

PACE urges policy makers to consider comprehensive tax reform designed to increase the competitiveness of U.S. companies both at home and abroad. Changes to our international tax system that fail to consider the competitive global marketplace will further disadvantage U.S. workers. When worldwide American companies become less competitive in their ability to serve foreign markets, demand for U.S. produced goods and services will decline.

PACE looks forward to working with Members of Congress to modernize our international tax system to improve the competitiveness of the U.S. economy and create jobs at home. If HR 5893 is not amended to remove the international tax increases, we respectfully request that you vote against this bill.

Sincerely,

BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE,
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
INDUSTRY COUNCIL,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MANUFACTURERS,
NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE
COUNCIL,
U.S. CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE.

As I noted earlier, the United States Chamber of Commerce says this bill imposes Draconian increases on American worldwide companies that would hinder job creation, decrease the competitiveness of American businesses, and deter economic growth.

I urge my colleagues to listen to these job providers and job creators, to reject these job-killing tax increases, and to vote "no" on this bill.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of our time.

It's really so important to look at the facts. This bill does not basically create government jobs. That is a total myth, and you know it.

The infrastructure money goes to State and local communities like highway monies do. These orange barrels, orange and white in Michigan, Mr. CAMP, are put up by private contractors with Federal money.

So why demean the Build America Bonds provisions by calling it money to State and local governments when everybody knows it's for infrastructure that goes to private contractors and their employees?

You mention the number of construction workers out of work; that is very true. And then you vote against the legislation that will give them jobs.

You say where are the jobs? Then you come down here and vote against bills to create jobs.

It doesn't make any sense. Instead, we get the same political speech aimed at November 2, instead of aiming at creating jobs for the thousands and thousands of people who are unemployed in the United States of America.

I want to say something about the double taxation so people understand what this is really all about. We have a foreign tax credit, as there should be, at least in this structure. This is a credit that is supposed to relate to the income by American companies created overseas.

So what has been happening under this loophole is that the credit has been used, not in relationship to that income, but has been used relating to other income. So it isn't double taxation; it's an effort to avoid any taxation, and the rest of us pick up the bill.

Now, one company that has objected to this has dramatically increased their investment offshore and diminished their jobs in the United States and diminished their R&D. So they say close the loophole and we will pay more taxes, yes. What we are saying is follow the rules, like small business does in this country, and like all of us individual taxpayers do in this country. You can come here and say closing a loophole increases taxes. By definition it does, because it says to people who are skipping paying taxes, pay your fair share.

So this is a two-fer, jobs in the U.S. and stopping the shipment of jobs overseas.

And if people come here and vote against this bill, they can expect to hear from constituents, that you have voted to help people and entities that ship jobs from this country elsewhere. We should vote resoundingly for this legislation.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, some Democrats have said the welfare expansion in this bill is about jobs. It's not. It's about more welfare.

This bill would expand the welfare emergency fund Democrats created in last year's failed stimulus bill. That fund made available up to \$5 billion in new "welfare emergency funds" over fiscal years 2009 and 2010. The bill before us would make available another up to \$5 billion for just fiscal year 2011, which starts in October.

So they propose to double the welfare funds for this program, all in just one year.

That is so much new welfare money that CBO estimates States wouldn't be able to spend it all. Still, the \$3.5 billion CBO estimates States would spend next year would almost match the \$4 billion States have spent in the last two years.

No matter how you slice it, spending out of this welfare emergency fund would accelerate rapidly under this bill.

What would this money be spent on? The same things it is currently spent on—almost exclusively more and bigger welfare checks.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has prepared a report on how the welfare emergency fund has been spent so far. As of July 22, 2010, only 25 percent had been spent on "subsidized employment," or the salaries of what are short-term positions.

And data from liberal advocates for these programs admit that nearly half of those positions have been summer youth jobs. Since summer is just about over, many of the jobs the other side talks about are nearly over, too.

And the other side's own rhetoric admits these jobs in general are as temporary as the Federal funding—which must be extended, they say, or else the "jobs" will end.

The fact is, despite the other side's newfound but empty "jobs" rhetoric, a full 75 percent of this money has been spent on basic assistance—that is, on welfare benefits.

But these are not just any welfare checks. States have had to be creative to spend this welfare emergency fund money.

Last summer New York State used its share of welfare emergency funds to provide one-time \$200 "back to school checks" to families already on welfare. Instead of spending the money on back to school supplies, many recipients used the money, as CBS News put it, to purchase "flat screen TVs, iPods and video gaming systems." Convenience stores in low-income areas "noted marked increases in beer, lotto and cigarette sales."

Perhaps our colleagues think that creates jobs.

I disagree.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1568, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5893 is postponed.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569 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. 5850.

□ 1738

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. 5850) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, with Mr. SNYDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 111-578 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111-578 on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 printed in part A by Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio.

Amendment No. 8 printed in part A by Mr. LATHAM of Iowa.

Amendment No. 10 printed in part A by Mr. CULBERSON of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 217, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

AYES—206

Aderholt	Fortenberry	McNerney
Adler (NJ)	Foster	Mica
Alexander	Fox	Miller (FL)
Altmire	Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Arcuri	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary
Austria	Gallely	Minnick
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Mitchell
Bachus	Gerlach	Murphy (NY)
Barrett (SC)	Giffords	Murphy, Patrick
Bartlett	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy, Tim
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Myrick
Bean	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Biggert	Granger	Nunes
Billray	Graves (GA)	Nye
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Olson
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Owens
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Paul
Blunt	Harper	Paulsen
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Bonner	Heinrich	Peters
Bono Mack	Heller	Peterson
Boozman	Hensarling	Petri
Boren	Herger	Pitts
Boucher	Herseth Sandlin	Platts
Boustany	Himes	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hodes	Posey
Bright	Hunter	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Inglis	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rehberg
Brown-Waite,	Jenkins	Reichert
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Jones	Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN)	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Camp	King (NY)	Rooney
Campbell	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	Kirk	Roskam
Capito	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Royce
Carter	Kissell	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Castle	Kratovil	Schauer
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Schmidt
Chandler	Lance	Schock
Childers	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Coble	LaTourette	Sessions
Coffman (CO)	Latta	Shimkus
Cole	Lee (NY)	Shuster
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Connolly (VA)	Linder	Smith (NE)
Cooper	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stearns
Dahlkemper	Lummis	Sullivan
Davis (AL)	Lungren, Daniel	Taylor
Davis (KY)	E.	Teague
DeFazio	Mack	Terry
Dent	Maffei	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Tiberi
Djou	Marshall	Turner
Donnelly (IN)	Matheson	Upton
Dreier	McCaul	Walden
Duncan	McClintock	Westmoreland
Ellsworth	McCotter	Whitfield
Emerson	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Fallin	McKeon	Wittman
Flake	McMahon	Wolf
Fleming	McMorris	Young (AK)
Forbes	Rodgers	

NOES—217

Ackerman	Baldwin	Berkley
Baca	Barrow	Berman
Baird	Becerra	Berry

Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Perriello
Blumenauer	Hill	Pierluisi
Boccheri	Hinchey	Pingree (ME)
Bordallo	Hinojosa	Polis (CO)
Boswell	Hirono	Pomeroy
Boyd	Holden	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Holt	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Honda	Rahall
Brown, Corrine	Hoyer	Rangel
Butterfield	Inslee	Reyes
Buyer	Israel	Richardson
Cao	Jackson (IL)	Rodriguez
Capps	Jackson Lee	Ross
Capuano	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carney	Kagen	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Christensen	Kaptur	Sablan
Chu	Kennedy	Salazar
Clarke	Kildee	Sanchez, Linda
Clay	Kilpatrick (MI)	T.
Cleaver	Kilroy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kind	Sarbanes
Cohen	Klein (FL)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kosmas	Schiff
Costa	Kucinich	Schrader
Costello	Langevin	Schwartz
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Critz	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cuellar	Levin	Sestak
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Loebsock	Shuler
Davis (TN)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
DeGette	Lowe	Skelton
Delahunt	Lujan	Slaughter
DeLauro	Maloney	Smith (WA)
Deutch	Markey (CO)	Snyder
Dicks	Markey (MA)	Space
Dingell	Matsui	Speier
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Doyle	McCollum	Stark
Driehaus	McDermott	Stupak
Edwards (MD)	McGovern	Sutton
Edwards (TX)	McIntyre	Tanner
Ehlers	Meeck (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Melancon	Tierney
Eshoo	Michaud	Titus
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Tonko
Faleomavaega	Miller, George	Towns
Farr	Mollohan	Tsongas
Fattah	Moore (KS)	Van Hollen
Filner	Moore (WI)	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Walz
Garamendi	Nadler (NY)	Wasserman
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Schultz
Gordon (TN)	Neal (MA)	Waters
Grayson	Norton	Watt
Green, Al	Oberstar	Waxman
Green, Gene	Obey	Weiner
Grijalva	Olver	Welch
Gutierrez	Ortiz	Wilson (OH)
Hall (NY)	Pallone	Woolsey
Halvorson	Pascarell	Wu
Hare	Pastor (AZ)	
Harman	Payne	

