway Luetkemeyer
 Courtney Lummis
 Crenshaw Lungren, Daniel
 Culberson E.
 Davis (KY) Mack
 Dent Manzullo
 Diaz-Balart, L. Marchant
 Diaz-Balart, M. McCarthy (CA)
 Donnelly (IN) McCaul
 Dreier McClintock
 Duncan McCotter
 Ehlers McHenry
 Emerson McKeon
 Fallon McMorris
 Flake Rodgers
 Fleming Mica
 Forbes Miller (FL)
 Fortenberry Miller (MI)
 Foxx Miller, Gary
 Franks (AZ) Minnick
 Frelinghuysen Mitchell
 Moran (KS)

Speier Spratt
 Stark
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Teague
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

Murphy, Tim
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Olson
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pence
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schauer
 Schmidt
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Taylor
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton
 Walden
 Wamp
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Barrett (SC) DeGette
 Blackburn Garamendi
 Bonner Hoekstra
 Campbell Johnson (GA)
 Costa Kennedy
 Dahlkemper Kratovil
 Davis (AL) McCollum

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1153

Messrs. POSEY, GARY G. MILLER of California and SCALISE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. KILDEE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 249, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

CELEBRATING MOTHERS AND MOTHER'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1295, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1295.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

YEAS—417

Ackerman Boswell Chandler
 Aderholt Boucher Childers
 Adler (NJ) Boustany Chu
 Akin Boyd Clarke
 Alexander Brady (PA) Clay
 Altmire Brady (TX) Cleaver
 Andrews Braley (IA) Clyburn
 Arcuri Bright Coble
 Austria Broun (GA) Coffman (CO)
 Baca Brown (SC) Cohen
 Bachmann Brown, Corrine Cole
 Bachus Brown-Waite, Conaway
 Baird Ginny Connolly (VA)
 Baldwin Buchanan Conyers
 Barrow Burgess Cooper
 Bartlett Burton (IN) Costa
 Barton (TX) Butterfield Costello
 Bean Buyer Courtney
 Becerra Calvert Crenshaw
 Berkley Camp Crowley
 Berman Cantor Cuellar
 Berry Cao Culberson
 Biggert Capito Cummings
 Bilbray Capps Dahlkemper
 Bilirakis Capuano Davis (CA)
 Bishop (GA) Cardoza Davis (IL)
 Bishop (NY) Carnahan Davis (KY)
 Bishop (UT) Carney Davis (TN)
 Blumenauer Carson (IN) DeFazio
 Blunt Carter Delahunt
 Boccieri Cassidy DeLauro
 Bono Mack Castle Dent
 Boozman Castor (FL) Deutch
 Boren Chaffetz Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M. Dicks
 Dingell Kissell
 Doggett Klein (FL)
 Donnelly (IN) Kline (MN)
 Doyle Kosmas
 Dreier Kratovil
 Driehaus Kucinich
 Duncan Lamborn
 Edwards (MD) Lance
 Edwards (TX) Langevin
 Ehlers Larsen (WA)
 Ellison Larson (CT)
 Ellsworth Latham
 Emerson LaTourette
 Engel Latta
 Eshoo Lee (CA)
 Etheridge Lee (NY)
 Fallin Levin
 Farr Lewis (CA)
 Fattah Lewis (GA)
 Filner Linder
 Flake Lipinski
 Fleming LoBiondo
 Forbes Loebach
 Fortenberry Lofgren, Zoe
 Foster Lowey
 Foxx Lucas
 Frank (MA) Luetkemeyer
 Franks (AZ) Luján
 Frelinghuysen Lummis
 Fudge Lungren, Daniel
 Gallegly E.
 Garamendi Lynch
 Garrett (NJ) Mack
 Gerlach Maffei
 Giffords Maloney
 Gingrey (GA) Manzullo
 Gonzalez Marchant
 Goodlatte Markey (CO)
 Gordon (TN) Markey (MA)
 Granger Marshall
 Graves Matheson
 Grayson Matsui
 Green, Al McCarthy (CA)
 Green, Gene McCarthy (NY)
 Griffith McCaul
 Grijalva McClintock
 Guthrie McCotter
 Gutierrez McDermott
 Hall (NY) McGovern
 Hall (TX) McHenry
 Halvorson McIntyre
 Hare McKeon
 Harman McMahon
 Harper McMorris
 Hastings (FL) Rodgers
 Hastings (WA) McNeerney
 Heinrich Meek (FL)
 Heller Meeks (NY)
 Hensarling Mica
 Herger Michaud
 Herseth Sandlin Miller (FL)
 Higgins Miller (MI)
 Hill Miller (NC)
 Himes Miller, Gary
 Hinchey Minnick
 Hinojosa Mitchell
 Hirono Moore (KS)
 Hodes Moore (WI)
 Holden Moore (KS)
 Holt Moran (VA)
 Honda Moran (VA)
 Hoyer Moran (VA)
 Hunter Murphy (CT)
 Inglis Murphy (NY)
 Inslee Murphy, Patrick
 Israel Myrick
 Issa Nadler (NY)
 Jackson (IL) Napolitano
 Jackson Lee Neal (MA)
 (TX) Neugebauer
 Jenkins Nunes
 Johnson (GA) Nye
 Johnson (IL) Oberstar
 Johnson, E. B. Obey
 Johnson, Sam Olson
 Jones Oliver
 Jordan (OH) Ortiz
 Kagen Owens
 Kanjorski Pallone
 Kaptur Pascrell
 Kildee Pastor (AZ)
 Kilpatrick (MI) Paul
 Kilroy Paulsen
 Kind Payne
 King (IA) Perlmutter
 King (NY) Perriello
 Kingston