NOT VOTING—15

Akin	Lynch	Tiahrt
Andrews	McCarthy (CA)	Wamp
Carson (IN)	Moran (KS)	Watson
Griffith	Radanovich	Yarmuth
Hoekstra	Shadegg	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1808

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MELANCON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BACA, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. KANJORSKI, BRADY of Pennsylvania, DINGELL, ACKERMAN, OBERSTAR, TOWNS, LARSON of Connecticut, LIPINSKI, CLEAVER, WU, LUJAN, Mrs. HALVORSON, Messrs. CUELLAR, THOMPSON of Mississippi and CARNEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. FOSTER, YOUNG of Alaska, KISSELL, HIMES and SCHAUER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 225, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

AYES—197

Aderholt	Flake	McClintock
Adler (NJ)	Fleming	McCotter
Alexander	Forbes	McHenry
Austria	Fortenberry	McKeon
Bachmann	Foster	McMahon
Bachus	Fox	McMorris
Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Rodgers
Bartlett	Frelinghuysen	Melancon
Barton (TX)	Gallely	Mica
Bean	Garrett (NJ)	Michaud
Biggert	Gerlach	Miller (FL)
Billray	Giffords	Miller (MI)
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Minnick
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Mitchell
Blunt	Granger	Moore (KS)
Boehner	Graves (GA)	Murphy (NY)
Bonner	Graves (MO)	Murphy, Tim
Bono Mack	Guthrie	Myrick
Boozman	Hall (TX)	Neugebauer
Boustany	Harper	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Olson
Bright	Heinrich	Paul
Broun (GA)	Heller	Paulsen
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Pence
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Peters
Ginny	Hill	Peterson
Buchanan	Himes	Petri
Burgess	Hunter	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Inglis	Platts
Buyer	Issa	Poe (TX)
Calvert	Jenkins	Posey
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Putnam
Cantor	Jones	Rehberg
Cao	Jordan (OH)	Reichert
Capito	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Carney	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rogers (MI)
Castle	Kline (MN)	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Kratovil	Rooney
Childers	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Lance	Roskam
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Royce
Cole	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Latta	Scalise
Cooper	Lee (NY)	Schmidt
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Schock
Culberson	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Sessions
Dent	Lucas	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Luetkemeyer	Shuler
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lummis	Shuster
Djou	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Donnelly (IN)	E.	Smith (NE)
Dreier	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Driehaus	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Duncan	Marchant	Smith (WA)
Ehlers	Marshall	Stearns
Emerson	Matheson	Sullivan
Fallin	McCaul	Tanner

Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi

Turner
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1817

Mr. DELAHUNT changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 252, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

AYES—169

NOES—225

Ackerman
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bocieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herse
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar

Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—16

Akin
Andrews
Griffith
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Kilpatrick (MI)

Lynch
McCarthy (CA)
Moran (KS)
Radanovich
Shadegg
Tiahrt

Wamp
Watson
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culbertson
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hodes
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Murphy (NY)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NOES—252

Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bocieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (GA)
Lujan
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey

Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Akin
Andrews
Connolly (VA)
Gutierrez
Hoekstra

Kilpatrick (MI)
Lynch
McCarthy (CA)
Moran (KS)
Radanovich
Shadegg

Tiahrt
Wamp
Watson
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1826

So the amendment was rejected.

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)

Arcuri
Baca

Baird
Baldwin

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chair, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 488, 489, and 490.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 488, "yes" on rollcall 489, and "yes" on rollcall 490.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part A of House Report 111-578.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation or the Federal Aviation Administration to pursue, adopt, or enforce guidelines or regulations requiring a sponsor of a general aviation airport to terminate an existing residential through-the-fence agreement, or otherwise withhold funds from a sponsor of a general aviation airport, solely because the sponsor enters into an agreement that grants a person that owns residential real property adjacent to the airport access to the airfield of the airport for non-commercial uses.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

□ 1830

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Graves-Boswell amendment. I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa for offering this amendment with me and for his support.

Our amendment prohibits the FAA from using funds in this act to terminate an existing residential through-the-fence agreement at public-use general aviation airports. It also prevents the FAA from withholding funds from the sponsor of a GA airport, solely because that sponsor enters into a residential through-the-fence agreement.

To kind of explain this, the sponsor can be the airport authority, it might be the community, it might be the municipality, it might be the county in many cases. What a residential through-the-fence agreement is is an agreement between the airport sponsor and a person who might own residential property adjacent to that airport. These agreements simply provide the property owner and their aircraft access to the airport.

It is very important to note that this amendment does not require a GA airport to enter into one of these residential agreements. If an airport or that airport authority—city, county, municipality—if they feel that such an agreement is not beneficial to the airport or they simply don't like the idea,

then they don't have to enter into an agreement. It's always been that way. It's up to those communities. Those communities, the municipalities, counties, they own the airport. The Federal Government doesn't. What this amendment simply does is keep that option out there on the table.

Most recently the FAA began targeting public-use airports that have residential through-the-fence agreements. In some cases, the FAA has withheld annual Airport Improvement Program funds from GA airports solely because the airport has a residential through-the-fence agreement. Airport Improvement Program funds are those funds that are deposited into the general aviation trust fund from taxes on aviation fuel. That's where it comes from. They go to these airports to make improvements, to expand airports, whatever the case may be; but the FAA has withheld those funds simply because an airport has entered into one of these agreements.

Residential through-the-fence agreements can safely coexist with GA airports. The FAA's policy banning all of these residential agreements remains, I think, misguided and unjustified. Rather than work through these on a case-by-case basis, the FAA finds it more convenient just to prohibit them altogether.

Our amendment will prohibit the FAA from enforcing this policy just in fiscal year 2011. What I am trying to do is hopefully give us some time so we can find a more permanent, long-term solution. This amendment does not prohibit the FAA from deeming an airport to be out of compliance. If an airport violates any of the criteria that are out there, they could still hold them accountable. They simply can't do it solely because the airport has entered into a residential through-the-fence agreement.

Again, Mr. Chairman, just to try to put it in basic terms, these airports belong to the cities and the counties. They don't belong to the Federal Government, and I think it's wrong that the Federal Government would withhold funds from them simply because they entered into one of these agreements. It should be up to the city; it should be up to the community or whoever the airport authority is and not up to the Federal Government.

I rise in support of the Graves-Boswell amendment. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for helping out with this. He has been a strong general aviation advocate for many, many years and obviously very active in this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the authorizing committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. The gentleman from Missouri, a strong advocate of general aviation, a great member of our committee, has expressed a very genuine concern and has introduced legislation; a bill that was introduced in March of this year, referred to our committee. We have asked for comments from the administration; that is, from DOT and FAA. Meanwhile, the FAA in January of this year initiated a process to address the issues created by the so-called "through-the-fence" agreements. They formed a policy review team to gather information, evaluate the concerns, decide what kind of action could be taken to address the concerns.

And what are these concerns? Well, I know the former president of the Airport Owners and Pilots Association, Phil Boyer, retired, I think, to Florida, to a place where he has an airplane literally in his garage. He can roll it out onto a runway and fly wherever he needs to go. That's the kind of thing we're talking about here.

Under these agreements, people have total access to runways, taxiways, sensitive operational parts of the airport. But people and pets have ventured onto airport property. Homeowners have hunted. They've thrown parties. They have buried pets on airport grounds. These are the reports we got from the FAA. These agreements have hamstrung airports in planning for the future, planning for safety and improving safety. With airport land encumbered by such agreements, airports may not be free to make the necessary safety improvements they require.

I would propose to the gentleman that we allow the FAA to continue its policy review team, bring forth recommendations; I would schedule a hearing in the Aviation Subcommittee, with the concurrence of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the chairman of the subcommittee; and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), schedule a hearing in committee, and air the issues.

The provisions that the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, has included in the bill he has introduced are very beneficial suggestions. They don't deal specifically with the issues that I just cited but those will be the subject of this review by the FAA. We'll give them a deadline of reporting to us in mid September, schedule a hearing and fashion a legislative proposal which we could then bring to the floor on suspension of the rules pending an agreement. But I think the gentleman's introduced bill is a much more thoughtful approach to the issue than just a bludgeoning of the FAA, cutting off and saying they can't take action.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 30 seconds.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I very much appreciate the chairman's willingness to work with me on

this and to move forward. This is going to be a process that is going to take some time. We need to come up with some thoughtful consideration.

□ 1840

What I'm trying to do today with this amendment, though, is just prevent us from doing some irreparable damage to these airports and to these agreements in the meantime, just this year. It's just for this fiscal year, just to slow this process down and to address some of the FAA's concerns.

Mr. OLVER. I again yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the authorizing committee, Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I would just conclude that it's inappropriate for us to impose this penalty on the FAA through the appropriation process. A much more appropriate way would be to deal with it through our committee.

I commit to the gentleman that we will work through to hopefully a legislative solution. Certainly, the FAA's committed to do that, and I will talk to the Administrator of the FAA, tell him we expect to hold a hearing on this issue mid-September, that they will be prepared to report to us whatever findings they have from the policy review team at that point.

I am prepared to do that if the gentleman would consider withdrawing his amendment or at least not pressing it to a recorded vote. If the gentleman presses to a recorded vote, I'd be constrained to oppose it.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you what, I would rather not withdraw the amendment, but I would take just a voice vote. I would like to say if I can, I just appreciate the chairman's willingness to work with me on this, and I understand what he's saying, too, and I respect it. But thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding to me.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 111-578.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$250,000)".

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,000)".

Page 2, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$175,000)".

Page 3, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000)".

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000)".

Page 9, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$225,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, indeed, this Transportation appropriations bill is a jobs creations bill, and I am totally in support of that.

My amendment here would modestly increase funding for the Department of Transportation's efforts to help small and disadvantaged businesses obtain transportation contracts. It would add funding beyond the \$14,000 increase requested by the President for the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization within the Secretary's office, and to increase the capacity for the department to reach out to small and disadvantaged businesses.

When I talk about small and disadvantaged businesses, it's not just ethnic minority businesses. It's veteran-owned businesses. It's women-owned businesses. This is an issue that affects every district, both Democrat and Republican.

This amendment is about strengthening these small, but important, programs and the work that they do and sending a strong signal to small businesses and to the Secretary about the level of importance that we as a Congress place on creating opportunities for American businesses that are deserved.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLVER. I'm very sensitive to the issues that the gentlewoman has raised, and I think these are very modest changes and I'm quite willing to accept the amendment that she has proposed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part A of House Report 111-578.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. __. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$10,520,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, earlier this week the House voted 393-24 to pass legislation that would cancel hundreds of millions of dollars in old earmarks that have been sitting unused, sometimes some of those for over 20 years.

The Surface Transportation Earmark Rescission, Savings, and Accountability Act rescinded \$713 million of Federal highway contract authority for 309 Member-designated projects for the Surface Transportation Authorization Acts of 1987, 1991, 1998 and 2005.

After passage of this legislation, Members of Congress should be applauded for supporting these common-sense spending cuts. We said long-term economic growth and recovery can't happen unless we cut wasteful government spending and tackle our exploding deficit. We agreed that these earmarks were a wasteful use of the taxpayers' money.

The number of unused earmarks in these old transportation bills shows that Congress needs a better process of deciding how to spend the taxpayers' money. While many on the other side want to continue their practice of earmarking on their constituents' behalf, I cannot support this reckless spending. The bill before us today includes over 500 new earmarks that we cannot simply afford. More importantly, these earmarks are potentially causing even more government inefficiency.

While I supported the bill on Tuesday, we also need to be honest that it did not actually reduce any spending. These projects have been on hold for a long time, and this money was never going to be used and never was allocated. I agree that Congress should repeal spending that is not going to be used, but we didn't reduce the deficit \$700 million by taking out these old earmarks, even though we talked like that's what we were actually doing.

Today, we get to vote on an amendment that actually cuts unspent funds. My amendment says that we should take the unspent money from the stimulus package and return it to the taxpayers. Most of us agreed that we should take unspent money out of the old transportation earmarks in the vote earlier this week. Most of us should agree then that with this bill we should take and give back to the American taxpayer the stimulus money that has not been spent.

My amendment would reduce the FY 2011 spending bill by the same amount that's yet to be committed from the \$61.7 billion included in the 2009 economic stimulus bill for transportation and housing programs. According to the Appropriations Committee report, \$10.52 billion went to programs that have not been committed to yet, and much less, the money has not been spent or is not out the door.

If Americans go to recovery.gov and review the agency reports for the Department of Transportation or Housing and Urban Development, they will learn that we're once again double-dipping on the backs of their children and their grandchildren. Here are just a few examples of programs receiving more money in today's spending bill that has money left from the 2009 stimulus bill.

One of those is the bill that is before us today, \$2 billion for capital investment grants. While these grants may provide worthy investments in the infrastructure, there is still \$800 million left from the stimulus that has not been spent.

Today's bill includes \$3.5 billion in grants for airports. However, there's more than \$1 billion left from the stimulus bill.

Grants to the Amtrak system that were slated to receive \$563 million already has almost \$1.3 billion ready to go out the door as we so often hear but actually not spent.

Moving on to housing, we still have \$2.2 billion in the Home Investment Partnership Program to spend from the stimulus, but today, we're poised to add another \$1.8 billion on top of the 2.2 that hasn't been spent.

□ 1850

Mr. Chairman, as we learned on Tuesday, we can raise up, rise above the partisan differences and put a stop to these projects that aren't working, won't be funded and aren't completed and ready to be taken off the books. Today we have an opportunity once again this time to vote to actually reduce spending and the deficit.

I recall the proponents arguing about this stimulus bill and how it's going to create new jobs for the American people. We were going to spend nearly a trillion dollars. We were going to create all these jobs. Unfortunately, unemployment was not going to go above 8 percent. Today 9.5 percent of the American people are out of work. We have lost 2.7 million jobs since this stimulus bill has passed.

Mr. Chairman, let's give the American people a break here. Let's give them their money back. This is money we don't have. We don't have a lot of money that's in this bill. For every dollar we are going to spend we are going to borrow 43 cents. We are going to charge it to our children and our grandchildren.

Quite honestly, it is not sustainable. Our national debt is \$13 trillion today. We are headed to \$20 trillion. We are headed to having debt almost equal to 90 percent of our total economy.

Mr. Chairman, let's give the American people a break. Let's give them their \$10 billion back. A lot of people say, well, it's just \$10 billion; but that's the problem around here. People don't take money seriously because it's not real money to them because we are charging it to our children and our grandchildren.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would oppose the amendment, both as the gentleman has described it and also as it is written. As the amendment is written and in our hands, it is a straight across-the-board amendment of a couple of billion dollars difference from the one that was offered by Mr. CULBERSON earlier and has been defeated by roll call vote in the last round of roll calls.

As described by the gentleman, he is dealing with monies that are not yet expended in the Recovery Act.

And those monies in the Recovery Act are ones that are, in the Recovery Act, those are monies, some of which are under high-speed rail or TIGER Grants, those monies have not yet been fully obligated, but they were not expected ever to have expended out in this first couple of years of the Recovery Act's life.

They were expected to be expended within the next 2 or 3 years at our given time until the end of fiscal 2012 to be expended. Others are being expended and really going into jobs right now, day after day after day. Every day, more of the monies that spend out more rapidly get used and get counted as having been expended at the end of every month.

But the amendment that is in our hands is specifically merely a sum of money taken off the bottom line of the bill on all appropriated funds, which is all of the discretionary \$67 billion, and \$10 billion off \$67 billion would be about 16 or so, 15 or 16 percent of that appropriated money that the bill involved. But it has nothing to do with monies that are related to the ARRA.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Thank you.

In the particular category you are talking about, \$116 million is still available. You only spent \$6.9 million, yet you are asking for \$1.4 billion. We were told that this money was going to go out the door real quickly to create jobs for the American people, yet we have a lot of these categories that still have a substantial amount of money.

We are plussing up with new money when we haven't even spent the money we had before. And I think this sense of urgency must have gone away because these projects, the money has not been spent.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming my time, but the gentleman is not talking about the amendment that is before us. He is talking about a different issue, about money that has not been expended in ARRA funds or money that has not yet been expended in the 2010. I am not quite sure which it is.

But the amendment that is before us, at least as we have understood it, as we

have it given to us, is an amendment that simply takes from the bottom line of the bill before us from the discretionary amount a total of \$10.5 billion, and I must oppose that proposal.

In closing, I just want to repeat again that our bill is already \$1.3 billion below the President's request that, as I had said earlier today, and have said at least twice, that we have used the President's request. We have not funded, in the base bill that is here today, several items that have never been authorized and really require authorization that total \$4.8 billion.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, on that I request a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. BRALEY OF IOWA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part A of House Report 111-578.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 77, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 78, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 98, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the amendment that I have offered to increase funds within the Community Development Block Grant by \$20 million to be used for disaster relief and recovery in the Midwest by reducing funding for the administration operations and management and nonpersonnel expenses in the bill.

This past weekend, heavy rains caused major flooding in parts of my district. Lake Delhi, which you see on this illustration, was a treasured summer retreat. It's gone. The 9-mile long lake disappeared after sudden flood waters breached its 92-year-old dam on Saturday morning. I was standing at the south end of the dam watching this happen at 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

Over a dozen other communities in my district are also experiencing major flooding this week.

This \$20 million increase to CDBG will be used to help aid flood relief and recovery in the Midwest. The eligibility requirements for CDBG clearly

state that grant funds can be used for particularly urgent community development needs because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the public.

Due to the flooding, parts of my district are currently experiencing serious and immediate threats to the public. Piles of flood-polluted garbage are piling up and raising serious public health concerns.