Peters Peterson
 Kissell Petri
 Klein (FL) Pingree (ME)
 Kline (MN) Pitts
 Kosmas Platts
 Kratovil Poe (TX)
 Kucinich Polis (CO)
 Lamborn Pomeroy
 Lance Posey
 Langevin Price (GA)
 Larsen (WA) Price (NC)
 Larson (CT) Putnam
 Latham Quigley
 LaTourette Radanovich
 Latta Rahall
 Lee (CA) Rangel
 Lee (NY) Rehberg
 Levin Reichert
 Lewis (CA) Reyes
 Lewis (GA) Richardson
 Linder Rodriguez
 Lipinski Roe (TN)
 LoBiondo Rogers (AL)
 Loebach Rogers (KY)
 Lofgren, Zoe Rogers (MI)
 Lowey Rohrabacher
 Lucas Rooney
 Luetkemeyer Ros-Lehtinen
 Luján Roskam
 Lummis Ross
 Lungren, Daniel Rothman (NJ)
 E. Roybal-Allard
 Lynch Royce
 Mack Ruppertsberger
 Maffei Rush
 Maloney Ryan (OH)
 Manzullo Ryan (WI)
 Marchant Salazar
 Markey (CO) Sanchez, Linda
 Markey (MA) T.
 Marshall Sanchez, Loretta
 Matheson Sarbanes
 Matsui Scalise
 McCarthy (CA) Schakowsky
 McCarthy (NY) Schauer
 McCaul Schiff
 McClintock Schmidt
 McCotter Schock
 McDermott Schrader
 McGovern Schwartz
 McHenry Scott (GA)
 McIntyre Scott (VA)
 McKeon Sensenbrenner
 McMahon Serrano
 McMorris Sessions
 Rodgers Sestak
 McNeerney Shadegg
 Meek (FL) Shea-Porter
 Meeks (NY) Sherman
 Mica Shimkus
 Michaud Shuler
 Miller (FL) Shuster
 Miller (MI) Simpson
 Miller (NC) Sires
 Miller, Gary Skelton
 Minnick Slaughter
 Mitchell Smith (NE)
 Moore (KS) Smith (NJ)
 Moore (WI) Smith (TX)
 Moran (VA) Smith (WA)
 Moran (VA) Snyder
 Murphy (CT) Souder
 Murphy (NY) Space
 Murphy, Patrick Speier
 Myrick Spratt
 Nadler (NY) Stark
 Napolitano Stearns
 Neal (MA) Stupak
 Neugebauer Sullivan
 Nye Sutton
 Oberstar Tanner
 Obey Nunes
 Olson Teague
 Oliver Terry
 Ortiz Thompson (CA)
 Owens Thompson (MS)
 Pallone Thompson (PA)
 Pascrell Thornberry
 Pastor (AZ) Tiahrt
 Paul Tierney
 Paulsen Titus
 Payne Tonko
 Perlmutter Towns
 Perriello Tsongas
 Upton Turner
 Van Hollen