You can see the damage that has been caused as the lake has drained. The stench of rotting fish permeates the air around Lake Delhi. Many of the homes are experiencing major flood damage while values are expected to plummet as the lake has disappeared.

The CDBG funds have been used in the past to aid in disaster relief and recovery. In 1997, they were used to aid communities in the upper Midwest affected by severe flooding.

In 2002, emergency CDBG funds were awarded to the State of New York for assistance for properties and businesses damaged by the terrorist attacks of 9/11. These emergency funds helped these businesses with economic revitalization.

□ 1900

I look forward to working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as the State of Iowa, to ensure that the CDBG funds are properly used to aid in flood recovery and relief. I urge everyone to support flood relief for the Midwest.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the chairman.

I certainly rise in support of the amendment. It is a disaster that happened, and like the gentleman from Iowa said, just to watch that dam collapse and all the damage that went through afterwards was devastating to so many folks. And so I think this is a good amendment, and I'm very proud to support it.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for his comments and I agree with him totally. These kinds of disasters need to be taken care of as soon as can be possible after they occur.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part A of House Report 111-578.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 420. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any prohibition or restriction on the establishment or effectiveness of any occupancy preference for veterans in supportive housing for the elderly that (1) is provided assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and (2)(A) is or would be located on property of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or (B) is subject to an enhanced use lease with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TURNER. I want to thank the Rules Committee for ruling my amendment in order and for providing this opportunity to assist low-income seniors and our Nation's veterans with obtaining safe and quality housing.

This amendment is a narrowly tailored, pro-veteran amendment which allows the VA to maintain its requirement of a veteran's preference on HUD-financed housing on VA campuses. Unfortunately, HUD has rules that don't allow for a veteran's preference for people who live in facilities built with HUD funds, even if they are built on VA property. My amendment simply says that no funds in this bill could go toward enforcing these rules against a facility that is built on a VA campus or is utilizing a VA-enhanced use lease.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. We carried this amendment last year. We accepted this amendment last year, and I am perfectly happy to accept the amendment again this year if that is acceptable to the gentleman.

Mr. TURNER. I would greatly appreciate that. It certainly goes to help our veterans and our low-income seniors.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MRS. KIRKPATRICK OF ARIZONA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part A of House Report 111-578.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is

not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to cut by 5 percent all of the discretionary spending in the Fiscal Year 2011 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act. I offer this amendment because it is imperative that Washington finally take notice and start acting to combat this year's record budget deficit and fast-growing national debt, which at last count amounted to an astounding \$13.2 trillion.

Just 2 weeks ago, the cochairs of the nonpartisan Debt and Deficit Commission, former Republican Senator Alan Simpson and former Chief of Staff to President Bill Clinton, Erskine Bowles, said that if the government fails to take action, our debilitating Federal debt will destroy the country from within. Bowles further described the debt as a cancer on our Nation.

There are plenty of folks in my district and all across the country who are finding ways to raise families, run small businesses, and pay their bills despite having lost their jobs or taking deep pay cuts in this economic downturn. If the families in my district have been able to tighten their belts, then surely the Federal Government can do the same.

Congress should be leading by example when facing tough economic decisions. My proposed 5 percent congressional pay cut is just one way Members can show they are serious about tackling the looming fiscal crisis. That is why I have previously supported budget cuts to Federal programs and will continue to support such cuts as our economy recovers, and that is why I am offering this amendment.

I strongly support building our national infrastructure—roads and bridges, affordable housing, quality education, and expanding broadband—but our long-term fiscal health depends on Congress making hard choices today to protect our ability to provide critical infrastructure tomorrow.

This amendment makes a 5 percent cut to the programs funded in this bill, but ordinary families are seeing much bigger cuts to their income. I have to believe that if those families can continue to make ends meet in these tough times, the Transportation and Housing Departments can keep the important programs going with 95 cents out of each dollar.

We are here to represent the folks back home, the folks who understand that the old ways of Washington no longer work for the American people. Please join me in supporting this cut.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment as presented by the gentlewoman from Arizona.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides a new wrinkle on what we have been dealing with earlier. Again, this is somewhat different from what the gentlewoman has expressed, but as written, it reads, "Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 5 percent." Now, what that means is it's not just discretionary expenditure, but it also applies to the nondiscretionary part of this bill. It is not just on the \$67 billion of discretionary expenditure that is part of this underlying bill, but the whole \$126 billion, which covers all of the contractor authority for all of the small safety agencies that get money out of the Highway Trust Fund, and also applies to the moneys that go to the FTA that come out of the transit portion of the Highway Trust Fund. So that is the way that is written.

There is a provision at the end, the part that I read, "or otherwise made available by a provision of law," which leaves CBO unable to score this amendment at all, and they cannot tell us what it really is meant to do. It says it cannot be implemented in this form.

So I must oppose this amendment for all of those reasons, because it goes far beyond the discretionary expenditure. That is different. Each of the earlier large cut amendments have been ones that purported to take only from the discretionary expenditure, and this one covers all of what is involved in this legislation, both the discretionary and the contract authority supported parts of the legislation, plus apparently some other things.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Chairman OLVER, the intent is to cut only discretionary spending by 5 percent. I will be happy to work with you to clarify that language.

Mr. OLVER. Well, we cannot change the language of the amendment at this point. I would be happy to work with the gentlewoman to find out exactly what was intended to be done here and try to work with you, but for the moment, I must oppose this amendment.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I agree to work with you.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I think enough has been said. It cannot be amended. It cannot be implemented. It cannot even be scored to know how much is really involved in it.

□ 1910

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-

woman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part A of House Report 111-578.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$18,579,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, who would have thought we would have witnessed the things we have witnessed in this country over the last 2 years?

Who would have ever thought the President of the United States would fire the CEO of General Motors?

Who would have ever thought in this great country we would see the taxpayers bail out the financial industry and bail out the auto industry?

Who would have ever thought in this country we would have a pay czar—a pay czar—telling private American citizens how much money they can make?

Who would have ever thought in this country we would have a major policy change, done in a completely partisan fashion, when the health care bill passed and when the majority of Americans opposed it?

Who would have ever thought, as OMB pointed out this past week, that we would have a \$1.4 trillion deficit—the largest deficit in American history—and a \$13 trillion national debt? On the path we are on currently, by 2020, we will have a \$26 trillion deficit.

Who would have thought those things would take place?

I would argue, although the other side is going to say, "Oh, this is terrible. We can't reduce the spending level in this bill to the amount that the gentleman wants," this is a modest first step. This is a modest initial step towards providing some fiscal sanity to this town and to this Congress.

My amendment is real simple. It says this bill should go back and we should spend it at 2008 baseline levels. After all, a lot of families are living on something less. A lot of families have had to live on what they were functioning on in 2008. A lot of small businesses are functioning on what they had to in 2008.

Why in the heck can't the Federal Government do the same thing?

This amendment takes us back to 2008 levels, which was before the bailouts, before the so-called "stimulus,"

before the out-of-control spending. Remember, since 2008, there has been a 38 percent increase in this bill. So this takes it back to a reasonable level, and I would argue this is a modest first step that the American people want us to take.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not a modest one by any means. It is a double ax taken to the legislation that is involved. It takes \$18 billion out of only the discretionary amount of funding that is provided in the underlying bill. As such, that is between 20 and 25 percent of the reduction in all of the discretionary accounts from the underlying bill.

Who would have ever thought that we would have gotten so deep in deregulation and had our major financial services regulating agencies so asleep at the switch that we would have ended up in a housing crisis, a foreclosure crisis, that has been raging to the point where there are 6 or 8 million foreclosed homes? It almost brought, not only the American financial system to its knees, but almost the whole world's financial system to its knees. It ended up with the Secretary of the Treasury, under the administration of the previous President, coming to Congress and asking for us—begging us, begging the Congress—to bail out the biggest banks in this country, the banks which caused the housing crisis by running a casino on Wall Street.

In that process, by that time, by the time they came to Congress to ask for that bailout, we were already four quarters into a recession in this country, a recession that raged throughout the whole of the year of 2008 and on into at least the first two quarters of 2009.

We have begun to come back out of that recession. We passed a stimulus bill within 1 month of the new President's being inaugurated, which, within another month, turned job losses to job gains—or at least to a reduction of job losses for a series of months. Now, in the last 6 months or so, there have been job gains. We have been out of the recession, but it is not a recovery that is happening very quickly.

Whoever would have thought that all of those things would have happened?

We have a series of economists who pointed out we had to do exactly those things—first, the bailout of the banks, which most of us in Congress, I think from both sides, voted for, and there were people on the other side of the aisle who voted for that legislation. Most of us expected that there would be some kind of evenhanded handling of the largest investment banks and also of those who had been bilked out of their money in the housing crisis and who had gone through foreclosures,

but the foreclosure crisis has gone on and gone on and gone on much farther than it should have been allowed to go.

Whoever would have thought that all of those things would have happened in America?

We are now coming out of this recession. If an amendment were implemented, such as the one the gentleman from Ohio has proposed, it would send us right back into the recession. We cannot do this. Though, I wonder, as I think I may have asked you earlier, Mr. Chairman: Is this a deliberate effort to put us back into a double-dip recession that would be so similar to the Great Depression?

This was exactly what happened in 1937, which was 4 years after the inauguration of FDR. Four years later, we went back into a recession, which took another 4 years of experiencing a really very, very bad economy. We are coming out with the rather prudent actions that have been taken by Congress and by this administration, and we must continue on that path.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Just a couple of quick responses to the chairman's comments.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I voted against the bank bailout, the TARP bailout. If my memory serves me correctly, the gentleman voted for that proposal.

Second, the chairman's comments about how this is such a dramatic cut is a great example of how out of touch this town is with the American people. All this amendment does is say let's spend what we spent just 2 years ago, in 2008. Go talk to average Americans. They think that's probably something the Federal Government could do—spend what we were spending 2 years ago.

Also, remember that this bill is a 38 percent increase over 2008. That's on top of the transportation spending that was in the stimulus bill. So it's even bigger than 38 percent, this increase over 2008.

Finally, I would say this: If big government spending, if big government taxation, if big government regulation were going to get us out of this economic mess, well, heck, we'd have been out of it a long time ago because that's all this government has been doing for 2 years.

□ 1920

Mr. Chairman, I will just close with this. How bad does it have to get before we can begin to reduce some spending around here? Do we have to have a \$2 trillion deficit? Do we have to get to \$30 trillion in debt? I mean, how bad does it have to get before we can start to do those things that make sense and that will guarantee a prosperous future for our kids and our grandkids?

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

It is the Chair's understanding that amendment No. 19 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part A of House Report 111-578.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the amendment on behalf of Congresswoman BACHMANN.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 53, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,203,500,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply reduce funding for capital and debt service grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for capital investments by \$1.2 million.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), who is the chairperson of the authorizing committee for rail.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I encourage my colleagues to oppose this terrible amendment.

Rail in America is experiencing a renaissance that we haven't seen in 50 years. All forms of passenger rail, including Amtrak, are seeing increased ridership numbers. In fact, in 2009 Amtrak welcomed aboard over 27 million passengers, the second largest annual total in Amtrak history. An average of more than 74,000 passengers ride more than 300 Amtrak trains per day. And with gridlocked roadways and ever increasing prices in gas, ridership will only increase.

Amtrak provides a majority of all intercity passenger rail in the United States, with more States and localities across America turning to passenger rail to meet the transportation needs of their citizens.

Amtrak reduces congestion and improves our energy independence. One full passenger train can take 250 to 350

cars off the road. Passenger rail also consumes less energy than both automobiles and commercial airlines.

Moreover, Amtrak plays a vital role in emergency preparedness and recovery during Hurricane Katrina. In fact, Amtrak was the only entity that could get into New Orleans to evacuate victims and deliver food, water, and supplies.

Amtrak has made significant improvements in its system over the last several years, has steadily increased ridership numbers, plays a vital role in disaster recovery, and has an ambitious agenda for future growth.

Indeed, it was Congresswoman BACHMANN and her Republican colleagues that put this country in this terrible debt and financial situation that we're in right now by rubber-stamping the Bush tax cut for the rich year after year, what I call "reverse Robin Hood." We're robbing from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich.

I encourage my colleagues to support your constituents, support Amtrak, and vote "no" on this terrible amendment.

I have a letter that I want to submit for the RECORD from the chairman of Amtrak, Joe Boardman.

And I just want to give one statement. The lack of capital funds would deny intercity passenger rail service to 29 million people in over 500 communities in 46 States.

And remember, folks, if it's FLAKE, it's "no."

NATIONAL RAILROAD
PASSENGER CORPORATION,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2010.

Hon. MEMBER OF CONGRESS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to advise you what the impact to Amtrak would be if Representative Bachmann's amendment to eliminate \$1.2 billion in capital funding is adopted during today's floor debate of the FY11 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies bill. If enacted, Amtrak would have no capital investment program for FY11. The lack of a capital funding program would deny intercity passenger rail service to 29 million people in over 500 communities in 46 states. Amtrak is on track to have the highest ridership year ever, carrying more people, more places than we did two years ago when the country was experiencing record high gas prices. This amendment would require us to furlough nearly all of our 20,000 employees who live in nearly every state in the Union. It would hamper the operation of key commuter rail services in major metropolitan areas including much of the Northeast, Chicago, Seattle, and Northern and Southern California, and we would default on commercial loans which finance most of our equipment.

Just under two years ago, Congress recognized the importance of intercity passenger rail and approved a reauthorization of Amtrak in the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act. Amtrak's appropriations request for FY11 is in line with this congressionally-approved authorization.

Investment in Amtrak's capital program creates jobs, provides energy efficient mobility, and allows us to keep America's passenger railroad safe and reliable.

Sincerely,

JOE BOARDMAN,

President and Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, I misspoke earlier; I left off three zeros. This amendment would save \$1.2 billion, not \$1.2 million. It's easy to mess that up these days, given all the zeros we're talking about.

The U.S. Department of Transportation calculates that the average Amtrak passenger receives a \$210 Federal subsidy for their ticket. Larger subsidies obviously go to underperforming routes and those traveling in first class or sleeper cars. In fact, the Federal Government says that it could actually save money by buying a plane ticket for every passenger on some of the worst performing routes, like that from Orlando to L.A., for example. This has been going on for a long, long time, and we're always told that Amtrak will be self-sufficient just around the corner, or that something else will happen; and it simply never does. It's kind of the transportation version of corn ethanol subsidies. So, I don't want to anger another group here.

But anyway, it just seems to never, never end; and we keep subsidizing on and on. It might be one thing if we were running a big surplus to do this. We're not: 42 or 41 cents on every dollar we spend this year will be borrowed from future generations, from the Chinese, from other bond holders. When we're spending, when we're borrowing 42 cents on every dollar, I think it behooves us to look for areas where we can save; and this is a modest area here, to cut some, just a small portion, of the subsidy that we currently provide.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to express that this amendment for a program which is totally authorized, and we are not running above the authorization number on Amtrak by any means at all, but this is a killer amendment for Amtrak to remove all of their capital funds, as this amendment purports to do. So I oppose the amendment, and urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This amendment eliminates all of Amtrak's capital and debt service grants but the \$132 million that Amtrak receives from state and local agencies for capital improvements.

This amendment is nothing more than a rehash of the Bush Administration's numerous yet unsuccessful attempts to force Amtrak into bankruptcy.

Let's be clear: This is a shut-down amendment. A shut-down of Amtrak will strand millions of rail passengers, disrupt commuter operations, add to our already congested roads and airports, eliminate well over 20,000 jobs nationwide, and jeopardize local economies and businesses that depend on Amtrak's service.

The gentle lady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) must know that without capital

funding provided by the federal government, Amtrak won't be able to maintain its own rail network. Amtrak is then left with two choices: shut-down or jeopardize the safety of millions of Amtrak riders, passengers on the commuter railroads that operate along the Northeast Corridor, and the crewmembers of at least two freight railroads—Norfolk Southern and CSX, which rely upon Amtrak's infrastructure and dispatching services in the Corridor.

Amtrak won't be able to replace any ties; fix any track, tunnels, or bridges; make station improvements; overhaul equipment; or invest in much-needed safety and security improvements. Further, the railroad won't be able to make any of the capital improvements necessary to make the 481 Amtrak-served stations, platforms, parking facilities, and other structures accessible to persons with disabilities, as required under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Funding for Amtrak's fleet plan would be decimated. The fleet, both locomotives and railcars, are the only means for Amtrak to provide service. If Amtrak's fleet can't be maintained, then Amtrak can't provide service—certainly not safe and reliable service.

Right now, the average age of Amtrak's passenger car fleet is 25. The mainstay of the Amtrak fleet are 412 "Amfleet I" passenger cars commonly used on the Northeast Corridor; these cars were built between 1974 and 1977 and are presently beyond their assumed 30-year commercial life cycle. Amtrak's Heritage Equipment railcars were built as far back as 1948. Baggage cars, used on long distance trains, were built between 1950 and 1961. Dining cars, also used on long distance trains, were built between 1948 and 1958. The locomotive fleet fares no better. Amtrak's locomotives average 21 years of age. Based on the 20-year commercial life cycle of a locomotive, replacement locomotives are already overdue.

Amtrak plans to overhaul its fleet and purchase new equipment over the next several years. Amtrak is already in discussions with General Electric to purchase new locomotives, and with other companies to purchase new rail cars and parts for maintenance for the existing fleet, which in turn will provide hundreds if not thousands of jobs for an entire industry (railway suppliers) that is rapidly declining in America. But without capital funding, that won't happen.

No funding for capital means no jobs.

According to the Association of American Railroads, if Amtrak shutdown, the freight rail industry would lose an estimated \$5.3 billion over the next six years at a time when the freight railroads are just starting to recover from the economic crisis and bring people back to work.

I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

It is now in order to consider amendments printed in part B of House Report 111-578.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk designated as No. 2, Part B.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading "Federal Highway Administration—Federal-Aid Highways (Limitation on Obligations)" shall be available for the Blackstone River Bikeway project in Rhode Island, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by \$1,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment would prohibit \$1 million from going to the Rhode Island Department of Transportation for the Blackstone River Bikeway, and it would reduce the overall cost of the bill by a commensurate amount.

This particular earmark would fund a project to construct a 3½ mile route or portion of a bikeway in North Smithfield, and Woonsocket, including the construction of sections that would connect a public library, a planned middle school complex, and several bridges.

Here we have a project that is described as a cyclist's paradise of mill villages and farming communities in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. According to the Web site of the project, the bikeway is being developed thanks largely to Federal transportation funding, and it's an effort among Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management to Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation and on and on, some other entities as well.

□ 1930

Well, certainly Federal transportation funding is right. There is a lot of it going here. And a lot of earmarks have gone this way as well. Over the past several years, this project has received several earmarks. In fact, Citizens Against Government Waste has in their waste Pig Book this project has received five earmarks in transportation appropriations bills worth nearly \$7 million since 2002, including, last year, same project received a \$475,000 earmark; in 2005, a \$500,000 earmark; 2004, a \$1.5 million earmark; 2003, a \$3 million earmark; 2002, a \$1.5 million earmark. Why are we doing this?

Here we are, as we just mentioned, running a deficit of about \$1.4 trillion this year. We have a national debt north of \$13 trillion. Forty-two cents of every dollar we spend this year will be borrowed. Yet we can't wean ourselves off these kind of earmarks.

Bike paths. I love biking. I will go home this weekend and bike. But why in the world should the taxpayers at the Federal level be on the hook for an earmark for a bike path in Rhode Island? Why did we just choose this one? That's part of the problem of this system of earmarking that we have.

I look at this chart. The contemporary practice of earmarking is very much a spoils system. And if we look at the bill that we are considering right now, THUD, this is actually one of the least egregious offenders. If you look at the red area, that's the percentage of earmark dollars that are claimed by members of the Appropriations Committee or members of leadership or chairmen of committees. They represent about 13 percent of this body, yet they claim, look at this, look at the red, some bills, in the ag appropriations bill 76 percent of all earmarks will go to these 13 percent of powerful members. In this bill, 42 percent.

That's the problem. How do we choose this bike path as opposed to one in Utah or one in Alaska or somewhere else? It's a spoils system that has to stop. And if we can't stop it this year, when we're running a deficit of \$1.4 trillion, when will we stop it?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. I urge a "no" vote.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, to hear the gentleman talk, you would think that this bill is being gobbled up by a huge number of earmarks, causing the deficit to explode. The gentleman used a chart. I've got a chart too. This bar represents the total spending in this bill, \$67 billion. This bar represents the portion of that bill represented by earmarks. Mr. Chairman, I have a tough time finding it. Oh, yeah, with this magnifying glass I can almost see the bar that represents the earmarks. Less than one-half of 1 percent of this bill are represented by earmarks.

And you know what? The last time I looked, the Constitution gave the Congress the power of the purse. No Congress has ever changed any President's budget by more than 3 percent in all the time I have been here. And that 3 percent difference is the difference between having a President and having a king. And whether the President is Republican or Democratic, I want a President. I don't want a king.

So all I would suggest to the gentleman from Arizona is that he keep this in perspective. Keep it in perspective. Or as my old friend Archie the cockroach said once long ago, "Perspective is everything. Of what use is it for a queen bee to fall in love with a bull?"

Mr. FLAKE. I don't think we want to talk about bull. I don't know how it is in Wisconsin, but in Arizona, to have a

bill that has more than 400 earmarks worth more than \$300 million is not an insignificant sum.

Now, you can have a chart that takes the overall amount that the bill spends and then make \$300 million look pretty small. But only in Washington will people say, yeah, that looks pretty small. Anywhere else in the country they're going to say that's a pretty big amount. And everybody knows how the game works here. Earmarks are, as has been said by many, the gateway drug to spending addiction. Once you start getting earmarks, you start approving bloated appropriations bills worth \$67 billion. And if you didn't have your earmark in there, you wouldn't be likely to keep increasing the amounts that we spend every year.

Now, some may point out, hey, we are down this year from last year, but we were up 28 percent last year from the year before. That is what has got us into this problem where we have a deficit of \$1.4 trillion and we are borrowing 42 cents on every dollar, and then we dismiss \$300 million as insignificant.

I mean you can use a magnifying glass and try to make it sound like it's small, but it's \$300 million. And people across the country are saying if we don't start here, where do we start? If we can't do this, will we ever reform the entitlement programs we have to reform?

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems like my colleagues, as the saying goes, know the cost of everything but the value of nothing. I think the gentleman is exactly right, entitlements. That's where the money is. We all know it. And yet my colleagues have not seen fit to increase research, biomedical research that could show enormous offsets in the cost of care for people with Alzheimer's, autism, Parkinson's, epilepsy. But that's just the costs. Think about the difference in people's lives that research in helping people live more functional lives, the cost in their quality of life that could make.

But are they talking about savings in those respects? No, they're just talking about dollars and cents that seem to fit on a piece of paper, but not in a difference in people's lives. Here they're talking about a couple million dollars on a bike path. They say that that is something we shouldn't care about. I'm the Congressman from that district. I know what dollars come back home. I know the value of this bike path. It helps get people to enjoy the quality of their life.

In case people don't understand, there is a public health epidemic. It's called diabetes. It's called lack of exercise. I think we actually ought to be encouraging people to be outdoors. It is

a public health issue. We will be paying for this public health problem if people don't exercise. But this gentleman seems to dismiss the cost of a bike path. The point is that once again, cost of everything, value of nothing.

So we'll hear a bunch of these amendments come on down the pike. I just ask people to keep in mind this is coming up on the silly season, election time. People will sound like they care a lot about your bottom line. But the real issue is, do they really care about the other kinds of deficits? The deficits in education.

You can only make first grade once in your life, second grade once, third grade once. And if your kid's in the classroom with 35 kids that year because we decide to save money, guess what? Too bad for your kid. They have no dress rehearsal in their life. No dress rehearsal. So if we decide to save money this year, too bad for that kid because we all of a sudden got serious about our deficit.

Forget their deficit that they're going to live with for the rest of their life in terms of human potential because that wasn't on their balance sheet, ladies and gentlemen. That GNP never factored into their timetable, into their value system. That's not the GNP they were looking at. So let's start changing the way we value what our economy is and what it is that we value when we're looking at dollars and common sense.

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

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

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

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

□ 1940

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk designated as No. 4, part B.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading "Federal Highway Administration—Federal-Aid Highways (Limitation on Obligations)" shall be available for the Downtown Tacoma Streetscapes Improvement Project in Washington, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by \$1,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Before I start on this amendment, let me address what was just said here.

We're told by challenging these earmarks, \$300 million in this bill, that we, those who want to save some money here, know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. I think we better translate that into Chinese. And the next time we try to auction our bonds and we have no takers and the Chinese won't buy this paper, say, "Hey, you know the cost of everything but the value of nothing." See where that gets us.

It does matter what kind of deficits we run and what kind of debt we have. It matters. It matters a lot. We may say that it doesn't around here or that we'll get serious about it later or that we can fund all of the bike paths we want this year or streetscapes or whatever we're doing because we'll get serious about it next year, but we never seem to do it.

I've been doing this for several years now, and I hear that all the time. "Yeah, we'll get to it later. This year we've got to do this," and we never seem to get to it.

So I would just challenge the cost of everything, the value of nothing, those sayings. Yeah, they're nice to hear, but when you're running a deficit of \$1.4 trillion, I think there's a little too much cost there, and I think people across the country would agree.

This amendment would prohibit a million dollars going to the downtown Tacoma streetscape improvements in Tacoma, Washington, and reduce spending in the bill by a commensurate amount. According to the sponsor's Web site, the recipient will be the City of Tacoma, and the funding would be used toward streetscape improvements along Pacific Avenue in downtown Tacoma.

The City of Tacoma, I believe, has received a similar earmark in 2010 for \$800,000 to develop complete streets, including new bike paths, widening sidewalks, installing medians, street trees, and other amenities.

When do we stop here? Why do we choose this one and say the City of Tacoma deserves another earmark, this time to use for streetscapes. There are a lot of cities around the country that need streetscapes, a lot of them that are probably deserving. But why in the world did we choose this one?

Again, it goes back to the spoils system I talked about. Powerful Members on certain committees get the spoils, a huge, disproportionate percentage of it.

So you can talk all high and mighty about how Members know their districts better than those faceless bureaucrats, but apparently, unless you're a chairman of an important committee or you're on the right committee or you're in leadership, you don't know your district very well. So it's a spoils system that shouldn't be done. We ought to be saving money where we can.

And let me just remind Members here that people across the country, it's all well and good to say we couldn't take 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent from

that bill because that's indiscriminate; it would cut out all programs. Here, we're talking about one specific project. And you're going to have to justify voting against amendments to remove funding for a streetscape in Tacoma, Washington, that was picked for who knows why.

So I would just caution those who want to support this kind of earmarking that people across the country are fed up with it, and they know when Members vote specifically on amendments to strike funding for these projects that they would rather fund a project like this than actually help pay down the deficit we have.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Today I rise in opposition to the amendment from the gentleman from Arizona. The Downtown Tacoma Streetscapes Improvement Project is a vital economic recovery tool for the City of Tacoma.

The Tacoma area has an unemployment rate of 9 percent. In addition, the largest downtown employer has recently announced their plans to move. In response, the community came together and created a revitalization plan to redevelop the downtown corridor.

The overall plan is estimated to create 500 new jobs and help transform the local economy. This plan has strong local support through partnerships with the Tacoma-Pierce County Economic Development Board, the Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber of Commerce, the Executive Council for a Greater Tacoma, and the State of Washington. The local business community and other stakeholders have come out in favor of the project.

The city is doing their part by investing approximately \$35 million in local funds to implement the downtown revitalization plan. Federal investments serve as an important catalyst to allow the leveraging of public and private dollars.

This specific funding will be used to develop complete streets, which will involve transitioning existing right-of-ways for multimobile use, including new bike paths, widening sidewalks, and installing medians along the city's main downtown corridor.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important economic development project in my district, and I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment and ask that the Members vote against it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Again, this bill has 461 earmarks, \$328 million in those earmarks. I wish we could challenge them all. We can't. We've only been allowed the opportunity to challenge four of them. So we will have a rollcall vote on four amendments to strike these earmarks. So Members will have to go

from this body back to their districts this next month and say why they voted against an amendment to strike an earmark for downtown beautification in one city that was just picked by the Appropriations Committee and why in the world it's better to borrow 42 cents of every dollar we're spending here from our kids and our grandkids and our foreign debtors, why that is a good plan for economic development, why it wouldn't be better to actually pay down the debt to lessen this deficit a bit. That's what this is about.

So don't think we can hide behind, well, these were indiscriminate cuts. This is a specific cut to cut a certain earmark from the bill, in this case, that would cut a million dollars. It's not insignificant not to anyone outside of the Beltway. This is a specific amendment to strike a million dollars in spending for a streetscape for beautification in a certain city.

I think we ought to beautify the appropriations process a little bit by actually having fewer earmarks and saving a little money.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk designated as No. 10, part B.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" shall be available for the Restoration and Improvements to the Historic Darwin Martin House Home and Complex project of the Martin House Restoration Corporation, New York, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for the Economic Development Initiative in the second paragraph under such heading) are each hereby reduced by \$1,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment would prohibit \$1 million from being used for a restoration and improvement project

at the historic Darwin D. Martin House and complex and would reduce the overall cost of the bill by a commensurate amount.

According to the sponsors of the Web site, the entity that would receive the earmark is called the Martin House Restoration Corporation, whose purpose is to restore a structure designed by Frank Lloyd Wright at the turn of the 19th century. The MHRC's Web site says that it was formed in 1992 with a clear mandate. First part of this mandate: Raise the money to restore the complex to its 1907 grandeur.

There are a lot of historic buildings around the country, a lot of them, that need a lot of restoration. My own home needs a lot of it. A lot of people are losing their homes. Those homes need a lot of restoration. A lot of them are losing them because of the Federal Government's spending ways.

□ 1950

Yet here we are designating one project to receive a million dollars. Again, let me say it one more time. This is not as if every Member comes here and is designated a million dollars to take home and spend in their district on restoring homes. They aren't. The spoils system runs well here. If you're on the Appropriations Committee or you're in leadership, you get the spoils. That's why 42 percent of the earmarked dollars in this bill are going to just 13 percent of the Members of this body. In that sense, you can't justify it nor can you justify spending a million dollars in this way when we're borrowing 42 cents of every dollar that we'll spend this year.

We have a deficit of \$1.47 trillion. We have a debt of \$13.2 trillion. How in the world can we continue to do this, to earmark money for projects like this, when we have that kind of deficit and we have that kind of debt?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the way I see it, we're watching a let's pretend attack on the deficit tonight by singling out these items that cost about a million bucks.

If Members are concerned about the deficit, I would ask, why did they vote for two tax cuts, primarily aimed at rich people, that spent more than \$2 trillion? Why are they continuing to insist that we provide further tax cuts for people who make over \$250,000 a year, again paid for with borrowed money? Why did they vote to go into two wars on borrowed money that cost over a trillion dollars? That's where the real money is.

Mr. OLVER. I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, Buffalo, New York, is the third poorest city in the United States. No one in their right mind would ever accuse Buffalo of getting spoils. This complex is a very important economic development tool for us. This amendment would strike an important lifeline to a place of cultural and economic significance in a struggling region that has been hit hard by the recession.

This house was completed in 1905. I won't go into all that. I simply want to say that Mr. Martin was the patron of Frank Lloyd Wright. He kept him going in good times and bad. Mr. Wright did his best work on this complex. It has been allowed to degenerate over the years because of a lack of money. The community has raised almost all the money to restore this by themselves.

Now, let me tell you, Mr. FLAKE, we estimate that when this is finished, consultants tell us that 42,000 to 83,000 visitors a year would come to see that house. It would generate \$17 million in economic impact annually. For this million dollars, Mr. FLAKE, you probably would not get a better return on your money, and additionally the tax return would be significant.

Of this \$17 million, \$8.34 million will be the earnings and wages of 198 workers who would otherwise be jobless. This is not the time to be striking those jobs from these persons.

One of the reasons that we are anxious to get it finished is that in October 2011, there will be a national conference convening in Buffalo with Martin House at its center bringing in more than 2,000 people. It is our aim to try to make this magnificent structure and we invite you to come up. I know you would love it. We want to have it finished.

We believe that this will be a significant destination for everybody in America who loves the finest architect that America ever produced—Frank Lloyd Wright.

And, Mr. FLAKE, I do appreciate you. As you remember, it was my committee that put this in order. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Flake Amendment eliminating funding for restoration of the historic Darwin Martin House and complex in Buffalo, New York.

This amendment would strike an important lifeline to a place of cultural and economic significance in an already struggling region hit hard by the recession.

The Darwin Martin House and complex was completed in 1905 in the historic Parkside neighborhood of Buffalo and is a testament to the genius of famed American architect Frank Lloyd Wright.

The Buffalo community has rallied behind this historic landmark, spearheading an ambitious effort to complete its full restoration after years of neglect and disrepair, turning into source of jobs and tourism revenue.

Consultants predict visitation levels at 42,000 to 83,000 visitors per year, which would generate \$17 million in economic impact for the region annually.

Of this \$17 million, \$8.34 million will be the earnings and wages of 198 workers who would otherwise be jobless.

I hardly think now is the time to be striking jobs from hard working folks, during a period of economic hardship we have not seen since the Great Depression.

Additionally, The National Trust for Historic Preservation will be convening its October 2011 national conference in Buffalo, a city of architectural masterpieces, including Frank Lloyd Wright's Martin House Complex, a lynchpin of the region's architectural and cultural tourism sectors.

Over 2,000 practitioners and opinion makers from the fields of historic preservation, architecture and design will be coming to see the Martin House.

Richard Moe, former president of the National Trust, called the Martin House, "the most ambitious and well executed restoration effort in his 15 years at the helm of the Trust."

He went further to say he believed the Martin House holds the promise of becoming "the signature Frank Lloyd Wright site in America."

This is a national success story that will bring millions of visitors to the Buffalo Niagara region and will be an anchor for the burgeoning cultural tourism industry.

New York State will have "book-end" Wright sites with the Guggenheim Museum in NYC and the Martin House to the west, in the shadow of Niagara Falls and all its international tourism appeal.

Please join us in opposition to this amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. OLVER. I now yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Buffalo, New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Flake amendment. The best way to reduce deficits is to create jobs.

The Darwin Martin House in Buffalo is one of Frank Lloyd Wright's singular architectural masterpieces and is currently undergoing an ambitious project to restore it from a period of neglect to its original grandeur.

The reason for its inclusion in the bill before us today is because restoration of the Martin House is important to the economic future of Buffalo and western New York. The Martin House currently attracts tourists from all over the world. This investment will help create 200 jobs and \$18 million in annual economic activity for a million-dollar investment.

Urban areas like Buffalo are leveraging our vast historical and architectural resources to create a new economy in cultural tourism. This project will play an important role in enhancing the economy and life quality of western New York.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues

on both sides of the aisle to support western New York and join me in opposition.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I do thank the gentelady on the Rules Committee for making this amendment in order, at least a few of mine. I do appreciate that. But I am just baffled that the other side would continue to talk about—let's gain perspective here—we're just talking about a little money, and to basically belittle any attempt to save a million here or a million there. I just think that says we're out of touch completely with what the country is going through, to say, hey, we've got a \$1.4 trillion deficit this year, we've got a \$13.2 trillion debt that we're going to need to pay off, our kids and grandkids will be doing this forever, but we say, "Well, we can't start here because it's just too big. We really need to tackle those entitlements." Although I don't see a plan of anybody here on this side of the aisle who has presented this bill to actually tackle the entitlement programs. Some of us have presented something. This road map that the gentleman from Wisconsin, the colleague of the gentleman who spoke before, has introduced is a great plan to actually address entitlement spending as well.

But we're here today to vote on four specific amendments to save specific money from specific projects; and that's what you'll have to go and answer to specific constituents about: whether you voted yes or no on amendments to strike a million dollars that could be saved from a project like this one, from an earmark like this one. I would venture to guess that your constituents and my constituents would want you to do that. And it will be tough to explain by saying, "This is just a little part of the budget. We can't save here. We're not addressing entitlement spending, so we're not going to address discretionary spending, either."

I would urge support of the amendment. And, remember, people are watching here. They're watching what we're doing. When you go home, you'll need to explain, if you vote against this amendment, why you didn't want to save the taxpayer a million dollars when we have a deficit of \$1.4 trillion and a debt of \$13.2 trillion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk designated as No. 11 in part B made in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" shall be available for the Construction of a Children's Playground project of the Municipality of Yauco, Puerto Rico, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for the Economic Development Initiative in the second paragraph under such heading) are each hereby reduced by \$150,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1569, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

This amendment would prohibit \$150,000 from being spent on the construction of a child's playground. Now I am the father of five children. I understand the importance of having a place for kids to play. Believe me, kids need to let loose and expend some energy somewhere. But Federal spending has been let loose, far too loose, so loose that we have this year a \$1.4 trillion deficit. We are borrowing 42 cents on every dollar that we spend.

□ 2000

When we are doing this, we can't just all of a sudden say we are going to build playgrounds anywhere as a model for economic development or anything else. We can't continue to spend money this way. This is one of the smaller earmarks. We have to start somewhere.

I would urge those of you who want to oppose this amendment to go home to your constituents and say, I wanted to put you \$150,000 more in debt because I thought it was important that we spend money; the Federal Government, mind you. Municipal governments, State governments, if they want to spend money on playgrounds that's great. But why is the Federal Government doing it here?

Why are we doing it when in May of 2010 the national debt hit \$13 trillion. It's now 13.2. According to The Washington Post, that works out to be more than \$40,000 in debt for every U.S. resident; \$40,000 of debt for every U.S. resident.

Then we are saying, "Well, this is just small. We can't save this money; we can't go at the deficit this way. We have to deal with those entitlement programs." We certainly do, but we need to start somewhere. This is a great place to start.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. PIERLUISI from Puerto Rico.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I requested \$150,000 to purchase equipment for a community and recreational park for low-income children in Yauco, Puerto Rico, a city in the southwestern part of the island. The park will be constructed so that it is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

This funding will supplement funding already provided for the project by the city of Yauco. This is one of the smallest earmarks in this bill. It is unquestionably an appropriate and viable use of Federal funds.

There currently is no recreational park in Yauco, which is home to approximately 50,000 residents, has a poverty rate of 56 percent and has an unemployment rate of over 17 percent. Furthermore, although there are over 75,000 children in Puerto Rico, I am advised that there is not a single recreational park in the entire southwestern region of Puerto Rico that is ADA compliant and thus meaningfully accessible to children with disabilities.

Earlier this week, Mr. Chairman, this House proudly commemorated the 20th anniversary of the ADA's passage. What better way is there to promote the goals of this landmark Federal law than to provide a reasonable amount of funding to help equip a recreational park that children with disabilities can enjoy side by side with their able-bodied friends.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development states that a core part of its mission is to build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination, and HUD's EDI program regularly funds acquisition of equipment for public facilities like the recreational park in Yauco.

In closing, I would gently remind my friend from Arizona that a State with Puerto Rico's population would benefit from congressionally directed spending requests from six Representatives and two Senators. However, because Puerto Rico is a territory, I alone am responsible for protecting the interests of 4 million American citizens.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Again, you have got to have a Federal nexus somewhere. If you are spending taxpayers' money, it helps to say why in the world should the Federal Government be involved at all. I would submit that if you argue that the Federal Government should be paying for playgrounds around the country, where does it stop?

Where is there no Federal nexus? What is the Federal Government not responsible for? How in the world

would our deficit stay at \$1.47 trillion this year if we say the Federal Government is in charge of all playground-building around the country?

I would remind my colleagues, when we vote on these amendments, these are specific amendments to save specific money on specific earmarks. And you can't get by with saying, well, that was indiscriminate cuts and it would have affected this program or that. We are talking about here on these four amendments saving money on street beautification. Where is the Federal nexus there?

On a bike path in Rhode Island, where is the Federal nexus? Why is the Federal Government doing that when we have a deficit of \$1.47 trillion and a debt of \$13.2 trillion? Why in the world, when every citizen of this country is in debt more than \$40,000, why in the world are we saying we are going to pile more on you simply because we can't control ourselves here?

I would urge you again, you are going to have to go home and not say, well, I voted against an amendment that would have cut that program indiscriminately. This is specific amendments for specific programs, specific earmarks that the country knows the Federal Government should not be doing or that the Congress should not be directing money toward.

With that, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. OLVER. I yield the gentleman from Puerto Rico 1 additional minute.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. Let me just say that there are 435 Members of this House; there are five Delegates representing the territories. Each and every one of these districts and the territories has its own peculiar needs, and the Members should be entitled to do something like what I am trying to do, help a town in Puerto Rico with the highest poverty rate in the region where kids do not even have a place to play, particularly meeting the needs and the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

There cannot be a more justified earmark than this one. The amount at stake is \$150,000.

So I urge my friend from Arizona to withdraw this amendment because, clearly, it has no merit.

I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. OLVER. May I inquire how much time remains.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1½ minutes, and the time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in this conversation. The gentleman from Arizona, who is usually so rational about this whole effort that he puts forward, he is going to earn a reputation as a grinch for trying to take the one Member representing 4 million people in Puerto Rico, taking a program that would provide ADA compliance in a very small park in a com-

munity that's done for children and teens, and he wants to deny the representative for those 4 million people the opportunity to have a very small earmark.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCHRADER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNYDER, 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. 5850) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2010

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 847) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and improve protections and services to individuals directly impacted by the terrorist attack in New York City on September 11, 2001, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 847

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act of 2010".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—WORLD TRADE CENTER HEALTH PROGRAM

Sec. 101. World Trade Center Health Program.

"TITLE XXXIII—WORLD TRADE CENTER HEALTH PROGRAM

"Subtitle A—Establishment of Program; Advisory Committee

"Sec. 3301. Establishment of World Trade Center Health Program.

"Sec. 3302. WTC Health Program Scientific/Technical Advisory Committee; WTC Health Program Steering Committees.

"Sec. 3303. Education and outreach.

"Sec. 3304. Uniform data collection and analysis.

"Sec. 3305. Clinical Centers of Excellence and Data Centers.

"Sec. 3306. Definitions.

"Subtitle B—Program of Monitoring, Initial Health Evaluations, and Treatment

"PART 1—WTC RESPONDERS

"Sec. 3311. Identification of WTC responders and provision of WTC-related monitoring services.

"Sec. 3312. Treatment of enrolled WTC responders for WTC-related health conditions.

"Sec. 3313. National arrangement for benefits for eligible individuals outside New York.

"PART 2—WTC SURVIVORS

"Sec. 3321. Identification and initial health evaluation of screening-eligible and certified-eligible WTC survivors.

"Sec. 3322. Followup monitoring and treatment of certified-eligible WTC survivors for WTC-related health conditions.

"Sec. 3323. Followup monitoring and treatment of other individuals with WTC-related health conditions.

"PART 3—PAYOR PROVISIONS

"Sec. 3331. Payment of claims.

"Sec. 3332. Administrative arrangement authority.

"Subtitle C—Research Into Conditions

"Sec. 3341. Research regarding certain health conditions related to September 11 terrorist attacks.

"Sec. 3342. World Trade Center Health Registry.

"Subtitle D—Funding

"Sec. 3351. World Trade Center Health Program Fund.

TITLE II—SEPTEMBER 11TH VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND OF 2001

Sec. 201. Definitions.

Sec. 202. Extended and expanded eligibility for compensation.

Sec. 203. Requirement to update regulations.

Sec. 204. Limited liability for certain claims.

Sec. 205. Funding; attorney fees.

TITLE III—LIMITATION ON TREATY BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN DEDUCTIBLE PAYMENTS; TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES

Sec. 301. Limitation on treaty benefits for certain deductible payments.

Sec. 302. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

Sec. 401. Compliance with Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

TITLE I—WORLD TRADE CENTER HEALTH PROGRAM

SEC. 101. WORLD TRADE CENTER HEALTH PROGRAM.

The Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end the following new title: