



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

No. 27—Book II

House of Representatives

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011—Continuing

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in the United Nations over and over again we see enemies of America, enemies of our freedom, voting against us over and over again. We see an organization there that's just rife with fraud, corruption, with a tremendous amount of problems. We see the U.N. bring people over here who have diplomatic immunity who have been caught in the business of spying against America, want to harm us. We see in the U.N. an organization that in their Human Rights Commission is populated by countries that are basically run by terrorist organizations.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to take a solid stand against our supporting this kind of organization by giving our taxpayers' hard earned money and taxpayers' dollars to an organization that I believe is not in the best interests of America.

Mr. Chairman, I personally would like to see us get out of the U.N. and get the U.N. out of the U.S., but we cannot do that today. But what we can do is in this continuing resolution we can deny taxpayer dollars being wasted on this organization.

And so I have the amendment to stop the United States from paying dues to the United Nations. I think it's in our best interests to do so. I think it's in our best interests to the taxpayers of America to prevent wasting their hard-earned taxpayer dollars on funding the U.N. through our dues to the U.N. So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to defund the U.N.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the Broun amendment would withhold U.S.-assessed contributions to the U.N., directly contravening U.S. treaty obligations and national security interests. It would isolate the U.S., cripple U.S. diplomatic efforts globally, weaken our leadership within the U.N. to advance crucial foreign policy priorities.

The U.N. is critical to advancing U.S. national security interests, and the Broun amendment would impede our ability to influence crucial counterterrorism actions at the U.N. Security Council, including concrete steps targeting al Qaeda and the Taliban, global action addressing the conduct of regimes such as North Korea and Iran, on which the Security Council has acted forcefully in recent years, imposing the most comprehensive sanctions ever on these regimes, U.N. missions in Afghanistan and Iraq, which play crucial and growing roles in both countries, supplementing U.S. efforts and reducing our burden.

□ 1550

U.N. peacekeeping operations, which are an indispensable tool, have saved untold lives, averted dozens of wars, and helped restore or establish democratic rule in more than a dozen countries.

The Broun amendment would put the U.S. on a dangerous path to isolationism. We learned on September 11, 2001, that we are not immune from events that take place halfway around the world. There are enormous challenges that we all must face together, and the United States cannot close its borders and think that we can protect our own security.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment to effectively withdraw from the U.N. because it would endanger our national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I rise to oppose the amendment.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her outstanding stewardship of American dollars as it relates to our standing in the world.

I understand the gentleman's concern, but the United Nations is where you draw consensus. It is where we are able to sit at the table and ask individual countries to join with us for what democracy means.

As you watch the rising crisis in the Mideast, it is the United Nations that we can draw upon to be able to emphasize democracy. As you watched the conflict in Egypt, where we celebrated what happened, many of you are aware of the tragedy that happened to one of our American reporters, Ms. Logan. The United Nations is where we can call upon the Egyptian Government to explain themselves and to apologize and call upon the U.N. Ambassador from Egypt to apologize to Ms. Logan and apologize to the American people for the tragedy that happened to this woman who was doing her job, the vicious sexual assault that occurred to her. It is the United Nations that we can come and ask others to accept that kind of responsibility.

We need to be part of the world family. The world family is a place where we can get solutions.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentlelady.

This is the 21st century. We have to live with our neighbors. If the United Nations didn't exist, we would have to create it. The fact is that even the Government Accountability Office estimates that a U.N. peacekeeping force is

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1255

eight times less expensive than funding a military force. We're going to have to move to more smart power in the 21st century. We can't do it all alone, whether it be establishing democracy, securing peace or promoting human rights.

We can't keep putting our own troops at risk, trying to put out the flames that erupt all over the world. The U.N. does that. They don't do it perfectly, but they are largely an international reflection of our American values.

We've got to find a way to secure peace in the world. And ever since Woodrow Wilson came up with the League of Nations, the United Nations continues to evolve, continues to reflect our values and promote our most fundamental foreign policy. This is not the time to be pulling the rug out from under such an important ally.

The U.N. represents every nation in the world. We don't agree with all of them, but we have more influence in the United Nations than does any other nation in the world.

This amendment is not in our national interest. It should be strongly rejected.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I'm sitting here hearing what a wonderful organization the U.N. is, and I can't help but wonder: Where in the heck were they during Rwanda? Where were they? I would love to yield the floor to anybody out there.

You know, that was the most miserable failure and genocide that the world has seen in modern times. Where was the U.N.? And we all know they were absolutely nowhere. There were 800,000 people killed, slaughtered, an absolute genocide; and it went from, I think, April until July 6, 800,000 people killed with machetes on the street, and the U.N. spent the whole 3, 4 months debating the definition of genocide.

The U.N. is not there when you need them. The U.N. spends lots of time condemning Israel, lots of time on anti-United States jabs. They aren't being helpful so far that I can see on Egypt, Tunisia, Yemen, or anywhere else in the Middle East where the pot seems to be boiling over. But I just remember so vividly genocide in Rwanda and the U.N. not being there.

I would suggest to people, you know, all we want to read books. Read the book "Hotel Rwanda." Read the book, "We Regret to Inform You, But Tonight They Are Coming for Our Children," about the genocide in Rwanda. There are lots of books, and it's well documented on how absolutely worthless the U.N. was.

Mrs. LOWEY. May I ask the Chair how much time we have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it very clear that none of

us are making a statement that the U.N. can solve all the problems in the world. But I want to reiterate again a comment that my good friend Mr. MORAN made: If we are going to put a cocoon around our country and operate in isolation, we will be less successful in dealing with the extraordinary challenges that we are facing today.

And I would like to say to my good friend Mr. KINGSTON, I'm not quite sure that we would be more successful in dealing with slaughters and genocide without the U.N. We are working very hard with our colleagues and our friends around the world to try and find solutions.

And I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I would ask my friend from Georgia: What's the alternative? Should we have gone into Rwanda? The U.N. was an abysmal failure, but where was the United States? And if we didn't have the United Nations, the United States would be asked to carry that themselves. We can't be the world's policeman.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am not an isolationist, but the U.N. has been an abysmal failure. We need to stop throwing our money down a rat hole. It's not dependent on us to keep the world safe. In fact, we, with our allies all across this globe, can do what's necessary far more efficiently without the wasting of American taxpayer dollars in trying to foster democracy, to foster human rights, to foster women's rights all across the world stage.

Continuing to pour money into the U.N. is not going to do anything except for keep a group of people who are in power there, who go against us as we try to stand firm for Israel, as we try to stand firm for world peace and democracy. Our efforts are thwarted through the U.N. And, in fact, they want to take the U.N. governance and apply it to every American citizen.

This is not in our best interest. It's a waste of taxpayers' dollars. It was totally ineffective, as my good friend from Georgia has said, in Rwanda and many other cases. It's time for us to stop funding this inefficient organization that is not in our best interest.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would prevent the U.S. from paying its annual dues to the UN and UN agencies, and put our nation once again into arrears. Passage of it would also end ongoing peacekeeping operations in nations critical to America's national security interests, including Haiti and Sudan.

Today the United States is in good standing at the United Nations after years of failing to meet our treaty obligations, and as a result, the U.S. is better able to advance our interests. Great nations keep their word, and by working with other countries in the UN, we can be sure that our nation does not go it alone.

In making his argument for fiscal responsibility, Congressman BROUN has picked the wrong target. In 2006, a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study concluded that UN peacekeeping is eight times less expensive than funding a U.S. force. This point was backed up by former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice who said that "[UN Peacekeeping] is much more cost effective than using American forces. And of course, America doesn't have the forces to do all of these peacekeeping missions, but somebody has to do them."

In the last ten years, the number of UN peacekeeping missions has grown—with each and every one of them enjoying the active support of both Democratic and Republican administrations. There are now over 100,000 peacekeepers—the second largest deployed military in the world—serving in 14 missions in some of the most dangerous corners of the world.

UN peacekeeping missions help end brutal conflicts, support stability, the transition to democratization, and bring relief for hundreds of millions of people. In 2005, The Human Security Report, a major international study on peace and war, judged that the global security climate improved dramatically since the 1980's, with genocides plummeting by 80 percent. The study attributed that decline to the explosion in conflict prevention, peacemaking, and increases in the number and complexity of UN peacekeeping missions.

The UN force in Haiti has provided security and access for humanitarian aid since the devastating earthquake and before that, the UN kept the peace. In the 1990's, Florida faced wave after wave of illegal Haitians trying to escape from the failed state. Why would we abandon this mission?

The UN force in Sudan was critical in supporting last month's referendum calling for independence and it continues to play a vital role in supporting South Sudan transition to a functional democracy. It's in our benefit to help South Sudan grant freedom to its people, and the UN is doing that. Right now the total cost to the international community for our peacekeeping and humanitarian efforts in Sudan is about \$4 billion a year. An article in Foreign Policy just last month noted that a return to war in Sudan could cost the wider international community \$30 billion. The UN is our main hope in preventing that from happening, so with passage of the amendment, we'd abandon the mission, possibly threatening stability in Sudan and potentially increasing our future costs.

In both the above cases, it is very likely that if the UN were not there, U.S. troops would have to be and they would be the ones in harm's way. Instead, by supporting UN peacekeeping, we lessen the burden on our own forces and reduce our own expenditures. U.S. Ambassador to the UN, Susan Rice said last week, "Those of us—Democrat and Republican alike—who support the UN owe it to American taxpayers to ensure that their dollars are well and cleanly spent. But, equally, those who push to curtail U.S. support to the UN owe it to U.S. soldiers to explain why they should perform missions now handled by UN peacekeepers."

I urge my colleagues to vote NO against the Broun amendment. It is not fiscally responsible—considering we are here today to vote on a bill to reduce costs, it makes little sense

to vote for an amendment that would likely entail greater U.S. military expenditures.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Amendment (Amendment No. 263) to H.R. 1 "Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011", offered by Mr. BROUN of Georgia providing that none of the funds made available by this Act be used to pay any dues to the United Nations.

I strongly oppose this amendment, because it is imperative that the United States pay its dues to the United Nations. The United States not only serves as the host country of the United Nations, it is also a Permanent Member of the United Nations and a Member of the U.N. Security Council. The United Nations serves the critical function of providing a forum where countries from the global community can meet and form a consensus for resolving the most important international issues of our time.

We must remain steadfast in our support for the United Nations especially during these times of rapid political, environmental and economic change throughout the world. We have recently witnessed large scale global events that require a multinational response. The crisis in the Sudan, the Earthquake in Haiti, and the protests for political change in Egypt and countries of the Middle East are just a few recent examples. The magnitude of these events requires a unified international response. The United Nations is the appropriate vehicle for that coordinated response.

Our presence as one of the few Permanent Members and our position and voice on the U.N. Security Council provide the United States with a powerful platform to exercise the kind of leadership necessary to promote peace, security of nations, international trade stability, international monetary stability, international aid to struggling countries and peoples worldwide, responsible monitoring of nuclear weapons proliferation, international human rights observance and adherence to the fair administration of justice.

So, in closing Mr. Chair, during this time when we are debating the funding of our Federal Government, an act of paying dues, it is hypocrisy to even suggest that the United States not pay its dues to the United Nations.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 526 OFFERED BY MR. WU

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, ad-

minister, or enforce section 3(e) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(e)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents funds under the continuing resolution from being used to provide the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, with exclusive authority to site, construct, expand, or operate an LNG terminal. Simply put, it ends overbearing federal regulation and gives local government and private property owners a say in LNG siting.

This is a States' rights issue. FERC's overbearing, overbroad Federal regulatory structure is preventing States and local communities from having any input, let alone decisionmaking authority, over use of local property.

In Oregon, where there are proposals for construction of LNG terminals, I have heard time and time again from my constituents that they are confused and frustrated by FERC's intrusive projects and unclear timelines. More importantly, their voices are not being heard on decisions that affect their livelihoods and property rights.

FERC has demonstrated in Oregon that it is unwilling to responsibly regulate LNG and is deaf to the needs and concerns of our citizens and communities. Defunding FERC's exclusive approval authority over LNG projects is a crucial first step towards reestablishing a local role in the LNG siting process and ensuring that future energy decisions better reflect local citizens' interests.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment attempts, using the appropriations bill before us, to enact significant legislative changes to a prior law. The law in question, enacted by Congress in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, establishes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the issuer of licenses for liquefied natural gas terminals.

Notwithstanding the merits of the gentleman's concerns, and we can see the gentleman cares deeply about the issue and knows of the issue, this is not the appropriate place to modify such a law, as this amendment would attempt to do. Frankly, such a broad authorizing issue warrants a suitably more broad discussion.

We would be happy to work with the gentleman to facilitate that wider discussion at the appropriate time, on the appropriate bill, and through the appropriate committees of jurisdiction.

In this regard, I yield to my ranking member, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, for the time that he may wish to consume.

(Mr. PASTOR of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I want to thank the chairman for recognizing and providing time.

This amendment would prevent FERC from carrying out its statutory authority. The term "enforce" would impact oversight of existing and operating liquefied natural gas facilities. This amendment appears to prohibit FERC from approving environmental or safety-related amendments to existing liquefied natural gas facilities. This amendment will impact both import and export proposals in addition to almost any new facilities at pre-existing plants.

While I understand the gentleman has concerns in his district, the language would impact a much broader constituency, and for that reason I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. WU. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts such time as he may consume.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

On September 11, 2001, when Richard Clarke, George Bush's terrorism czar, was asked to sit in the control room to take over the response on 9/11, the first call he made was to the port of the city of Boston to shut down the port because of the LNG facility in Everett, Massachusetts, in my district. That was the first thought in his mind. And why was that so? Because the al Qaeda had actually come in from Algeria, jumping off those ships in Boston Harbor in Everett, Massachusetts, in my district.

Now we've had a tremendous amount of development of natural gas in the Marcellus shale formation and all across the country, an addition of 30 percent to the natural gas reserves of our country over the last 4 years.

Now if a city, if a State determines that the terrorism threat is so great that they do not want an LNG facility in the middle of their most densely populated area, it should not be the right of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to override the public safety decision made by the State and local police that it is too great of a danger. That is why the Wu amendment is correct.

We have a bonanza of natural gas domestically. If a State decides they can get it from our own people rather than overseas, it is not up to the FERC to make that decision if they are going to override the national security, the safety consideration of that community, in making that decision.

I urge an "aye" vote on the Wu amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I wish to express my strong support for allowing states to have a say in the siting of liquefied natural gas (LNG) facilities and Representative WU's amendment #526 to H.R. 1.

Mr. Chair, for years, there's been an ill-conceived proposal to permit an LNG facility in

Fall River, Massachusetts. This is a densely populated urban area with more than 9,000 residents of southeastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island living within a one mile radius of the proposed site.

Siting an LNG facility here comes with enormous security risks as 900 foot long tankers would need to be brought up the Taunton River and pass under four bridges.

From day one, local residents have expressed their vehement opposition to this misguided and dangerous proposal.

Current and previous Massachusetts and Rhode Island governors, local leaders and public safety officials have also fought against this irresponsible project.

Unfortunately, the Republican energy bill of 2005 gave the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) the exclusive authority to site LNG terminals, overriding the role of states and local communities in these critical public health and safety decisions.

In Fall River, FERC has ignored legitimate local concerns, despite Federal laws and regulations directing a preference for remote siting of LNG facilities away from heavily populated areas and directing the agency to consider local input.

Mr. Chair, my constituents in Somerset, Swansea and Fall River have made their opposition to this project loud and clear. Fall River is not the right place for an LNG facility.

Let me be clear—I am not opposed to LNG as an energy source but it should not be sited in an urban area. Off-shore siting is preferable. The Northeast is already in a good position for currently permitted LNG off-shore terminals.

And, I firmly believe that states and local residents should have a say in the decision to locate a dangerous energy facility in their backyards.

Furthermore, Mr. WU's amendment is important because the City of Fall River deserves the right to plan its future and not have its economic development held hostage to a FERC permitting process that does not take local concerns into account.

At a time when so many of my Republican colleagues are fond of saying that Washington has overreached its authority, Mr. WU's commonsense amendment would restore the public's role in the siting of LNG projects and ensure that future energy decisions reflect community interests.

I want to thank my colleagues Mr. WU, Mr. FRANK and Mr. MARKEY for their leadership on this issue.

I urge a "yes" vote on Mr. WU's amendment.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I urge a "no" vote. This is a proposition that ought to be discussed by the authorizers. It should not be considered within the limits of this continuing resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue any new lease that authorizes production of oil or natural gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et. seq.) to any lessee under an existing lease issued by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note), where such existing lease is not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, we all agree that we have to do some serious work to reduce the deficit. But we need to start by first eliminating unnecessary taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies. I'm going to finish the rest of this opening statement in the well.

As a result of a poorly drafted law passed by the Republican Congress in 1995, oil companies are now drilling for free on public lands offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. The Government Accountability Office projects that the American people currently stand to lose as much as \$53 billion in royalty payments over the life of these leases. And according to a brand new study, that's as much as \$1.5 billion just this year. And with oil prices at \$90 a barrel, we do not have to be allowing them to drill on public lands for free and take all of the profit for themselves and giving nothing back to the American taxpayer.

□ 1610

This amendment is very simple. It says to these companies we will allow you to continue to drill and not even pay any royalties, but we're not going to give you an opportunity to bid on any new leases on public lands in our country.

So if you renegotiate so that you are paying your fair share back to the American taxpayer, then fine, you can drill in the future. But we need that \$53 billion that they owe in royalties, in taxes to be put towards reducing the Federal deficit.

That's what this debate should be all about: Where do we go to find where the waste is in our Federal Government? The oil companies drilling for free, paying nothing to the taxpayers while reaping windfall profits is absolutely something that we should not tolerate.

This amendment passed in 2006 on the House floor. This amendment passed as part of the BP response bill last year. This amendment passes over and over again with significant Republican support, 60 votes just 5 years ago. In order to reclaim this money, I urge an "aye" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, contrary to what the gentleman from Massachusetts just said, while this happened in 1995, it was not the Republican Congress. It was the Clinton administration and a result of the oil leases that were made under the Department of the Interior at the time and the Clinton administration.

If this amendment passed, companies with existing Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases would be required to renegotiate lease terms with DOI to include price thresholds before getting new leases. Companies with Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases have been successful multiple times in court challenging Interior's authority to include price thresholds in the lease agreements. DOI has lost at the district court, the appellate court, and the Supreme Court. The Secretary does not have the authority to include price thresholds on these leases.

The problem stems from language included in the Deepwater Royalty Relief Act itself and the regulations promulgated to implement the act that did not address or require Interior to include price thresholds in the Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases.

In addition, forcing companies to renegotiate the leases would be a violation of contract law and would be challenged in court. This would only cost us millions of dollars more. This would hinder our leasing ability, reducing revenues to the Federal Government, not increasing revenues to the government, as it limits the pool of potential leases.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, well, we voted to subsidize the cotton industry, NASCAR, agribusiness. You name it, we vote to subsidize it. But now we have an opportunity to correct the most egregious abuse of the Federal taxpayer. \$53 billion of oil that belongs to all American taxpayers is basically being given away. It's their oil. It's being drilled offshore. We own it, but we're not charging royalties to the largest American corporations, and that's the real rub of it.

These are the most profitable corporations in America. BP is the biggest beneficiary. Exxon, Shell, Conoco, you name it. Chevron. They're all at the trough. Exxon, for example, last year \$383 billion in revenue, and yet we're

told they didn't pay any American corporate taxes. They paid it to other countries, but not to the United States.

You know, at a time when we cut \$1 billion out of Head Start and then we're going to give \$53 billion to the wealthiest corporations of America, take American taxpayer-owned oil? This is insane.

Now, it may have made some sense when oil was at \$20 a barrel. But when oil is over \$80 a barrel and the American consumer is having to pay \$3.50 a gallon for gas, is this really the time that we should be giving away \$53 billion in oil? No.

Let's stop this egregious abuse. We say we're in favor of eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse? This is the worst abuse. Let's stop it. Support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am tempted to ask the gentleman: What part of the contract that was signed by the Clinton administration don't you understand? But I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly oppose the gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment. I wish he would understand that we are not drilling right now. That is the problem.

Many on the other side of the aisle have been thrilled with the administration's moratorium and praises the Department of the Interior and BOEMRE's work or, in true reality, the lack thereof in the deepwater drilling permit process since the BP oil spill.

This amendment is insane, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Massachusetts must be confiding with the likes of George Soros, who happily watched and encouraged the most advanced deepwater drilling rigs leave the Gulf of Mexico and travel to Brazil and Africa. If they are not picking up and leaving the Gulf of Mexico for good, they are filing for bankruptcy, like Seahawk Drilling in my district. This week, Seahawk Drilling blamed its demise on an unprecedented decline in the issuance of offshore drilling permits following the Macondo blowout.

The chief executive, Randy Stilley, said in a statement, "The decision by regulators to arbitrarily construct unnecessary barriers to obtaining permits they had traditionally authorized has had an adverse impact not only on Seahawk, but on the sector as a whole."

Seahawk's clients were waiting on 11 projects that were in various stages of the permitting process, none of which had been approved. This just proves this administration and Interior are not serious when they say they have lifted the deepwater drilling moratorium.

The minority is claiming this spending bill is a job-killing piece of legislation, but they are just fine with increasing taxes on an industry that is in limbo and employs hundreds of thousands in my district.

Louisianans are very hardworking, tough folks. They rarely ask for much.

Mr. Chairman, they have been yelling loudly and beating down my door to tell me they are fed up and ready to go back to work.

I guarantee you, Americans across the Nation will begin to yell as well when they are paying more at the gas pump when prices should be falling.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York, the author of this amendment in 2006, Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. HINCHEY. At a time when our country is facing record deficits and the oil industry can't count their money fast enough, oil drillers in the Gulf of Mexico are getting away with highway robbery because of mistakes that were made many years ago.

Oil and gas companies are extracting resources from public property without paying royalties, regardless of the price of oil and gas. It's time to fix the problem. The GAO has estimated that not doing so will continue to cost American taxpayers up to \$53 billion.

These hugely profitable companies are tapping oil and gas reserves that belong to the American people, selling it back to us, and then reaping a massive profit on the backs of the middle class. But they are not paying one red cent to the public for the oil and gas they have extracted. They get it for free, and we pay the price.

I don't know a single person who would allow an oil or gas company to drill on their private property and not expect to be compensated for the oil extracted from that land. So why should the Federal Government continue to be taken advantage of by the most profitable industry in United States history?

Congress has a chance to correct this injustice.

Last year, oil companies earned over \$70 billion in profits when oil prices were significantly lower than they are today. With the cost of oil once again approaching \$100 a barrel and prices at the pump also rising, the idea that this industry is still getting royalty relief is downright criminal.

If we're serious about reining in our deficits, then we should adopt this amendment. It's an important amendment; it makes perfect sense, and it is in the best interests of all of the people of this country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. And what is not being pointed out here is, while the gentleman from Massachusetts is talking about companies and royalties, he fails to mention, first of all, that the second largest source of Federal revenue next to income taxes is royalties that are paid by oil companies. They are paying billions of dollars in royalties. They are hiring tens of thousands and, in some cases, probably in the millions of Americans to work in the energy in-

dustry. But that, right now, is at jeopardy by this administration's policies. In fact, as my other colleague from Louisiana just pointed out, just last week another company filed for bankruptcy because of this administration's policies shutting off the ability to issue permits and allow people to go back to work.

And so what does this amendment do? Well, my colleague talks about royalties. Let's actually read what his amendment does as opposed to what he says about his amendment.

The amendment by Mr. MARKEY says: None of the funds made available by this act may be used to issue any new lease that authorizes production of oil or natural gas under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

This is about closing off more domestic sources of energy production at a time when the Middle East has never been more volatile. You might as well just call this the OPEC protection amendment, because it ensures that more of these companies, as they are already doing, will be going out of the country.

And by the way, oh, is this hypothetical? Of course it's not. I have got a list here of some of the rigs by some of the very companies my colleague talks about that are already leaving. And one of the countries that they have already left to bring their assets to to drill because they can't do business in America is Egypt. Two of these billion-dollar assets have actually said it's better to do business in Egypt and drill for energy there than to drill in America because of these radical policies.

So I guess my colleague is okay with shutting off more domestic energy, allowing more American companies to go bankrupt. The White House has acknowledged 12,000 Americans have already lost their jobs because of these policies, and then my colleague wants to bring this amendment to shut even more areas of the Outer Continental Shelf off.

OPEC might love this amendment, but I think Americans who are going to be paying \$4 and \$5 a gallon for gas at the pump this summer don't agree.

I oppose this amendment.

□ 1620

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

This is really important. The country needs this money. The country owns this land. The country deserves these royalties. And whether we have not collected these royalties because of a mistake or because of a cozy relationship with the oil companies and the other party, for whatever reason these weren't collected, they should be collected.

Royalty relief? No, it's not relief. This is what is supposed to be paid. And I think about all of the things that it should be going for.

Portions of the royalties are owed to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This is what we spoke about yesterday, our Nation's most successful open space preservation program that is supposed to take money from the depletion of resources—these oil resources—and apply it to preservation of parks, recreation, and open space. That's just one of the things that should be done with this money that is owed to the American taxpayers.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would just remind the gentleman from New Jersey that it was the Clinton administration that let these leases.

I would like to now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We hear about a cozy relationship, and that's interesting because when you go back and look at the worst oil spill in American history from British Petroleum, BP, and why it took this administration so long to come down on them, we find out that BP was the one oil company that was willing to support and endorse the administration's crap and trade bill. They were ready to come out and make a big deal out of it.

And that's why—you talk about cozy relationships. Oh, yeah. That's not enough. This administration hired to help oversee these leases the person who was responsible under the Clinton administration for costing this country billions by taking out language that would have gotten us the royalties we should have had.

But one of the problems we should never lose sight of, no matter how cozy the relationship was with the Clinton administration and BP and this administration and BP and the 800 hazardous safety violations they overlooked, was that this country's history has been one of integrity.

You go back to the War of 1812. Banks in England had loaned this country's businesses money. And we had the War of 1812. It went on for a couple of years. After that war, we were struggling, but people that owed banks in England paid them anyway. The world took notice and said this is a country that can be trusted. When they give you their word, it means something.

Now this administration and this provision would say, Hey, if we make a contract with you and maybe because of this administration's cozy relationship is too good for you, we'll just come back, cancel the deal, punish you because we were able to lure you into a deal.

There's been more damage done to the gulf States by this President's moratorium. You want to help with jobs. Give them their jobs back. Open up the provisions. Get alternative energy by using the proceeds from the drilling that this group has cut off.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this straightforward amendment to reduce the deficit and protect taxpayers. It says the Nation's biggest oil companies won't be able to buy new leases from the Federal Government if they want to keep drilling on the public's land for free. That's all.

Now, there's a consensus in this Congress that we need to address the Federal deficit. With this amendment, we can.

GAO says we're giving \$53 billion to the oil companies over the next 25 years if we do not fix the royalty relief law.

So let's fix it. Let's make the oil companies simply pay their fair share. Let's stop pouring billions of dollars into their already stuffed oil industry coffers. Isn't it time we give our constituents a break instead of the oil companies?

This is about the people we represent. They're taking their savings and they're putting it into their gas tanks and into heating their homes. Big Oil doesn't need this profit.

Let's end the handouts, reduce the deficit, protect the taxpayer. Support the Markey amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Could the Chair inform me as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 2½ minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

This amendment encapsulates this entire week. This week's debate is all about priorities: Will we stand with Big Oil or with Big Bird? With the big corporations or with the little guy?

Shell Oil isn't curing our addiction to oil, but the millions of Americans afflicted with Alzheimer's and Parkinson's need a cure for those diseases; and they need these revenues from the oil companies.

Executives from BP won't be shivering in the cold any time soon, but our Nation's poorest families and senior citizens will be.

ConocoPhillips doesn't need help feeding their profits; but millions of America's poorest women, infants, and children who don't have enough to eat need help staying fed.

Chevron doesn't need special treatment, but special education programs for our neediest students are on the chopping block.

ExxonMobil doesn't need a head start on success, but our kids do need the Head Start program to send them on the right educational path.

My amendment focuses on just the kind of special interest loophole that should be closed before we open attacks on programs for the poorest Americans most in need of help.

One of the several dozen companies receiving this windfall is BP. Imagine

that. BP spilled oil freely into the Gulf of Mexico for nearly 90 days, and yet they are now drilling for free in some of those same waters at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Just last week the former president of Shell Oil, John Hofmeister, was quoted in the National Journal as saying, "In the face of sustained high oil prices, it was not an issue for large companies of needing the subsidies to entice them to looking for and producing more oil."

Well, I agree with Mr. Hofmeister. At nearly \$90 a barrel, subsidizing oil companies to drill is like subsidizing a bird to fly or a fish to swim. You do not have to do it.

Unless this amendment is adopted, ExxonMobil, BP, Shell, ConocoPhillips, and Chevron will continue to hold leases that let them drill on public land without paying taxpayers a single dime. These companies are already getting 100-year-old tax breaks to sell \$100-a-barrel oil to make \$100 billion a year in profits. They don't need a \$53 billion windfall courtesy of the American taxpayer and our national debt.

Vote "aye" on the Markey amendment. Cease paying big oil companies' windfall profits for the American people.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You remember Paul Harvey's "The Rest of the Story"? You want to hear what's really behind this debate?

In the mid-1990s, worried about how much oil we're importing from the Middle East, the government encouraged companies to go out deeper into the gulf to create American-made energy here in the United States. So for 4 years they signed lease agreements. And companies here in America, they paid millions of dollars for these leases with no knowledge of whether there was oil there or not, or gas.

□ 1630

They spent billions of dollars to drill in depths they hadn't before—again, not knowing if they would hit anything or not. They used American companies to do it on American platforms with American workers. And guess what? It worked. They created American-made oil and natural gas, and they kept it here for us. This outraged the Democrats: How could this happen? And by the way, these companies paid billions of dollars of royalty not on the price, but on how much they bring out of the ground. It was a win-win situation—taxpayers win, our jobs win, we get American-made energy.

Outraged, they took it to court. Four times the court said—they wanted the American Government to break its own contract—the court, four times, including the Supreme Court, said no. Now they've tried to extort U.S. companies in saying, you must break your contract, or we will deny you any chance

to do business in the Gulf of Mexico. That's what this amendment is about. It's extortion. They want businesses to break the contract with America that America can't break itself.

If the government has power to force you to break the agreement they made with you, how much power will they have over you, over your family, over your business? And by the way, what's wrong with creating good old-fashioned American energy here in this country with our workers, with our companies, with the revenues coming to us and to the local communities, giving us affordable energy? Isn't that what America is also about?

Our energy jobs aren't expendable. Stop sending our oil and gas workers to the unemployment line. Let them explore right here in America. Does Hugo Chavez really need a bigger incentive to sell more oil in the United States of America?

This amendment needs to go down on this House floor.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to Amendment No. 27 by Rep. MARKEY to H.R. 1, the Fiscal Year Continuing Appropriations Act for FY2011. This amendment attempts to retroactively reverse the express intent of Congress in passing the Royalty Relief Act. In the case of *Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas v. Alfred*, the Fifth Circuit Court specifically held that the Department of the Interior does not have authority to impose royalty relief price thresholds on deep water leases issued from 1996–2000. In reaching this decision, the Fifth Circuit held that Congress was unambiguous in guaranteeing royalty relief, without price thresholds, to holders of these leases up to the volumes specified in the statute. The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and other regulations allow our government to preclude a lessee from obtaining new leases if it has failed to act with due diligence with respect to its existing leases. This amendment would add a new requirement that imposes that same penalty but for an entirely different and unrelated reason. For these reasons, I strongly oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 409 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by division B may be used by the Department of Health and Human Services to im-

plement or enforce section 2718 of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 1001(5) and replaced by section 10101(f) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think that we've made some significant progress in the area of improving health care in this country, the laws related to health care in this country today in this Chamber. This is another portion of an amendment that would address the issue of health care.

As a physician and dad, I care greatly about the issue of health care and came to Congress, frankly, as one of the major reasons was to try to fix the health care system and to make it more patient-centered.

Over the last 2 years, we've seen a significant affront to our health care system with costs increasing, destroying jobs, violating principles to a significant degree as it relates to health care.

Last year, this Congress made a lot of decisions that gave Washington control over our health care system. And a perfect example of that control is that ObamaCare mandates to the companies that provide the health coverage for individuals, helping individuals, how to run their business. Essentially, the Federal Government is in the business of dictating to private companies what they should do to run their business, what kind of coverage they can provide, what kind of prices they can charge, what kind of definition of quality care, and what meets the definition of essential services for individuals. It really is central planning at its finest, and it is certainly not the government's role in a free market system.

The government has already proven that it's not well qualified for mandating and defining what will be counted as quality improvement activity for the purposes of calculating, in this instance, the medical loss ratio. For instance, many of the fraud provisions that are required are excluded from being included in the medical loss ratio. The coding system that is required for health insurers to utilize is not able to be included in the medical loss ratio.

So what it does is compromise the opportunity for brokers to provide the best advice to citizens. It makes it so that these folks who are actually—they're actually the exchanges, Mr. Chairman, if you think about it, but these folks are going to be pinched and pushed out of their jobs, the ones that are actually helping our citizens to weave their way through the morass of health coverage in this country.

The President said famously during this whole debate, "If you like what you have, you can keep it." The fact of

the matter is, as you know, Mr. Chairman, and so many others know, that that simply is not true. These medical loss ratio requirements will in fact break that promise to a further degree.

So the amendment is very simple. It makes it so that no moneys in this bill can be utilized for the provision of enforcing the medical loss ratio, destructive provisions in the area of health care. I urge my colleagues to back the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment for some very good reasons on that.

Let me explain what the medical loss ratio is. That is what the people in these private insurance companies call providing health care for the premium dollar you provide. For every time they give you a health service for your premium dollar, they think of it as a medical loss. The medical loss ratio is the amount of your dollar that they actually spend on health care versus CEO salaries, bonuses, stock dividends that are out of control, lobbyist costs that they might incur, advertisements, and so on down the line. The purpose of the medical loss ratio provision is in fact to make sure that they spend a higher percentage of your premium dollar on actual health care.

In 1993, the average used to be about 95 cents of every dollar would be spent by private health insurance companies on health services. Now, however, recent studies indicate that some of these private insurance companies are spending as little as 60 cents of every health care dollar on actual health services and the rest on lobbyists—probably some of whom are down here arguing to kill this provision—on high CEO salaries and bonuses and advertisements, and so on down the line.

The MLR, the medical loss ratio provision in this bill, says an insurance company for individuals or small company plans has to spend at least 80 cents of every premium dollar on health care. And if you're in a large company plan, it's 85 cents. What a novel idea; you get some bang for your buck and the government would actually do something for you for a change, protecting consumer rights and making sure that companies do what they should be doing.

This isn't about profits. The companies are extremely profitable, and this is not going to cramp their style. In fact, this is about greed. The profits for the 10 largest for-profit insurance companies in this country show a whopping \$9.3 billion in profits for the first three quarters of 2010. That's \$2.1 billion

more than the first 9 months of 2009. So it's gone up 41 percent from 2009. What this is about is them avoiding having to pay premium dollars for health care.

Another provision that I like in this is they're going to have to tell the American public, they're going to have to be transparent in identifying what it is they term as "health services," so people would know if they're trying to put lobbyists fees under health services or excessive bonuses or CEO salaries or advertisements, things of that nature. And I don't think they have any will at all to make sure that people understand where their health care premium dollars are going.

If you don't have a provision like this, we're going to return to what we were; you take the power away from the consumer and you put it with the insurance company. So how do they do it? They raise the premiums or they cut your health care. They take away health care for people that want to get on their parents' plan up to the age of 26 if they're working at a company that doesn't have coverage, or they don't have coverage otherwise. They put on caps annually or lifetime caps so you can't get coverage. They rescind your policy exactly when you're in the middle of your cancer or diabetes care. Or they make sure some other way that you don't get the coverage you ought to have.

Wendell Potter, who was a whistleblower, used to be with CIGNA, one of the larger insurance companies, made it real clear when he was testifying before committees that in fact this is what companies want to do, they want to keep that medical loss ratio in place where they benefit and the consumer loses.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 2½ minutes and the gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to an excellent member of our conference, a new Member, a member of the healing profession, a nurse from North Carolina, RENEE ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, let's be reminded why we are here today. We are here because the leadership of the 111th Congress couldn't even pass a budget. However, my colleagues across the aisle did manage to pass this monstrosity with a closed rule and no debate.

□ 1640

This, my friends, is ObamaCare.

No one had time to read it, much less understand how it would actually affect small businesses. As a nurse and small business owner, I can tell you that this bill is devastating to health care and the economy. Calling a government takeover of one-sixth of the economy "reform" over and over and over again does not make it so.

Not only should we pass this amendment; we should pass this CR so we can save the American taxpayers from funding this outrageously bad bill. Then we can get to work providing real health care reforms that give the decision-making back to the doctors, nurses and patients, not to Washington bureaucrats.

Ms. DELLAURO. I would just like to remind the gentlelady that I understand she was not here, but we did debate health care in this body for approximately 18 months, so there was a very healthy and robust discussion about health care.

This amendment is a further demonstration of the majority's special interest priorities as they have to do with insurance companies. It really demonstrates the hypocrisy on job creation and deficit reduction as well.

Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlelady from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELLAURO. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. I want to follow up on what the gentlewoman from Connecticut said.

This is about Whose side are you on?

If you're with the gentleman from Georgia, you are on the side of the big insurance companies, and you'll want to make sure that they make bigger profits, that they get bigger bonuses, that they pass out bigger dividends and more money to their CEOs; or if you're against this amendment and you want to go with the health care reform bill that we have, you're with the little guy—with the consumer, with the average American.

Right now, the law says that consumers have to receive more value for their premium dollars. Insurance companies are required to spend 80 to 85 percent of premium dollars on medical care and health care quality improvements rather than on the bonuses and the salaries and the dividends for the CEOs and the stockholders.

That's what this is all about. You're going to hand back to the insurance companies control over what happens with the money that you paid in your premium so they can do whatever they want with it and make whatever profit they want. I think it's wrong.

One of the major issues that we face this year is affordability and what consumers are getting for their buck, so to speak. With health care reform, we made health insurance more affordable, and it will become more so as this kicks in further. At the same time, we wanted to make sure that when you spend your premium you get something back: you get good value, and you get good benefits. That's what we're doing with health care reform. We're not worried about the insurance companies and whether they get enough profit. They make enough profit. I'm going to give you some examples.

Let's use Aetna. Between 2009 and 2010, their profits went up 40 percent. I can use that for every one of the insurance companies.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. How much time remains, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself the remaining time.

We've heard this is about "whose side are you on?" and that it's about greed. It really is about who decides, Mr. Chairman. In health care, who decides?

The folks on the other side of the aisle want the government to decide. They want the government to decide what qualifies as health care and what kind of health care you can get for yourself and for your family and for everybody across this land. On this side of the aisle, we want patients to decide, patients and families and doctors.

That's what this amendment is all about. Support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 296 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Klamath Dam Removal and Sedimentation Study.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, the appropriations committee leadership supported my amendment No. 297 to cancel \$2 million that would be used to consider destroying four perfectly good hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River that are generating 155 megawatts of the cleanest, cheapest, and most reliable electricity on the planet—enough to power over 150,000 homes.

Amendment No. 296 is the companion measure. It forbids the Bureau to redirect its remaining funds for this purpose.

Let me emphasize: Congress never authorized this study. Congress never authorized the Klamath settlement. The Bureau of Reclamation is moving forward with it anyway. At a time when skyrocketing electricity prices threaten our economy and when acute capacity shortages threaten the reliability of our grid, destroying 155 megawatts of clean, cheap, and reliable hydroelectricity is simply insane.

We're told this is to save the salmon, but the proposal also includes destroying the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery, which is producing 5 million salmon smolt each year, 17,000 of which return to the Klamath as fully grown adults in order to spawn.

The Bureau is conducting this study without congressional authorization, and the language in this amendment is essential in order to implement the reduction that the House approved on Tuesday.

I thank the appropriations leadership for their support on Tuesday and ask that the House adopt the implementing language.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, as a staunch supporter of dams, I understand my colleague's position on this issue, and I support this amendment.

The constituents I represent overwhelmingly oppose removing functioning hydropower and its associated benefits. I fully share that concern and the disturbing precedent it sets. I think it represents a monumental failure that current Federal laws and regulations provide no alternative that will allow these dams to be operated as cost effectively as they were during the previous licensed term or that will allow the Federal Government to fully meet the obligations it made to the Klamath Basin agriculture with the development of the Klamath Reclamation Project.

As such, this amendment by itself will, unfortunately, not address the underlying issue, which is the environmental extortion that impacts property owners across the West and that impacts the hardworking people who depend on the land for their livelihoods.

Our laws are grossly out of balance, so I look forward to working with Chairman HASTINGS and Chairman MCCLINTOCK on the necessary reforms to prevent this continued abuse and to bring greater certainty to the Klamath Basin's agricultural community.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I just want to make a point.

The gentleman from California is correct. We did accept his amendment several days ago, an amendment which

dealt with the reduction of funds—I think it was \$1.9 million—but it was not specific to this dam; it was specific to the account. So this is a very different amendment, and that's why we rise in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What we're hearing on this amendment and as to the amendment itself is certainly a switch from what we've been hearing over the past couple of days. I say that because this amendment is a Washington, D.C., solution to a very, very local issue.

□ 1650

This amendment would stop a comprehensive local solution to a major and very costly problem in the Klamath River Basin.

This effort at the local level, supported by farmers and ranchers, fishermen, conservation groups, the privately owned power company in question, tribes, as well as the States of California and Oregon, it has a very bipartisan root. It was negotiated under both the Bush administration and the Obama administration.

It's a study. It does not, nor is it an agreement to, remove any dams.

All the local communities in the Klamath Basin, even those who were opposed to dam removal, support the completion of the study and they are at the table working on this specific issue.

Even the California Farm Bureau is in support of completing this study. It needs to be noted that only Congress can authorize dam removal.

This amendment is not wanted by any of the stakeholders: agriculture, conservation, local government, the dam owners, sportsmen and -women, nor the tribes. It will exacerbate the already serious problems we face in the Klamath Basin watershed.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in voting against this bad amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, nearly a decade ago the farmers and families in the Klamath Basin suffered irreparable harm when two government agencies with conflicting demands and questionable data shut off water for irrigated agriculture, threatening a way of life and the economy of the region. Fertile farmlands turned to dust under the summer sun. A wildlife refuge nearly dried up. Some farmers whose families had tilled the soil and grown crops for generations lost everything and filed for bankruptcy. The stress was too much for some. One died of a heart attack and another took his own life.

Out of that aftermath, the House Resources Committee, then chaired by

Jim Hansen of Utah and Richard Pombo of California, went to work with me trying to find short-term solutions and work on the long term. Principals in the basin, as you have heard, found common ground where they had been apart, and they reached agreement that they have brought forth to KBRA and the KHSA.

However, it's clear to me that the agreements as written do not have those in charge of the Resources Committee today. The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) have made that clear. There is little point, then, in spending more of the taxpayers' money, especially during these dire fiscal times, on an effort that is unlikely to move forward in its present form.

Given that reality, I will support the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The House's decision today, however, will not lessen the threat to irrigated agriculture in the Klamath Basin. It does not add to water storage. It does not provide protection to the ratepayers. It does not resolve the water rights disputes.

It does mean, however, the burden of finding a timely and effective solution to conflicts in the Klamath Basin now resides in the Resources Committee and those who rejected these plans, because there is no escaping the fact that the problems remain, the conflicts grow and the courts call all the shots absent legislative action.

Nearly a decade ago, the farmers and families in the Klamath Basin suffered irreparable harm when two government agencies, with conflicting demands and questionable data shut off the water for irrigated agriculture, threatening a way of life and the economy of the region. Fertile farmlands turned to dust under the summer sun. A wildlife refuge nearly dried up. Some farmers whose families had tilled the soil and grown crops for generations lost everything and filed for bankruptcy. The stress was too much for some . . . one farmer died of a heart attack and another took his own life.

Meanwhile, the nation's attention turned to the plight of the Klamath Basin farm families and more than 15,000 members of the community turned out in a symbolic bucket brigade that stretched from one end of town to the other.

I was a member of the House Resources Committee then, and our chairmen, first Jim Hansen of Utah and later Richard Pombo of California, responded to my calls for help with hearings and legislation. And the Bush Administration weighed in, too. We were committed to finding lasting solutions to prevent another water cut off. We put in place historic conservation efforts to improve water management. We got funds to screen the A canal and to remove Chiloquin dam. We created water banks and added to storage—although not by enough.

And then the principals in the Basin who often were on opposing sides, spent years trying to find common ground. They worked in good faith, tirelessly in search of a long-term plan to prevent another water cutoff. They should be commended for their work. And it is

the culmination of that effort—with all of the controversy that surrounds it—that brings us here today.

It is clear to me, that the agreements as written do not have the support of those in charge at the Resources Committee. The gentleman from California Mr. MCCLINTOCK and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, have made it abundantly clear that they will not move forward on the KBRA or the KHSA.

There is little point in spending more of the taxpayers' money—especially during these dire fiscal times—on an effort that is unlikely to move forward in its present form. Given that reality, I will join them today in voting for this limiting amendment.

The House's decision today will not lessen the threat to irrigated agriculture in the Klamath Basin. It does not add to water storage. It does not provide protection to ratepayers. It does not resolve water rights disputes.

It does mean, however, that the burden of finding a timely and effective solution to the conflicts in the Klamath Basin now resides with the Resources Committee and those who rejected this plan, because there is no escaping the fact that the problems remain. The conflicts grow. And the courts call the shots, absent legislative action.

I pray that we never have to see a repeat of the disaster of 2001. I look forward to working with the Chairman Mr. HASTINGS and the Subcommittee Chairman Mr. MCCLINTOCK on whatever plan they have in mind to bring about a comprehensive, Basin-wide solution. And I know they must understand, especially in this water year, how critical prompt action is.

Doing nothing is not an option.

[From Klamath Falls Herald and News, May 27, 2010]

COMMENTARY: HUKILL, SWITZER: AGAINST DAM REMOVAL, BUT FOR KBRA

(By Al Switzer and Cheryl Hukill)

There seems to be some confusion on where we, Commissioners Al Switzer and Cheryl Hukill, stand on dam removal and the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement.

From the very beginning of this process we have publicly stated that we are against dam removal and lobbied for fish ladders or trucking of fish instead. We are for jobs, jobs, jobs, and a strong economy. That message has never changed and will not change.

State Rep. Bill Garrard has stated publicly that his position is against dam removal but for the KBRA, and this is the same position that we have taken and continue to take.

We are not willing that outside entities make the decisions for this Basin when it comes to the water and agricultural issues that face us.

We know that whether we signed the agreement or not, the dams are destined to come out. That was a private company making a private business decision. Government has no business interfering with private industry.

But the destiny of our farmers and ranchers is our priority, and we must be participants of the committees that will be formed as a result of the KBRA.

The agricultural community brings in over \$600 million, using a multiplier of 2. It has also created over 4,000 jobs.

Businesses with livable wage jobs will quit looking at Klamath County as a viable place to relocate if we do not have a stable economy, of which agriculture is a huge part.

Status quo is no longer an option. We must never forget what happened in 2001. Every

business was affected by the government shutting our water off. At least with the KBRA, a committee of stakeholders will help set the course for our water issues.

If the KBRA had been in effect in 2008, we would have had enough carryover to have 330,000 acre-feet of water instead of the 150,000 acre feet. Why? Because the biological opinion would have allowed the flow of water going down the Klamath River between October and February to be far less than it was this year.

Again, we stand against dam removal, but stand for jobs and a strong economy.

The authors

Al Switzer and Cheryl Hukill are Klamath County commissioners.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from California and Arizona.

This has been a hard-fought battle in my State. In a prior lifetime, I was a legislator in charge of the appropriations process for my home State of Oregon; and for the 10, 12 years I was in the State legislature, this area, this internecine warfare in the Klamath Basin over the use of the water resources was a really hot topic.

As a result, our State and the Federal Government were spending millions of dollars in lawsuits. This agreement, this agreement to have a study to bury that hatchet and come to an agreement is absolutely critical. We have tribes, ranchers, farmers, local officials who have all come together to say let's solve this problem at the regional level.

We in Washington, D.C., should not be getting involved. This is a long-fought battle that finally has come to some accord. We should let it happen and stay out of Oregon and California's business.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the gentleman from Arizona is disingenuous when he says that we didn't know this was about the Klamath when we adopted the funding reduction on Tuesday. That was the entire context of the debate. I mentioned it over and over again. It's not true that this is somehow a surprise if the gentleman was listening.

As to the claim that this is an agreement that has been agreed to by all of the political insiders in the area, let me assure the gentleman from California that it is opposed by the overwhelming majority of voters as tested in several local elections, including the formal opposition to the dam removal by the Siskiyou border supervisors elected by the people of the region.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I was listening; I did understand. Because even though I heard the words, the understanding I had with the chairman of the subcommittee and the reason we supported it was that the reduction of funds was to the account, not these specific projects. So I did listen; I did understand.

But today we are talking about prohibiting money for the study. And I

have to tell you that this agreement is to study the potential removal of four privately owned dams, not the agreement to remove dams. It is designed to bring about significant improvements to both environmental conditions and water supplies, certainly, which need to be confirmed through the study.

The studies are scientific. They deal with engineering and economic and environmental-based analysis to determine whether the promise of the agreement will occur. And for that reason, we oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I just want to say to the gentleman, the Oregon Public Utility Commission has ruled that, from the standpoint of the rate-paying public, the settlement agreement is preferable to relicensing under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, known as FERC, as the agreement caps ratepayer cost at \$200 million; whereas, fish passage costs, because these dams are old, could exceed \$500 million, plus an additional \$200 million for O&M. The amendment would force these costs on the rate-paying public without the benefit of accurate benefits and costs.

Being from the Northwest, I want you to know that sometimes, and they are just studying this dam removal, but sometimes by taking out dams you can restore the original habitat and help the salmon recovery, as we are doing on the Elwha Dam project up in Washington State.

The reason we did it: Because it was going to cost so much to fix up the dam, that it was actually cheaper to take them out and restore, and this became a major restoration project. So I wouldn't just assume that this is not a positive thing.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. He is absolutely correct.

What is being dealt with in the Klamath Basin is an unraveling of a serious problem all because the Federal Government has promised more than Mother Nature can deliver. And part of what is being considered—is being supported broadly by Native Americans and business interests. We have been working with utilities—

Mr. DICKS. By the local community.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. A broad range of people in the community. This is something that needs to be seriously studied and done right.

There is a very strong likelihood that if it isn't done properly, there may well be something that happens in the Klamath River Basin where circumstances move ahead and it's not done in the way that I think most people would like.

So I appreciate—

Mr. DICKS. And being from Oregon, you realize that it would do a lot potentially for salmon restoration.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is a tremendous opportunity for the Klamath River Basin. It's a tremendous opportunity for the Native Americans, for agriculture, for sportspeople and to avoid the litigation and the political squirrel cage that we are in.

If you go down there and visit the Klamath Basin, you would find, as I know my good friend from California has, it's a tremendous opportunity. This amendment really would be a mistake.

□ 1700

Mr. DICKS. I thank my friend.

Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman, and I want to agree with you, Mr. DICKS, on the salmon implications of this, and also Mr. WALDEN, who talked about the agricultural implications of not having a solution. This has been an absolute mess for decades, and we've seen the fruits of that disaster bear out in the salmon industry crashing and agricultural problems that we have.

And for the first time in decades, first time ever, we have had all the stakeholders come together. These are people who you couldn't get in the same town with before who are sitting around the same table. They are working out solutions. They have come to some agreements. And this study has to be made, and, Mr. DICKS, you are absolutely right.

Mr. DICKS. And you would think that the gentleman from California would be interested in letting the local community come to a decision on this rather than imposing it from Washington, D.C., and overturning what this local group of people have been working on for years. I mean, this is really a bit much.

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

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

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I don't need anywhere close to 5 minutes. I simply want to emphasize that the gentleman is correct, that the local people should decide that issue, and they have.

In one local election after another, when this has been the deciding question, the voters themselves have said it is insanity, at a time when we can't guarantee enough electricity to keep their air conditioners running or the refrigerators running, to tear down the generating capacity equivalent to enough for 150,000 residents and 155 megawatts of electricity.

The Siskiyou Board of Supervisors, elected by the people of the region, has taken a very strong stand in opposition to the removal of the dams.

And to the gentleman from California, I too am concerned about the salmon. That's why the Iron Gate Fish

Hatchery, which is producing 5 million salmon smolt a year, 17,000 of which return as fully grown salmon to spawn, is so critical. And why they would want to tear that out, along with the dams, is absolutely beyond me and beyond the people of the region who have voted repeatedly on this issue.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think the idea is we wanted to wrap this up without too much debate. I just felt in fairness that the gentleman deserved some extra time. I don't think we need to prolong this.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I would just like to clarify one fact.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I just want to clarify one issue, and that's the cost of energy as a result of this. If this isn't solved, the dam owners, the private owners that are supporting this study will have to make repairs to the dam that far exceed other costs and will drive the ratepayers' utility rates up through the roof. That's why the statement was made about those costs of utilities and the costs to the ratepayers.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. That's the point. It would cost more to fix these dams up. That's the problem we faced on the Elwha. Even though the dams were there, the cost was so high to fix them up that it was better to take them out.

Now, this study will just look at this and the local people will wind up getting hurt if you force them to have to do this. So let the local people decide this and let this study go forward. It is a very inexpensive thing, and this community has worked hard and deserves a chance to look at this.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman.

And I would simply say in response that the gentleman in opposition forgets two important points. Number one, the additional costs are being forced on those private dam operators by the government. It is about time that we recognize that it is the government imposing these regulations that's driving up these costs.

And I would remind him he also forgets the enormous replacement costs. The power coming off those dams is the cheapest and cleanest on the planet. To replace that power is going to cost many, many times the costs currently borne by the ratepayers for the cheap hydroelectricity those dams produce.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. MCDERMOTT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan for, begin, continue, finish, process, or approve the relocation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Marine Operations Center-Pacific from Seattle, Washington, to Newport, Oregon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am a big fan of NOAA. The scientists and analysts at NOAA do extraordinary work for this country. Unfortunately, NOAA's process for choosing a location for the Marine Operations Center jeopardizes the operation of the Pacific Center and is wasting tens of millions of dollars of taxpayer money.

My amendment would save at least \$5 million immediately, and beyond that, probably \$10 to \$20 million in long-term costs. It would defund the move of the Marine Operations Center from Seattle to Newport, Oregon, for the rest of the year so that there is time for the broken process to be looked into.

Now, this is not a case of sour grapes. If it was what was best for the country, I wouldn't fight tooth and nail against some jobs moving from one place to another. But the Commerce Department's inspector general and the Government Accountability Office have written scathing reports about this move and the decision process. They found it is among the worst run, least transparent, and least competitive bidding processes they have ever investigated. If you want to compare it to the Bridge to Nowhere, this is exactly what it is.

I came from Chicago, and when we looked at something like this, we would always say the fix was in. Spending tens of millions of taxpayer dollars to dislocate hundreds of families to a site that's frequently unavailable for navigation because of dangerous conditions, is not near shipyards or maritime suppliers, is more than 120 miles from the nearest airport, and will be hugely expensive to run every year makes no common sense. And the reports of the inspector general report that very clearly.

Now, Newport is an environmentally sensitive area, and NOAA's own, their

own private consultants say the site is the least qualified destination for the move. Despite all these issues, NOAA has charged ahead and been completely unaccountable. NOAA officials are not willing to admit their huge mistake and fix it. And this is just plain wrong. Taking a breather for the next 7 months while we get a truly transparent process is the right thing to do.

NOAA and Newport are saying that any delay, any examination, any looking at this will have catastrophic consequences. That simply is not true. We have studies from the CRS and others it won't put contracts at risk, it will not increase costs.

So I rise today to stop the process for the remainder of the year, to give NOAA and the Commerce Department time to get their ducks in a row, hit the restart button, and stop wasting taxpayer money.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
THE INSPECTOR GENERAL,
Washington, DC, May 26, 2010.

Memorandum for: Jane Lubchenko, Ph.D.,
Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans
and Atmosphere
From: Todd J. Zinser
Subject: NOAA's Acquisition of Facilities to
House the Marine Operations Center—
Pacific

By letter dated March 5, 2010, Chairwoman Maria Cantwell and Ranking Member Olympia Snowe of the Senate Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, requested that the Office of Inspector General review NOAA's decision to award a lease to the Port of Newport, Oregon, to house NOAA's Marine Operations Center-Pacific (MOC-P). Their letter raised several specific questions regarding the decision-making process that resulted in this lease.

NOAA began the lease acquisition process as early as September 2007, when it initiated a market analysis. It published a Solicitation for Offers for a new lease on November 24, 2008. Four bidders submitted offers, and NOAA awarded a lease to the Port of Newport on August 4, 2009. One of the unsuccessful bidders, the Port of Bellingham, Washington, filed a protest with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) on August 27, 2009—10 days after it received a post-award debriefing from NOAA. On December 2, 2009, GAO sustained Bellingham's protest against NOAA's lease award and recommended that NOAA conduct an analysis of practicable alternatives to the Newport offer. In its January 29, 2010, response to GAO, NOAA stated that it expected to complete all corrective actions relating to the successful bid protest by May 28, 2010.

Although the lease acquisition process began in 2007, the decision-making process related to the acquisition can be traced back approximately 10 years. Together, these processes involved several separate offices within NOAA, the Department, and other federal agencies. In addition, they involved many statutory provisions, regulations, NOAA and Department policies, other administrative directives, and changes in personnel. Given the scope and complexity of these processes, we continue to gather and evaluate information, and in order to gain the best understanding of the facts and circumstances surrounding NOAA's process, we will need to continue our work beyond the time by which NOAA intends to finalize its assessment of practicable alternatives.

Although our review is ongoing, we have identified one issue that warrants higher-level review by NOAA before it finalizes its examination of practicable alternatives. Specifically, based on our review, we believe that NOAA should examine whether it sufficiently complied with the requirement to consider existing federal facilities before pursuing a new lease acquisition. Such an examination will help to ensure that the ultimate decision—whether it be to affirm the original choice or select an alternative approach—is grounded in a more thorough, well-substantiated, and well-documented analysis.

According to 41 C.F.R. 102-73.10, before acquiring real estate by lease, purchase, or construction, federal agencies should first use space in government-owned and government-leased facilities. Similarly, Department of Commerce policy generally disapproves of long-term lease solutions (Department of Commerce, Real Property Management Manual, 5.4.1(d) (2003)). These issues are separate, but both relate to how NOAA assessed its options for MOC-P. We address each issue separately here, detailing factors that may potentially impact NOAA's own assessment of how well it followed these directives.

While there is a lack of detailed criteria against which to measure NOAA's efforts to consider other federal facilities, the Department's Real Property Management Manual does require the Department to make "every reasonable effort to utilize Government-controlled space" before leasing space. Our review uncovered some evidence that NOAA considered other federal facilities; however, NOAA was not able to provide evidence that other federal facilities were systematically inventoried, analyzed, and rejected before initiating efforts to acquire a follow-on lease from other sources for MOC-P, nor was the decision to reject other federal facilities well-documented.

For example, we were told by NOAA officials that NOAA had considered collocating with select Coast Guard and Navy facilities, but its consideration was not documented. In preparation for the lease acquisition, NOAA received proposals in mid-2007 for an alternative site analysis to (1) investigate the most functional, efficient, and cost-effective options for reconsolidating MOC-P and (2) provide an indication of how each site might perform during the subsequent lease solicitation process. That study, conducted under contract, was completed in September 2008. Of the 32 ports, cities, and economic development councils contacted, 11 responded, offering a total of 22 potential site options for further analysis. The 22 were further narrowed to a total of 15, only 3 of which were federally-owned: GSA's Federal Center South, the Department of Labor's Tongue Point, and NOAA's Western Regional Center. In November 2008, in an apparent rejection of those federal sites, NOAA issued the Solicitation for Offers.

NOAA also considered and declined GSA's May 2008 offer to fulfill the MOC-P requirements at the GSA-owned Federal Center South (FCS) facility. NOAA's Western Regional Center (WRC) was also rejected as a long-term solution because of what NOAA characterizes as litigation risks in that area. Having ultimately rejected the use of other federal facilities, it is also unclear whether NOAA adequately considered other required alternatives. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-94, which requires cost-benefit analyses of decisions on whether to lease or purchase, is an example of other potentially applicable requirements that may apply to NOAA's decision-making.

Our review has thus far uncovered three key issues regarding NOAA's consideration of other federal facilities.

First, at some time between 2000 and 2007, as detailed below, NOAA may have changed from considering a dispersed model for fulfilling the MOC-P requirement, which could have affected the analysis of available federal facilities.

Although NOAA's 2008 Solicitation for Offers was limited to the lease of a consolidated facility (which would collocate all ships and staff), it commissioned a June 2000 Homeport Alternatives Analysis, conducted by SRI International, in which it contemplated operating from dispersed facilities as a cost-saving measure. This study was commissioned to explore alternative homeports, given the possibility of the Lake Union lease not being extended beyond 2003.

The 2000 study indicated that NOAA was seeking to reduce costs by moving MOC-P staff to the WRC. Noting that NOAA was evaluating split homeporting, the study also explored homeporting two of four MOC-P vessels in Alaska to reduce ship travel time.

To date, NOAA has not provided an explanation of what factors led to the apparent shift from the 2000 study to the current preference for a consolidated, leased solution. This apparent change in the vision for meeting the MOC-P requirement may have had a significant impact on how NOAA approached its available alternatives.

Notably, since the July 2006 fire that destroyed the MOC-P piers at Lake Union, MOC-P has operated under a dispersed model, using piers at NOAA's WRC and GSA's FCS. Also, NOAA's Marine Operations Center-Atlantic operates in dispersed facilities. This suggests that a dispersed model may be feasible and should have been assessed as part of NOAA's requirements-planning process.

Second, NOAA's analysis of how well it considered other federal facilities should include an examination of how thoroughly it analyzed and weighed its potential long-term options at the WRC and FCS, where it currently operates.

NOAA should consider whether it would have been feasible to maintain its current dispersed configuration while relocating staff to the WRC or other leased offices.

Specifically, we found that the WRC was dredged in the 1970s in anticipation of developing four long piers to accommodate many more vessels, and utilities may already be in place for two additional planned buildings that were not developed.

Although NOAA has cited neighborhood opposition to expanded use of the WRC and litigation against NOAA in that area in the 1970s, MOC-P has been homeported there since 2006. We have reviewed recent letters from some surrounding neighborhood groups that support locating MOC-P at the WRC. The potential cost savings of using these existing facilities may outweigh the litigation risks.

Third, GSA's pre-solicitation offer to serve the MOC-P requirements at FCS may have presented a viable federal facility for NOAA's consideration. This is particularly relevant because of the changed circumstances at this site.

GSA's May 2008 offer arrived well before NOAA issued its Solicitation for Offers in November 2008. NOAA declined this offer one month later, citing the narrowness of the waterway adjacent to the existing FCS pier, the fact that the waterway was a Superfund site, and NOAA's established goal of being operational in a new lease by July 1, 2011.

Since then, GSA has obtained American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds to redevelop three FCS buildings and plans to relocate a large tenant, leaving an existing building potentially available for NOAA, with some modification.

We have been advised that NOAA currently has access to a pier that is sufficiently

equipped and sizable to accommodate three of its vessels.

Although NOAA has cited concerns regarding underwater property lines, it has not provided an indication that this situation has been a problem during its use of the pier since 2006.

Regarding FCS being a Superfund site, according to a senior official at GSA with whom we spoke, this would be an issue for GSA, not NOAA. While the potential issue exists and an environmental impact statement would be required, Superfund liability would lie with GSA or another FCS tenant.

NOAA cited its June 30, 2011, deadline for vacating the Lake Union site in its June 2008 letter declining GSA's offer. However, this deadline was driven by the expiration of the Lake Union lease, and suitable workarounds—such as short-term office leases through GSA—may potentially have been available.

Pursuing such workarounds may have enabled NOAA to garner the necessary time and funding to develop the WRC and FCS individually or together for the MOC-P requirement.

In our view, NOAA's examination of these issues related to its consideration of other federal facilities will ensure that the final decision regarding practicable alternatives to Newport is thorough and well-documented.

We noted above that Department policy generally disapproves of long-term lease solutions, and it states that leased facilities should not be considered a permanent solution. Yet although the Newport lease award will commit NOAA to a leased solution for another 20 years, our review of how NOAA approached government-owned solutions found little documented analysis. NOAA has told us that leasing was preferred because acquiring funding for such an acquisition would have required considerable lead time and because funding of facilities has historically received lower priority than other funding requirements.

NOAA officials also cited the fact that MOC-P has historically used leased sites.

The relevant documents show that on at least two occasions, NOAA briefly considered acquiring the Lake Union site, which housed all MOC-P operations prior to the fire, but documentation of those efforts was limited to what can be characterized as passing comments. We have not been provided with evidence of systematic efforts to assess the feasibility of purchasing or constructing facilities elsewhere.

We understand that NOAA's consideration of the practicable alternatives to the Newport site is in progress and scheduled to be completed by May 28, 2010. Although NOAA had the authority to define the scope of the practicable alternatives as it saw fit, it limited its assessment to the four offers that it received under the solicitation. However, considering the range of options that were available to NOAA in government-owned and government-leased space, a broader examination may be warranted as part of this analysis.

According to NOAA, it is standard GSA practice for lease-to-build leases not to include a termination clause in the lease, and such a clause was not included in the Port of Newport award. We understand that NOAA obtained a preliminary estimate of potential lease termination costs from the Department of Commerce Office of General Counsel. However, as part of its decision-making process, NOAA should conduct a rigorous analysis of the potential termination costs and document the specific components of this estimate. As it continues to evaluate its practicable alternatives, it would be prudent for NOAA to minimize these potential costs to the extent possible.

Whatever conclusion NOAA reaches, it should carefully examine and document all pertinent factors, including those that we have highlighted. In order for both of our offices to be responsive to the Subcommittee, it is important to examine these issues regarding NOAA's consideration of other federal facilities. As we finalize our response to the Chairwoman and Ranking Member, we will follow up with your office to determine what additional information NOAA may have identified.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

□ 1710

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

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Frankly, I am not sure exactly where my friend from Washington has gotten his facts. Let's be clear up front, if this amendment was enacted, NOAA would face termination liabilities well in excess of the \$5 million or \$10 million that my good colleague refers to that would be in excess of \$50 million, and their ability to conduct the mission critical activities in the Pacific would be in serious jeopardy.

NOAA would have neither the authority nor resources to contract for alternate arrangements, putting in jeopardy the support of this fleet of ships which gather critical data to produce navigational charts of U.S. waters, survey fishery stocks, and maintain instruments which support tsunami warnings, weather forecasts, and climate research. Let me say again for the record very clearly here, after NOAA's current lease is up in June, if this amendment were to pass, NOAA would have no authority—zero, legal or otherwise—to mobilize its Pacific fleet. It would be dead in the water.

There has been a lot of talk about process; but, frankly, this process has been comprehensive, transparent, and legitimate. My friends in Washington State have made sure that's the case. After a rigorous competitive lease acquisition process that followed GAO guidelines, NOAA was awarded a 20-year lease to Newport for the relocation of its Pacific fleet in August of 2009, and it subsequently complied with the IG report that was referred to and met the guidelines.

The facts are clear. NOAA made this decision based on merits, not politics. Let's not have politics undo a good decision. Newport was a superior choice for the taxpayers and the agency's mission in the Pacific. It was the number one choice in cost, and it was the number one choice in technical merit. In fact, the annual lease of the Newport facilities will cost the Federal Government 50 percent less than the three competing sites located in Washington State.

In fact, in 2006, the pier at NOAA's Lake Union, Seattle, facility was destroyed by fire and was never even reconstructed by the host city. On the other hand, the State of Oregon and

the local community have spent millions of dollars of their own dollars with no Federal support to construct new facilities in Newport. Newport is actually ahead of schedule and will be ready to hand over the keys to NOAA on May 1 when NOAA's 20-year lease is set to commence. NOAA is contractually obligated, Mr. Chair, to commence the 20-year lease in May of this year.

The new facility in Newport brings costs, offsets, and advantages that my good friend and colleague from Washington conveniently omits. The closer proximity and transit time from the port to the ocean is dramatic. Instead of 8 hours from Lake Union, they get to the ocean in 20 minutes. The new facility is right next to the Hatfield Center, Oregon State University, for great research compatibility. And importantly, the relocation of NOAA's Pacific fleet represents a huge boost to a small rural Oregon coastal community with a great fishing legend and tradition that will bring much-needed jobs and translate into significant economic benefits. This is a David versus Goliath opportunity.

Over the last 4 days, we've engaged in rigorous debate about the fiscal health of our country. For my colleagues that are serious about saving taxpayer dollars and reducing our deficit, you should join me in opposing the McDermott amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the good Representative from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, as I appreciate his leadership. Because this is a process that he has been stewarding, being a key congressional partner. I appreciate his referencing what has happened here, dating back to August 2009.

This has been scrutinized. We are friendly rivals in the Pacific Northwest. And it's a rare, rare, rare occasion that any Federal activity ever leaves the Evergreen State and ends up in Oregon, as my good friend, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, can attest because working with Senator Magnuson, he helped vacuum functions into the State of Oregon.

So you can bet that this was flyspecked to the extreme, but the advantages are overwhelming. The proximity, the technical effort, the local investment has been amazing. So we've been pilloried on this. It's been under a microscope, and we've reached the point now that it's really past the point of no return. If this ill-advised—but I'm sure well-intended—amendment would be adopted by my friend from Washington, the Federal Government would be on the hook for more money; it would be disruptive for NOAA; and, frankly, it would be a disservice to the people who played fair, who went all along the way playing by the rules, making the case.

I strongly urge rejection of this amendment.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chair, I have good friends, and I know they have to defend their hometown as adequately as they want.

But let me read from the IG's report: "In our view, the more fundamental problems pertaining to NOAA's process prior to the competitive lease process, a primary cause of these problems is grounded in the fact that NOAA did not subject the MOC-P project to a rigorous capital investment planning and oversight process. While the Department has clear property policy, NOAA did not follow it. NOAA thus proceeded with requirements for its desired option of consolidated facility based on justification and consideration of alternatives that, on the face and without additional documentation, are significantly lacking. NOAA's financial analysis of the four offers submitted in response to the solicitation did not assess the total cost to the government, and NOAA provided no evidence that it had thoroughly considered the operational and logistical implications of the relocation."

Now that's not two rivals from one State and another. This is the Inspector General of the Commerce Department going down and looking at the process. And the fact is that the CRS report, dated 30 September 2010, which I will submit for the RECORD, says that the Federal Government is able to terminate its contracts for convenience. The governmental interest is always higher than the commercial interest. So the Federal Government can get out of this. They save \$50 million. It's not going to be \$50 million because they still have the pier. They can do whatever they want with it, but they do not have a contract with the Federal Government for the next 20 years in a place that is very far away.

NOAA has been in Seattle for 40 years. That's true. Whence it was created, it was put there for a very good reason. I don't care if it goes to Bellingham or it goes to Oregon or where it goes, but there ought to be a transparent process.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. HERGER

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

The Acting 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 by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to implement or enforce Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule (subpart B of part 212 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations), relating to the designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use, in any administrative unit of the National Forest System.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1720

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I'm offering this amendment after much frustration and a lack of responsiveness from the Forest Service to locally elected officials and the recreation community in northern California and across the Nation. For a couple of years now, I and northern California constituents I represent have tried many times to work with the Forest Service on the 2005 Travel Management Rule. Yet we have been completely ignored as the Forest Service presses ahead with route designations that in some cases will eliminate more than 90 percent of the previous access.

Locally elected officials are now at the point of considering litigation against the Forest Service to keep these federal lands open to recreation. It is disgraceful that local counties would have to spend valuable public funding to preserve access to our own national forests. Not only are our counties forced to defend themselves against well funded environmental activists trying to turn every acre of federal land into some kind of sanctuary, but now also against the very agency that is supposed to serve the public.

For these reasons, I believe it is necessary to impose a 7-month timeout on designating these routes.

Chairman SIMPSON, ultimately, we want a workable solution, and I hope to work with you and Chairman HASTINGS to ensure a more balanced implementation of the Travel Management Rule.

I hope that my colleagues can support this amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would stop a very careful planning process that determines what routes off-road vehicles can use through our national forests. Now over the past few decades, we know that the availability and capability of off-road vehicles has increased tremendously. That means more Americans are enjoying access to, and recreational opportunities in, their national forests, but the resulting proliferation of random routes results in severe impacts, particularly on the quality of our water

supply and the physical safety of national forest visitors.

The national forests are spectacular lands. There are 193 million national forest acres all over this Nation. Oftentimes, we take them for granted and fail to realize that the national forests are the headwaters for much of our Nation's surface waters. The clean, pure water produced on a national forest is a national treasure and the economic resource that supports industry and agriculture nationwide. In fact, half of the American West gets their drinking water from national forests, while in many rural communities, it is 100 percent.

The proliferation, though, of random trails created by off road vehicles, increases erosion and pollution into water sources with no possibility for mitigation by culverts or other measures that would be available to land managers on designated routes.

This amendment is poorly considered. The amendment would stop a reasonable, locally oriented planning process that has been going on for 6 years to allow recreational access to our forests, but to do so in a way that also protects the sustainable production of water, timber, wildlife, and other natural resources.

The Forest Service has been called upon to designate which motorized routes are appropriate in the eyes of inclusive groups of local community leaders, with particular consideration to visitor safety and the ability of the Forest Service to comply with its other mandates. It is practically impossible to maintain trail conditions without designated routes or to avoid accidents to hikers, damaged equipment, or even visitors getting lost in the back country.

Route designation enables land managers to guide motorized users away from sensitive wildlife habitats at appropriate times of the year, helping to maintain quality herds.

In summary, the planning process that this amendment would repeal is local, driven by longstanding productive partnerships among local, State, and federal agencies; Indian tribes; and a diverse array of commercial and non-commercial interests. Halting this planning process would squander those investments and rebuke the sincere commitment it reflects on the part of so many citizens to protect their public lands. All who love and use our national forests should oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. HERGER. I have to comment that really all we're doing is asking for a 7-month timeout so that we—our local officials, our local communities have not been counseled with, they have not been brought into the process, and to have 90 percent in many areas declared off-bounds is not reasonable.

I would like to yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from California is absolutely right. These Travel Management Rules are highly exclusionary. They severely limit the public's access to the public's own land with devastating consequences for the local economies of every mountain town that's affected.

As Butte County Supervisor Bill Connelly writes, "the roads within the National Forests are used by thousands of residents and visitors for transportation and recreation. These activities generate revenue for our rural communities which are critical for their survival."

This is not a small matter. The Forest Service now controls 193 million acres within our Nation, a land area the size of Texas. In recent years, the Forest Service has utterly reversed the vision of its founder, Gifford Pinchot, "to provide the greatest amount of good for the greatest amount of people in the long run." Instead, we confront an increasingly elitist and exclusionary attitude that is vividly illustrated by the draconian restrictions in the forest travel management plan. It bears far more resemblance to the public's exclusion from the royal forests under King John than to an agency that is supposed to encourage, welcome, facilitate, and maximize the people's use of our national forests.

These amendments restore the inclusionary vision of Gifford Pinchot by restoring the public's access to the public's land.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I would yield those 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman. And I rise in opposition to the Herger amendment.

In 2001, the Forest Service finally admitted the obvious—the road system through our national forests is far larger than it should be. Though the Forest Service can't tell us for sure, the best estimate is that the national forests are crisscrossed by more than 308,000 miles of roads. That is eight times the length of the entire United States interstate system. Forest roads could wrap around the Earth 15 times.

From 1975 to 1985, the Forest road system doubled. And that is just the authorized roads. It is estimated that there are an additional 60,000 miles of user-created, illegal roads through the forests, cut through sensitive areas just because it looked like fun.

The massive tangle of roads fragments the forest, destroying habitat, increasing erosion, and decreasing water quality. And the problems get worse each year as the Forest Service road maintenance budget falls further and further behind. Real maintenance needs for this massive road system just

don't happen. The current backlog is estimated to be \$10 billion.

And do you want to know how we know it's really so bad? Because it was the Bush administration that finally announced in 2001 that a planning process for inventory of the road system to figure out how many miles of roads it really needed, closing illegal roads, and starting to work on a more efficient system, were needed.

The Herger amendment stops the Bush administration planning in its tracks just as it is about to be completed. And I just believe that the Members really should not take it upon themselves to end this 7-year process that is going to finally bring some order to the Forest Service. I urge a "no" vote on the Herger amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Again, we're not saying we shouldn't look at this, we shouldn't examine it, we shouldn't have regulations. We should. Those of us who live in these areas, we care about the environment more than anyone does. That's not the question.

The question that is being presented and what we're asking for is, since the Forest Service has not been consulting with local government, they have not been consulting with the local communities, we are asking for a 7-month timeout so that they can consult with us and then we can continue to come up with a plan where we work together and not have, again, an all-powerful government in Washington dictating and preventing those that are local from being able to enjoy our own recreation in our national forest.

□ 1730

I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 323 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). 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 new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide benefits described in section 1001D(b)(1)(C) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(b)(1)(C)) to a person or legal entity in excess of \$250,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011,

the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, no serious effort to reduce the Federal Government is complete without addressing agricultural subsidies. Even in time of record high farm prices and profits, we still gave \$16 billion in subsidies last year.

There are no meaningful limits. They are easily evaded, doubled if you are married. They don't cover loan deficiency payments or marketing loans. This amendment would establish a hard limit of \$250,000 per entity.

In 2009, almost 1,500 entities got \$250,000 or more. Something called Fidelity National Insurance Titles, probably not a family farm, raked in more than \$4 million in 2009. For the past 15 years, Riceland Foods in Arkansas has collected a half-billion dollars from the taxpayers.

I strongly urge that you join with me, Taxpayers for Common Sense, the Environmental Working Group, Humane USA, a wide variety of groups and organizations, to establish this limit, save \$100 million this year and more in the future, and start us on a path of reform that we can realize in the upcoming farm bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to say about this and to my friend from Oregon is, I believe we should put farm subsidies on the table. And that's why in this bill we have included cuts to very popular agriculture red state, if you will, programs, rural development, the Farm Service Agencies, and the NRCS. All kinds of conservation programs are cut in this. However, there are a number of traditional farm programs that we are going to let the ag authorizing committee deal with, because that's where they need to be dealt with.

So I want to say this. While I oppose the gentleman's amendment, I don't oppose you seeking a reduction to the subsidies. But we believe that this has to be dealt with in the farm bill. And I look forward to working with you and the chairman of the Agriculture Committee on that when it comes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the ranking agriculture appropriations member, a champion of agriculture reform and of agriculture, Congressman FARR.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise reluctantly because Mr. KINGSTON and myself, I think, have a great deal of respect for how we ought to be managing the future of payments, and

I concur with his remarks. But I am rising in favor of the amendment because I think we have to push the attention to how vital it is that we reform this program, and I don't think you get that attention without bringing this amendment to the floor and passing it.

It's going to be hard to implement in the next remaining months, as so many of the amendments that we've adopted here in the last 3 days, but I do think that it is worth the debate of how we focus on the rest of the year. Because, frankly, we ought not to be just paying entities in this country hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars because they didn't get the price they wanted at the market.

I represent the biggest growing area, and we don't get any of these payments. Not a single farmer. These are just a few entities, and it's wrong. So we ought to adopt the amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is wrongheaded at this point in time, as my colleague from Georgia has said.

The farm safety net is an integral series of compromises and changes from 2002 to 2008 that the folks went through in order to come to that agreement. To pull out one segment of that safety net, and in an ad hoc manner without any testimony, without any references to what it might do to the overall program, in my view, is wrongheaded. Next year is the time to do this.

We will go through a rigorous debate across the section. The conservation folks will be able to weigh in. All segments of the farm safety net will be represented at the table during the farm bill debate next year under the leadership of Chairman LUCAS. That is the time in order to do this.

We will have opportunities to do this work thoughtfully. There will be trades and compromises that will have to be made because, in all likelihood, we will have less money under the farm bill next year than we had in 2008.

As an aside, if we could go back to 2008 levels, I'm sure most of our agriculture guys would love to do that, since that is the mantra of the Republican House this week, to go back to 2008 levels. We'll take that. Throw us into the briar patch. But to do this today on an ad hoc, pulling this element out and changing it in this manner, is wrongheaded and I oppose it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague, Congressman KIND, who has been a tireless champion of agricultural reform, coming as he does from farm country in the upper Midwest.

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, and to my good friend from Texas, I hear what you are saying. But I have been around here long enough to realize that next

year never comes. The next farm bill that addresses comprehensive reform never happens.

I commend the gentleman from Oregon for offering this amendment and trying to begin the process now, because I know how difficult it is.

In fact, earlier today I offered an amendment, a very straightforward amendment, that would end a new American taxpayer subsidy program to the tune of \$150 million a year that is now going to Brazilian cotton agribusinesses, and it was defeated on the floor. That just shows you what we have gotten into with these outdated farm programs and the institutional interests and the special interests that maintain the status quo.

These large taxpayer subsidies going to a few very large agribusinesses have got to end. They are not fiscally responsible, they are not responsible to the American taxpayer, they are not helping family farmers throughout the country, they are driving up land prices, leading to greater consolidation of production in agriculture making it very difficult for new beginning farmers to enter the occupation. From the State of Wisconsin, where the average farmer's age today is 58 years old, that's a pretty serious topic for the new generation of farmers taking over these farm operations.

This is difficult, I understand. There are built-in special interests fighting reform and maintaining the status quo. But this also has to be on the table when it comes to serious budget deficit reduction. It is distorting the marketplace, and it's distorting trade policy. And there will be more successful WTO challenges against our farm programs unless we have the institutional will to change them.

I encourage support for my friend's amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I want to make three points real quickly.

Number one, we have shown in this bill that we understand our mandate is to reduce spending. We are going to take on ag subsidies.

Number two, we have already shown that in this bill with cuts to rural development, Farm Service Agency, the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

And, finally, we talk about next year? This is last year we are debating. We are debating the year in which planting decisions have already made.

□ 1740

This is last year's budget we're still working on. That's why we can't do this in the midseason.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close on this amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has the right to close.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I have one more speaker, and we will close with him.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well, I have listened to the language about damaging the farm safety net. There is a massive farm safety net in place. We're just reducing the safety net to a mere quarter million dollars a year.

My friend, Mr. KIND, is absolutely right. Tomorrow never comes here. I've been on the floor of the House when the House instructed the conferees to accept this exact limit. We were rolled by the Ag Committee and ignored.

This is an opportunity for us to not deal with the savings that you're taking away from nutrition and from the environmental titles. Talk about the safety net. What about your cuts to WIC?

For heaven's sakes. A hundred million dollars savings to the taxpayer. Get started on reform now and join in a bipartisan effort. I've been pleased to work with Congressman FLAKE, Congressman KIND, Congressman RYAN. Year after year we have brought these issues to the floor and been rolled. Now is the time to start by adopting it and changing the system.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just want to say that the ag section of this bill cuts \$5.2 billion. Three to four of those billions comes straight from production agriculture, not from school nutrition and other socially sensitive programs.

I yield the balance of my time to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Why are we making policy decisions in an appropriations bill? This amendment changes current law. This is a decision that needs to be made in the context of the next new farm bill. We'll consider the farm bill next year in an open and transparent manner. We have a committee process that can review the merits of any proposal and all proposals. And they'll be debated and they'll be considered and allowed for the Members to offer their opinions and cast their votes.

In fact, if you look at the 2008 farm bill under Chairman PETERSON's leadership, we made significant reforms. Yes, cuts in the areas, lowering the overall payment caps significantly. But I guess the opponents of farm programs will not be satisfied with that until every last marketing tool has been eliminated.

I know it is a popular parlor game in some circles to see how far you can jerk farmers around, but making these changes midstream in a 5-year farm bill is disruptive to market decisions that producers have made in some cases years ago. All farmers and ranchers want certainty. They plan to work under current law.

Plain and simple, the author of this amendment wants to change agricultural policy, and this debate does not belong in this bill.

And I would remind my friends, we today, this week, are a part of a bold,

new, open legislative process. Maybe that's not how you did it in the past, but when we do this farm bill, it will be done in committee and on the floor in the same open way we're doing this.

Let the process run its course. Let us work our way through this open process when it should be done in the next farm bill next year. Is that so much to ask?

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 408 OFFERED BY MR. CLYBURN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ (a) Of the funds made available by this Act for each of the following accounts or activities, 10 percent shall be allocated for assistance in persistent poverty counties:

(1) "Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs".

(2) "Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, Economic Development Assistance Programs".

(3) "Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Construction".

(4) "Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Education".

(5) "Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education".

(6) "Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services".

(7) "Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration".

(8) "Department of Housing and Urban Development, Economic Development Initiative".

(9) "Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs".

(10) "Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants, Water and Wastewater".

(11) "Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Transportation Community and System Preservation".

(12) "Department of the Treasury, Community Development Financial Institutions".

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "persistent poverty counties" means any county that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1990, 2000, and 2010 decennial censuses.

(c) Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, each department or agency listed in subsection (a) shall submit to Congress a progress report on the implementation of this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011,

the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment, and I have called it the 10-20-30 amendment. It deals with what we call "persistent poverty counties"—those places in America that have experienced a poverty rate of at least 20 percent for the last 30 years.

My amendment requires that at least 10 percent of the funds in certain accounts be directed to counties where 20 percent or more of their citizens have languished below the Federal poverty level for the last 30 years; hence, the 10-20-30 approach.

Mr. Chairman, approximately 15 percent of all counties in America qualify as persistent poverty counties. These counties are diverse and spread across the country, including Appalachian communities in Kentucky and West Virginia, Native American communities in South Dakota and Alaska, Latino communities in Arizona and New Mexico, African American communities in North and South Carolina. They are urban communities in Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore, and St. Louis.

Democrats represent 149 of these counties, with a total population of 8.7 million. Republicans represent 311 of these counties, with a total population of 8.3 million. Fourteen of these counties, with a total population of 5.3 million, are split between Democrats and Republicans. A total of 43 Democrats and 84 Republicans represent all or a part of these counties, and 35 of our 50 States have at least one persistent poverty county. Fifteen of South Carolina's 46 counties qualify for this ignoble recognition, and I happen to represent seven of those counties.

This is not a red State or a blue State issue. That's why on this map beside me the persistent poverty counties are colored in purple. There is no political affiliation for poverty. Poverty has never been limited to race, region, or creed.

These counties do not have the resources to hire sophisticated, high-powered grant writers and lobbyists to help compete for the finite amount of dollars that should be available to them.

In today's New York Times, there is a front-page story which I would ask everybody to read. It is entitled, "For Much of Rural America, Broadband is a Dividing Line."

Mr. Chairman, I was particularly struck by the words of Mrs. Sharon Jones, a small logging company owner in Coffeerville, Alabama. Listen to her words. "We are trying to pull ourselves

into the 21st century." Mrs. Jones says, "I don't think the rest of the world understands there is a piece of the world here that is really challenged."

Her business, her customers, and her neighbors are the reasons we included the 10-20-30 amendment in the Recovery Act in the Rural Development section of the Agriculture title, and it is working well.

The formula allowed many persistent poverty counties to benefit from the Recovery Act, and they do not otherwise receive funds. Projects like these are crucial to meeting the basic needs of the community and laying the groundwork for future success.

□ 1750

This amendment builds on that success, and I hope to work with my Republican colleagues to have it included in the final version of H.R. 1.

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make one comment. I wanted to thank Mr. CLYBURN for raising this issue, and I wanted to thank Mr. REHBERG for agreeing to work with him.

Out of the 28 counties that I represent in southern Missouri, 14 of those 28 are persistent poverty counties. And the gentleman is absolutely correct when he says that for a lot of those communities it is very, very difficult to find the means by which you can get people to help write grants for you, for example, and other things. So I think this is an important issue on which we can all work together. I am so pleased Mr. CLYBURN raised it, and I really just wanted to thank Mr. REHBERG for his generosity in working with us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, and therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rules states, in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 566 OFFERED BY MR. BOREN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require a person licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to report information to the Department of Justice regarding the sale of multiple rifles or shotguns to the same person.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this bipartisan amendment with Congressman REHBERG of Montana, my colleague and a fellow member of the House Second Amendment Task Force.

I am proud to report that two important groups have endorsed this amendment, the National Rifle Association and the National Shooting Sports Foundation. Our amendment would prohibit the ATF from using any funds in this act to collect information from federally licensed firearms retailers about multiple rifle sales.

Last December, ATF published an emergency request in the Federal Register. It asked the Office of Management and Budget for the power to collect information from firearms retailers on all sales of two or more semi-automatic rifles within five consecutive business days. This would include many of today's most popular rifles used by millions of Americans for self-defense, hunting, and other lawful purposes.

ATF officials have said this information collection would apply only to licensed firearms retailers in certain States—Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California. However, ATF's request published in the Federal Register does not mention a geographic limitation. This means we have to take the ATF at its word. I have heard numerous concerns about this ATF request from fellow Oklahomans, including sportsmen, gun owners, and responsible firearms retailers alike.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose granting ATF this information-collecting authority for three reasons: first, it would subject responsible firearms sellers who are often small business owners to burdensome reporting requirements. Second, ATF would catalog records on Americans who purchase rifles, thereby compromising their privacy. And, finally, ATF lacks legal authority to collect this information. The Gun Control Act of 1968 requires Federal firearms dealers to report multiple sales of handguns.

What I'd like to do at this time is yield to my colleague and friend from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) for any comments he might have.

Mr. REHBERG. Thank you, Mr. BOREN. And I thank the chairman for allowing this opportunity.

It's one of those situations where you'd like to believe the administra-

tion is not trying to creep into an area that is not necessarily something they would try and slip by anyone. But when you talk about gun control, we get very serious about the Constitution and the creeping of various rules and regulations in areas that Congress has specifically stayed out of, didn't want us to be involved in. And so there is always that lingering thought in the back of your mind like, what's going on here?

Now I don't tend to believe that I would be a scary individual, but if I were living in one of those four States, I would be in this category of having purchased two long rifles because I happened to buy a hunting rifle for myself and my son, who was of age. For Christmas I went out and bought two, and it throws me into that category. I would like to think I'm not considered a gun runner for a Mexican cartel or something like that, but that's the effect of a regulation like this. And so I hope that we will seriously consider this not necessary.

We took the action that created regulation on handguns, we understand that. But when it comes to a long rifle—we're talking hunting rifles, we're talking about other types of rifles that are out there—this doesn't really make sense. So I really thank Mr. BOREN for taking the lead on this amendment. It's really important to those of us who are active firearm users.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1¼ minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and his colleague and my colleague from Montana.

Let me say first and foremost that this was a request having to do with the four States on the southwest border. It would not have involved our great friend from Montana in his purchase of rifles. This was limited to long guns that would have detachable clips. Multiple purchases would have been required to be notified. So if someone went to buy 1,000 AK-47 assault weapons and semi-automatic clips that were detachable, they would have to be reported.

Now, this reporting requirement already exists for pistols or for handguns. There was a request made, OMB denied it, wanted to get a series of public comments. So there was no rush on the administration's behalf to rush this through under the cover of some emergency order. It's been out for public comment. And I think that is a reasonable thing to think about whether or not we would want to have a notification to our government if someone was

buying large quantities of assault weapons, especially along the border, which many, many of our colleagues have told us about being a place of significant danger related to organized crime to the south of our sovereign Nation.

So this is a request that's been made. It's been met, however, with this amendment. And I think we all know the result of what might happen here in the House regarding this. I hope that we're prepared to live with the consequences of whatever votes we might cast in this matter.

This has nothing whatsoever to do with hunting rifles or guns used in sporting activity. This has to do with long guns with detachable clips used for only one purpose, and that is, shooting large numbers of rounds and killing large numbers of people. So we should be clear about it; it's a request that's been made. It's been noticed on the public record for comment by the administration. It relates only to these four States. It is modeled after a regulation that already exists now for handguns. So I know that some may get paranoid about these issues, but I think we should have at least some paranoia about what this could portend if we don't take reasonable action in the protection of the citizens that we've been elected to protect.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

□ 1800

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Ms. CHU. Thirty thousand.

That's how many people were violently slaughtered by the Mexican drug cartels in just 4 short years. One of them was Bobby Salcedo, an American citizen and rising star from my district. He was kidnapped and murdered last year with a semiautomatic rifle.

I oppose this amendment because it makes it harder to stop these types of violent acts. This amendment will prevent the tracing of bulk sales of the military-style rifles, popular with cartels, that have resulted in tragic murders like Bobby's. Last year, the U.S. military announced that, if the drug war continues, it could cause the Mexican Government to collapse, and the cartel war could spread over the border into the U.S. This amendment makes the drug war worse.

Every day, people are dying from this war, even American citizens. We must stop it, and we can by opposing this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I don't know if anybody has noticed what has gone on

in Mexico recently. The previous speaker just spoke of the drug wars that are going on. It's a known fact that much of the equipment that's used to carry on those wars comes from the United States and is smuggled into Mexico.

This is a very sane and necessary attempt to slow down the availability of high-caliber, high-capacity automatic weapons that are smuggled into Mexico. It makes no sense not to know what's going on, because this is dramatically affecting the border States and American citizens who happen to be in Mexico.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this amendment is very simple. It prevents the ATF from imposing burdensome reporting requirements on responsible firearms retailers; it protects the privacy and Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens; and it ensures that the ATF will not circumvent the will of Congress.

Again, I remind my colleagues that this amendment carries the full support of the National Rifle Association and the National Shooting Sports Foundation.

I urge adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, 48 hours ago, two officials of the United States Government, ICE agents, were attacked. They were in an armed vehicle which was traveling south of the border. One of those agents died. The assault weapons used in this incident, like tens of thousands of them that have found their way into Mexico, have crossed the border through these legal purchases.

This is about notification to the Department of Justice. It doesn't stop the sale. It notifies the DOJ that large amounts of these guns have been purchased. I think it's a reasonable thing. I leave it to my colleagues to make a reasonable judgment about this amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment serves no legitimate purpose and would only compromise our national security and put more Americans in harm's way.

By barring the use of Federal funds to mandate Federal firearms dealers to report the sale of multiple long guns such as semiautomatic assault rifles, this amendment would undermine the Obama Administration's efforts to combat cross-border illegal gun trafficking.

We must do everything we can to secure the border, strengthen our anti-gun-trafficking efforts, and help the Mexican Government fight the drug cartels.

The Mexican drug cartels are killing people at a staggering rate—more than 30,000 since 2006. And long guns are widely known as the cartels' weapon of choice.

Some may shrug their shoulders and conclude this is just another problem beyond our reach. That would be a mistake.

The drug cartels are getting their guns from the United States.

Since 2006, the ATF has seized more than 10,000 firearms and nearly one million rounds

of ammunition destined for Mexico, where the public is not allowed to purchase or possess guns.

Authorities in Mexico say most of the guns used in police assassinations and cartel bloodshed originate in the United States and have pressed the U.S. to reduce the flow of weapons south.

And this isn't just a border state problem. The impact of this trafficking is felt in my hometown of Chicago.

According to the National Drug Intelligence Center, Mexican drug trafficking organizations have infiltrated small and large cities in 48 U.S. States, affecting our national security.

For example, Mexican drug cartels have a significant presence in Chicago, which Federal officials say is a key transfer point for drugs heading to Minnesota and points north and east.

Last year, eleven alleged drug traffickers with connections to the Sinaloa Cartel were indicted by U.S. Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald in Chicago as part of "Project Deliverance,"—a multi-state and agency effort to disrupt the flow of drugs and guns across the border.

The drug cartel's violent war for control, which is fueled by illegal trafficking from the U.S. to Mexico, seriously impacts our public safety.

The ATF's proposal to compel federal firearms dealers to report the sale of multiple long guns is not about gun control or compiling a registry of long gun owners.

This is a law enforcement response to the evidence from successful tracings of weapons recovered in Mexico.

Recent tracings show that a large number of these weapons were first sold by a licensed gun dealer in California, Arizona, New Mexico, or Texas.

This amendment would undermine law enforcement's capacity to combat illegal gun trafficking and put Americans at even greater risk of gun violence.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to take any action to effect or implement the disestablishment, closure, or realignment of the United States Joint Forces Command.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr.

FORBES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me start off by saying that this is an amendment that the Congressional Budget Office has said is cost neutral, so we are not talking about revenue coming in or going out. The second thing about this amendment is that it is not dispositive—it doesn't ultimately make a decision. The third thing is that this is an amendment that is supported, not only by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, but by every single subcommittee chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

So what does it do?

It simply states that, before we turn out the lights on the men and women who, without question, have the most expertise and experience and who have had the legal authority to assemble the teams to fight our wars and to respond to our national emergencies, we are going to know who will replace them.

Any time this Nation faces a crisis, there are two observations that always emerge. First, we realize how ineffective our government agencies are in assembling cross-agency teams to respond to that crisis. Second, we realize how good our military is at putting those teams together.

One of the reasons for our military's success is that, for over a decade, whether we go to war or defend our homeland, the military does it as a team. They can bring together a Coast Guard cutter, Army Special Ops units, a marine expeditionary unit, an Air Force squadron, a Navy carrier group, Reserve units, and when needed, even allied partners in a combined response that we call "jointness."

It is a competitive advantage for which no nation in the world can rival us; yet, as hard as it is to believe, it is an advantage we did not have just 20 years ago.

One of the reasons we have that advantage is that, for over a decade, a single group has had the legal authority to bring those teams together, and that was the Joint Forces Command. They have assembled the majority of our forces in Iraq, a majority in Afghanistan; they've had control of over 80 percent of our continental U.S.-based combat-ready conventional forces; and they've assembled our military teams for our national disasters.

On August 9, 2010, the Secretary of Defense announced he was closing that command allegedly to save money; but the next day, when the Pentagon briefers came, they were asked by the House Armed Services staff one question: How much money will you save?

Their answer was, "Not a clue." We don't have a clue.

For days, weeks, months, Members have been asking how much this is going to save and who is going to be able to put teams together when this

command is gone. The Pentagon's response has been deafeningly silent. It is not because they are bad people; it's just because they don't know the answer.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply says the answers to those questions are too important for us not to wait until September 30, which is all this amendment does, to give our committees and this body the chance to get the answers and to make sure we do not go back 20 years.

If there is any Member in this room who can answer even the most basic core question presented by this closure, which is who will ultimately have the legal authority and expertise to put together the teams we need to fight our wars and respond to our crises, then you can vote with good conscience against this amendment; but you cannot, because nobody at the Pentagon can answer that question either.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation deserves a better answer than "we don't have a clue," and this amendment gives them a chance to find that answer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. The amendment would prohibit the use of funds to take any action to dis-establish the Joint Forces Command. In FY 2010, Secretary of Defense Gates recommended dis-establishing the Joint Forces Command, and included this as part of his efficiencies initiatives in the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

On January 6, 2011, President Obama issued an official memorandum accepting the recommendations of Secretary Gates and of chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mike Mullen, and approved dis-establishment of Joint Forces Command.

The Department of Defense expects to save at least \$240 million annually by dis-establishing the command. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff retains responsibility for promoting joint operations and essential functions. The resources needed to perform these functions will be assigned to other organizations in Hampton Roads and the Navy support activity in Norfolk, Virginia. All told, DOD estimates that about 50 percent of the current level of effort will remain in the Norfolk, Virginia area.

We've been through so many rounds of BRAC. I can sympathize with the gentleman from Virginia, and I understand his concerns about this.

□ 1810

But, you know, your side is taking the position that we have to reduce spending on some of the most sensitive programs that we have in our government.

I happen to have chaired the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee just for a brief time but was a member of the committee for 32 years, and I am now the ranking Democratic member. We went through this budget very, very carefully this year, Mr. YOUNG and I did, and we came up with \$15 billion of cuts.

We have to give some respect to the Secretary of Defense, who, in fact, was a Republican and serving in this administration. Some of these things I know are painful and it affects your community. I have had that problem over the years myself. But just like the alternate engine, sometimes we have to make these hard decisions.

The Secretary of Defense, I think in this case, deserves the benefit of the doubt. I think the Virginia delegation is totally correct in asking for substantiation for what they are doing and why they are doing it.

But, you know, Joint Forces Command is—I have been there and visited there. The responsibility is to assign forces to various contingencies.

You know, we only have so many forces, so we do look at all the plans there are. There is going to be this fleet or this division or this going here, there and everywhere, depending on what the scenario is. So I think the Chairman, Mike Mullen, and the Joint Chiefs can do that just as well as having a separate command.

And, again, I say we have to make some hard decisions. We are cutting the heart out of the domestic programs of this country and defense has to give something up here. If you look at the various commands, this one makes as much sense. And the Secretary of Defense has made the decision. It is supported by the top members of the joint staff and, for that reason, I regretfully have to object and oppose the amendment.

Mr. FORBES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. I would ask the gentleman if all this amendment does is give us until September 30 to answer those questions. All the leases are in effect. They can't be changed until that period of time, so we are not talking about cost. But this is the question I would ask the gentleman:

You mentioned that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had the authority to be that joint provider and to allocate those troops. But I would ask the gentlemen if, in fact, they do have that authority, because Goldwater-Nichols and the reauthorization act expressly prohibited them from being able to do that. And so I would ask the gentleman if it doesn't make sense, at least before we cut out the lights, regardless of the ultimate decision you make, to make absolutely sure we know who is going to be able to have that authority before we make that final decision.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman's point.

As I have been told, there has been an effort to try and keep 50 percent of the people and the activities in your area in Virginia, and that's one of the most important defense areas the country has.

So I think you guys are working hard, and I think that the Department is responding as best they can, but, again, I think we should reject the amendment and let this thing work out as the Department has recommended.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FORBES. May I inquire how much time I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Virginia.

This amendment would give Congress time to conduct oversight over the decision to close Joint Forces Command pure and simple, and specifically it would allow us to determine how the closure could impact national security.

In August, it was announced by the Pentagon that JFCOM would be dis-established, but there was no transparency in that decision. Congress was not informed, and Congress asked multiple times for the analysis that was done that led to the decision to close JFCOM without getting that information.

This leads me to believe that a thorough and detailed analysis into the JFCOM decision was never conducted. It leads me also to believe that in 5 years the Pentagon will be asking Congress to set up a mechanism to ensure jointness among our services.

Capabilities exist under JFCOM that are vital to our national security and paramount to our success in the current wars the military is fighting. Without that analysis, we cannot know whether we are casting away years of joint experience that will be crucial to the future defense of this Nation.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the Congressman from the Second District of Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Forbes Joint Forces Command Amendment. The establishment of a combatant command requires a literal act of Congress. It follows, then, that the closure of a combatant command should involve thoughtful analysis that is shared with this body for comment. The closure of Joint Forces Command fails on that important count. Either no such analysis has been conducted or it is being withheld.

Mr. Chairman, the absence of data that supports the closure of a combatant command is simply unacceptable. Accordingly, this cost neutral amendment delays its closure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of the Forbes Joint Forces Command amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by division A of this Act for Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide may be used for official representation purposes, as defined by Department of Defense Instruction 7250.13, dated June 30, 2009.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, since 2006 the taxpayers have entrusted the Department of Defense with over \$2.5 trillion, and the law has required that the Department of Defense make sure that they allow the taxpayers to know where that money is being spent by providing audited financial statements. Yet in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, it was established recently that no such audited financial statements were filed in 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010, and that none would be filed this year.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Defense testified that compliance with the law was, in fact, a priority and that they had had a plan at the Department of Defense. But when you put up the Web site just 2 days ago from the Department of Defense, it showed very clearly that the plan that they had 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 said that they would have completely filed clean audited statements by 2010.

They were only 100 percent off, because according to the testimony right now, the records at the Department of Defense are so bad that less than 5 percent of all of the monies given to the Department of Defense are in an audit-ready position.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have heard some draconian efforts to try to get them into compliance. This is no such effort.

What this simply does is to recognize that we give \$2 million in the funds set forth in this amendment that are basically party funds. They are funds for dinners. They are funds for entertainment. They are funds that have no impact directly on our warfighter. And what this amendment simply does is to take away those funds, Mr. Chairman.

And our thought is that if we take away those funds until we have compliance with those audited financial statements that the taxpayers deserve, we will give a strong incentive to make sure that we get that compliance and we are not 100 percent off.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. This amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from spending any funds—any—for official representation due to a lack of auditable financial statements.

Now, I completely agree with the gentleman on the point that we need to get them to do this. I just think this approach is not the way to do it.

If authorizers could set a timeframe in statute—and that's the way to do it—without cutting out these funds when they are entertaining people from other countries around the world. I just think it's one of those things that sounds good, but it's going to have unintended consequences.

□ 1820

Auditable financial statements have long been a goal of the Department of Defense. The committee has long pressed DOD to improve the quality of its financial management, and will continue that effort in the coming year. However, eliminating official representation funds is not connected to that goal. And limiting these funds would have damaging consequences.

The amendment would preclude activities associated with hosting military to military contacts, both domestically and overseas. The activity extends official courtesies to guests of the United States and the Department of Defense, and upholds the prestige and standing of the United States. The amendment would also harm the military services' ability to conduct community relations activities.

The amendment hurts DOD's ability to represent itself to foreign Nations and to the communities in which DOD activities are located. And it does so with very little payback. The bill before the House cuts over \$15 billion on a bipartisan basis from the Defense Department budget on careful analysis of DOD programs. The approach in this bill yields both a higher payback and does not have the drawback of unintended consequences.

Therefore, I urge rejection of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I rise in support of efforts to highlight the need for the Department of Defense to become audit ready.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense was instructed by Congress to provide taxpayers with audited financial statements for the first time in the 1990s. Now it's 2011, more than 20 years later, and we are still talking about the same issue while our country faces a grave economic downturn.

As a CPA, I understand the painfully difficult process that will go into auditing the largest enterprise on the face of the Earth. But as General Petraeus told us last year, hard is not impossible. The American people made a very clear statement last November that they're ready for their government to get its fiscal house in order. The Department of Defense cannot continue to get a pass on this issue. We cannot allow the status quo practices to hinder our ability to provide for the finest military the world has ever known.

This challenging goal will require buy-in from the top down, and it begins with the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We call on him for sound leadership to exercise fiscal responsibility. I will continue to press Defense officials across the river to get their fiscal house in order. We must not be having this conversation two decades from now. Support this amendment.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, my good friend mentioned that we need to put something in regulations or statutes to make the Department of Defense comply. We have done that. They have had it in statute. The law requires that they do it, and we have had it in there, and they have just failed to do it 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and they won't do it this year. And they admit that they are not a bit closer.

The second thing is, we mentioned unintended consequences. There are no unintended consequences with this amendment. We intend the consequences. You got to stop the partying until you do what the taxpayers are entitled to have required by the law, and that is just account for where the money is going. We can't determine how much we're going to spend on defense if we don't know where those dollars are going.

I hope we will adopt this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 333 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting 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. _____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program is hereby reduced by 75 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I just want to begin with a map of Arizona, showing all of the colored areas of Arizona that are actually Federal property, over half of the State. My amendment deals with PILT and Federal payments to places like Arizona, which is on a continuing welfare system of government spending and has been for many, many decades.

Let me now show you the State of Ohio, where there are proposals that the Community Development Block Grant funds in the base bill are being cut. This is Ohio. We don't have much Federal property. We hardly have anything at all related to federal government. Ohioans have to make it in the free market. And yet what's happening in the bill is that more money is going to pay out for PILT than for places like I represent in the Midwest, where unemployment is so high. The bill actually cuts Community Development Block Grant dollars for cities and towns across this country to the tune of \$2.95 billion. And yet, the base bill continues these PILT payments, which are really welfare payments to the West.

If this Congress is serious about cutting spending, we need to address some of the fundamental challenges contained in what I call megamarks. These aren't earmarks; these are big megamarks that benefit certain regions of the country at the expense of others.

Just to give you a sense of this, these subsidies have existed for generations. It's time that the West stood on its own two feet. These subsidies cannot be afforded by the other parts of the country that don't have that kind of Federal largesse. If we're going to have sacrifice in this legislation, then it needs to be shared. We need to reduce the payments in lieu of taxes called PILT by 75 percent. That's just the administrative costs that we're reducing. What's good for the cities of Toledo and Detroit, Boise, Dallas, Charlotte, Salt Lake City, and Reno is really good for the Western subsidized communities as well.

PILT is mandatory spending just like farm subsidies, and outside our annual appropriation bill's spending recommendations. My amendment targets the administration of those funds. Let me just put a couple figures on the record, and then I would like to yield 1½ minutes to my dear friend, the ranking member, Mr. MORAN.

For the PILT subsidy, the West has received over the last 10 years. Let's look at Arizona. Arizona has gotten an increase from \$10.3 million in 1999 to \$31.6 million in fiscal year 2009. Idaho has gone up three times, from \$8.3 million to \$26.4 million. Montana from \$9.8

million to over \$28 million. Nevada from \$7.1 million to in excess of \$23 million. New Mexico more than tripled from \$11 million to over \$37 million. And Texas has leapt from \$1.3 million to \$4.3 million. Utah from \$9.7 million to over \$33 million. And Wyoming, which has fewer people than the District of Columbia, which is going to lose funds under the Community Development Block Grant program, 10 years ago received \$8 million annually, and now Wyoming will receive over \$25 million. Come now. For empty property where the Federal resource is already located there and can serve as an economic engine?

To begin with, you can pivot so much development off of that federal presence. You can do economic development off of tourism. You can use those lands to attract investors who like to drill on those lands, and improve those lands. You can attract economic development around what I would call Federal encampments. My goodness, it's really amazing what can be accomplished with some creativity and vision.

You know how much my district gets for our thousands of acres of Federal wildlife refuges? Are you ready? \$180. Yes. One hundred and eighty dollars compared to billions and billions and billions going out in these permanent PILT subsidies.

And you know what? PILT doesn't even begin to account for what the West gets for oil and gas leasing subsidies, livestock grazing, timber harvesting. I think one of the reasons our Midwestern taxpayers are feeling the tax load so heavily is some other parts of the country are really being lifted up by the federal government, and they don't even appreciate what they have.

For my colleagues, if you want to send the American people a message that you are serious about cutting spending, the place to begin is by cutting the administrative fees of PILT.

TOTAL STATE PAYMENT RESULTS—Continued

State	FY 2009 payment	FY 2010 payment	FY 2011 payment
New York	139,400	122,706	0
North Carolina	4,047,121	3,858,283	0
North Dakota	1,392,092	1,367,945	0
Ohio	730,179	485,605	0
Oklahoma	2,539,173	2,582,013	0
Oregon	14,963,789	12,651,531	0
Pennsylvania	514,117	527,493	0
Puerto Rico	20,893	9,983	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0
South Carolina	382,647	388,740	0
South Dakota	4,263,660	4,778,507	0
Tennessee	2,409,845	1,615,385	0
Texas	4,348,915	4,501,553	0
Utah	33,063,034	34,265,151	0
Vermont	879,257	896,432	0
Virgin Islands	37,575	33,171	0
Virginia	3,809,111	2,532,009	0
Washington	10,771,272	12,821,358	0
West Virginia	2,551,988	2,799,356	0
Wisconsin	1,355,170	741,498	0
Wyoming	25,561,575	22,705,431	0
Total	381,647,942	358,078,641	0

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a message amendment. We love our colleagues who represent the Western States, but many of them, particularly on the other side, don't seem to show much love for the Federal Government they represent. The payment in lieu of taxes program was created to compensate counties for lost taxes, since Federal lands don't pay taxes. That's fair. Western States with lots of Federal lands get most of the payments. That's fair.

□ 1830

But while the counties don't get any taxes from Federal lands, they don't have to provide services on those lands either. In fact the opposite occurs. The national parks, wildlife refuges, national forests and BLM lands and the staffs of all these provide very valuable services and substantial revenue and jobs to the western counties, and the public lands provide ecosystems that are worth billions.

Without clean water and open space, imagine. You wouldn't have the communities, the agriculture, that we seem to take for granted. In fact, the States get fully half the mineral receipts that come from the coal, oil and gas that is owned by the Federal taxpayer. The gentlelady makes a very important point that is worthy of consideration.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, this is such a bad amendment. It's one of the few amendments I've ever seen that actually leaves me speechless, so I'm going to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the map you see in front of you is not the coverage area for Verizon. Everything that is red on this map is land that is owned by the Federal Government. One in every 3 acres in America is owned by the Federal Government and as you can clearly see it is disproportionate here in the West.

TOTAL STATE PAYMENT RESULTS

State	FY 2009 payment	FY 2010 payment	FY 2011 payment
Alabama	\$685,234	\$605,410	\$0
Alaska	25,674,111	24,905,298	0
Arizona	31,662,123	27,823,593	0
Arkansas	3,917,683	4,463,032	0
California	34,397,858	36,766,468	0
Colorado	28,660,622	24,267,593	0
Connecticut	28,131	28,773	0
Delaware	17,354	17,750	0
District of Columbia	24,631	25,087	0
Florida	4,600,719	4,525,156	0
Georgia	2,397,205	1,938,517	0
Guam	2,185	2,235	0
Hawaii	323,801	326,064	0
Idaho	26,434,457	25,281,177	0
Illinois	1,058,185	1,099,777	0
Indiana	641,040	412,560	0
Iowa	434,023	504,820	0
Kansas	1,074,017	1,099,185	0
Kentucky	2,245,050	1,480,359	0
Louisiana	528,877	546,772	0
Maine	326,618	295,510	0
Maryland	99,913	103,643	0
Massachusetts	99,809	100,986	0
Michigan	4,336,151	3,830,742	0
Minnesota	2,736,684	2,538,098	0
Mississippi	1,469,166	1,488,198	0
Missouri	2,760,923	2,695,274	0
Montana	28,060,662	23,513,338	0
Nebraska	1,106,017	980,520	0
Nevada	23,269,350	22,753,204	0
New Hampshire	1,686,757	1,726,820	0
New Jersey	94,439	96,597	0
New Mexico	37,013,334	32,205,935	0

This of course is the gentlewoman from Ohio's region. This is my district. And until such time as my district resembles her district, in the ability of us to control our future and our resources, payment in lieu of taxes is not welfare to the West, it is simply rent on the land that you control; until such time as the Secretary of the Interior's decision—which the Inspector General said was capricious and arbitrary—does not destroy 3,000 jobs in a county with only 31,000 inhabitants; until such time as \$1.9 billion in investment leaves the West to go to the East where there are fewer regulations; until such time as somebody from the East who comes to frolic in the public lands of the West and consumes the entire county's search and rescue budget in 1 day, until that is changed, PILT is not welfare, it is rent on the land you control.

I want you to look carefully at this map. See where the red is. Then I also want you to look at this particular map. States in red are the States that have the hardest time funding their education system. That is the slowest growth in education. I hope you realize there is a similarity between the two particular maps. Because the bottom line is, individuals in the West pay more in State and Federal taxes than in the East. There are more kids in the West. We have larger class sizes in the West. Our education system has a harder time to fund itself in the West because this map prohibits us from developing our property taxes, developing our energy royalties, developing high-paying jobs with income taxes, so kids are hurt in the West. This map and this situation means that kids are underfunded.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Kids in the West, their education is underfunded, their teacher salaries are depressed, and my retirement is threatened because of this particular situation. When this changes, there will be no more need for PILT. But until that time comes, this is not welfare; this is rent on the land you control. To be honest, we'd rather have the land back, but until that time, pay for what you control.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the gentlewoman's time expired?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady from Ohio may actually have stumbled upon something, and if she's ready to actually help us, so a State like Arizona, we can actually own our land, great. But until that time, you've got to understand, only 18 percent of our State is privately owned. Tribal lands, Federal lands, BLM lands, other government lands.

Are we ready to start paying the full property tax load? I was the county treasurer in Maricopa County and huge portions of our county, we can't even touch. If you want a sense of fairness, then we step up and we give the land back to the State. Until that time, this borders on silly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. There are over 20 million acres of Federal land in Colorado. I want to be clear with, of course, great respect to my colleague from Ohio. This is not in any way, shape or form a giveaway to our counties. This is land we cannot tax, we cannot develop, we cannot benefit from. In fact, PILT payments are insufficient. They're too low to compensate for the burden of having all this land that's not part of our local tax base. It is a burden. In fact many of our counties have to actually spend money maintaining this land because some of the Federal infrastructure isn't sufficient as well. There is nobody who's making out like a bandit from this and it's all we can do to justify the fact that the Federal Government owns a lot of land.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield—I think I just have 30 seconds left; is that correct?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 1 minute left.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I want to thank the chairman for yielding.

I have to remind my good friend from Ohio that as the West was settled, it was people from Ohio and Virginia and the Midwest that were making these laws that created most of the western States to be 80 percent, 70 percent, 90 percent Federal lands.

In order for us to be able to have somewhat of a tax base because of the limited private property we have, we need to ask the Federal Government to pay its share. You cannot in many cases develop economically these lands because people from the East prohibit us from developing these public lands. I just want to throw that out as a reminder.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to rise in very strong opposition. Being a westerner, I have counties in my district that receive these payments. I think it's justified. I appreciate the fact that the new majority has tried to protect these payments. It's very important in the West.

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me just conclude by saying I have one county that's 96 percent Federally owned. Ninety-six percent. That means 4 percent of the

property is taxable in order to provide the services for all of you that come out and enjoy the beauty in the county.

Do you think PILT payments are appropriate? I think they are and I would hope that we overwhelmingly reject this amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to maintain an end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty in Europe in excess of 35,000 members and end strength levels for active duty members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of 565,275, 328,250, and 329,275, respectively, and the amounts otherwise provided by this Act for "Military Personnel, Army", "Military Personnel, Navy" and "Military Personnel, Air Force" in title I of division A are hereby reduced by \$155,914,688, \$18,047,700, and \$118,488,825, respectively.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, we all share the goal of reducing the deficit. If we are serious about deficit reduction, we need to look at defense as one of the line items. My amendment would save hundreds of millions of dollars by reducing our troop count in Europe. Instead of having over 80,000 troops in Europe where they are no longer needed, we would reduce the amount of troops in Europe to 35,000. This would allow the Department of Defense to save money by closing bases in Europe that don't have any strategic rationale. Deploying our troops out of Europe and closing these bases is an excellent way to help reduce expenditures and save money.

My amendment would only cut 7,500 troops which would save \$278 million. An additional 35,000 troops would be available for deployment to actual theaters where we have a strategic interest. So it would enhance our preparedness at the same time as saving money.

□ 1840

This step would save \$278 million and improve our national security.

Reducing our troop levels would save money, personnel costs, housing expenses and the cost of stationing troops abroad. On top of these savings, my amendment will allow us to close bases across Europe that, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman are relics of a by-gone era. Rather than fighting the demons of the past, we need to focus on the very real threats of the present and the future. We are no longer in a battle with the Nazis. We are no longer in a battle with the Soviets. The need for these bases was understandable in a different geopolitical context.

But what is their justification now? The U.S. taxpayer did not sign up to defend wealthy European democracies from imaginary threats forever. These bases cost U.S. taxpayers millions and millions of dollars. I fail to understand why we're wasting money to maintain bases where they aren't needed. Our European Allies are some of the richest countries in the world. Why are we subsidizing their defense spending? Our European allies have enjoyed a free ride on the American dime for years now. Today, they spend on average only 2 percent of GDP on defense, while we spend between 4 and 5 percent.

There's no reason for us to subsidize European defense while every other aspect of our government we are looking at for cuts.

I understand that many of the troops stationed in Europe have in the past been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. My amendment is consistent with that. Currently 13,000 troops stationed in Germany and Iraq are deployed in our theaters of operation. My amendment would allow for that to continue. It allows for 35,000 troops, well within the number that are currently deployed in actual theaters where we have a strategic interest.

Nor does my amendment signal any kind of weakening of our commitment to NATO. With modern technology, we can move troops and weapons quickly across the globe when needed. My amendment would still allow for 35,000 troops to remain in Europe so they can do joint exercises with NATO. It is time for us to rethink our defense spending. We are not under threat in Europe. Maintaining a network of bases in Europe is not a rational or effective response to the terrorist threat, nor is it fiscally responsible.

These cuts are not my idea. They are based on recommendations from the Sustainable Defense Task Force, a bipartisan project organized by Congressman FRANK, Congressman PAUL, Congressman JONES, and Senator WYDEN and backed by a number of credible organizations, CATO Institute, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Center for American Progress, Center for Defense Information, National Security Network and others.

Even Donald Rumsfeld believes it is time to change our policy. This is his quote from his recent book: "Of the quarter million troops deployed abroad in 2011, more than 100,000 were in Eu-

rope, the vast majority stationed in Germany to fend off an invasion by a Soviet Union that no longer existed. I believed our troops had to do more than serve as security blankets for wealthy allied nations."

When even Donald Rumsfeld admits that this policy doesn't make sense and isn't cost justified, we must seriously reconsider our policy maintaining bases in regions that are clearly peaceful and pose no threat.

Let's get serious about balancing the budget and find savings in every agency, including DOD. Reducing our military presence in Europe is low-hanging fruit. This will save money. The time is now. The time was last year. The time was 3 years ago. After the fall of the Soviet Union, there fails to be a strategic rationale to maintain our current troop levels or expenditure levels in the European theater.

My amendment will save taxpayer money and improve military preparedness for conflicts in zones where America has a strategic imperative to fight the global war on terrorism. I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TURNER. The gentleman from Colorado says that there is no strategic rationale for these troops; but, in fact, there is no strategic rationale for this amendment. This amendment is completely arbitrary in the cuts that are proposed, and there is no basis for these levels of cuts that are proposed.

In fact, the strategic rationale is for the support of our troops that are currently serving in Europe. Secretary Gates just Wednesday appeared before the Armed Services Committee; and while he was there, he testified that it is the presence of our military on the ground in Europe and other places that assures our allies and provides a deterrent effect to would-be aggressors.

These troops are not just staring down a past Soviet Union. They are, in fact, providing wartime support currently. They are also providing an effective deterrent both for our allies and for the United States.

This amendment would reduce the Army by more than 5,000, the Navy by more than 500 and the Air Force by more than 5,000 from programmed end-strength levels for fiscal year 2011. These are planned troop deployments and presence. This is not something that was done 10 years ago.

The limits on this end strength would damage wartime operational capability. To reduce manpower halfway through the fiscal year would likely require the abrupt involuntary separation of many servicemembers, sending the message, thank you for your service, but now please leave. These troops are actively providing protection both to our allies and to the United States and play a vital role in what is wartime operational capability.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. Secretary Gates has worked out a reduction in the troop force that will occur later in the FYDP. I think under the circumstances with the troops in Afghanistan, we are bringing in troops out of Iraq. And one of the things that is very important about our European bases is we train with the Europeans. We work with the Europeans. When the flights come out of Iraq or Afghanistan with wounded troops, they come back to Landstuhl in Germany where the troops are taken care of in the hospital. There is a long-term relationship with NATO that is very critically important.

And just to do this off the back of the hand, I understand the gentleman has some other advisers on this amendment; I wouldn't exactly be touting Donald Rumsfeld myself. But anyway, I hope that we can defeat this amendment and let the Secretary of Defense and the joint chiefs make the decision in bringing down our troop forces. And I really do believe Europe is still important to the United States.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you. Although the gentleman from Colorado referenced I think what is an accurate quote to Donald Rumsfeld, I think that he, too, would have serious concerns about this amendment and its immediate effects.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Ohio mentioned that the troops are an effective deterrent. I would simply ask, who are we deterring from attacking Germany and Italy?

Might I inquire as to how much time remains on either side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Since he didn't want to answer on my time, I will be happy to yield my 20 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio, and again, who are we deterring from attacking Italy and Germany?

Mr. TURNER. I think it's important for us to understand who might attack us. And this is not an issue of these troops being a relic.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, again, the gentleman cited that they would be a deterrent, so I was just trying to clarify who we were attempting to deter.

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

Mr. TURNER. I think it's important for us to continue to honor our obligations to our allies and also to protect our country. Secretary Gates just as recently as this week on Wednesday reaffirmed the need for these troops so that we can continue to support our allies and the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 498 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by division B of this Act may be used to develop, carry out, implement, or otherwise enforce proposed regulations published June 18, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 34,667) by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would stop the Department of the Interior's Office of Surface Mining and Reclamation and Enforcement from going forward with a proposed revision to the stream buffer rule that could, according to the Obama administration's own analysis, eliminate up to 29,000 coal industry and industry-related jobs, cut coal mining production by 50 percent, and increase the cost of electricity for families and businesses.

In December 2008, OSM issued a clarification of the stream buffer zone rules after a 5-year process that included 40,000 public comments, two proposed rules, and 5,000 pages of environmental analysis from five different agencies.

The final rule clarified and codified coal surface mining practices that had been in effect for over 30 years, but an entry in the Federal Registry from June 2009 shows that early in the first days of the Obama administration, the decision was made to reopen the carefully crafted and properly vetted stream buffer zone rule. The proposed sweeping regulatory action would radically alter the definition of a stream as well as how the agency measures material damage outside of the permit area. To date, the agency has provided no studies, no data or support to justify these radical changes.

□ 1850

Given the complete lack of justification, analysis, or rationale for these proposed changes, it can be said that this is a political decision and not one

based on science or fact, and this flies in the face of the administration's pledge to base rulemaking decisions on science and not on political factors.

Furthermore, several States have expressed serious concerns about the need and justification for the proposal. Mr. Chairman, the unemployment rate in my home State of Ohio is 9.6 percent. In parts of eastern and southeastern Ohio that I represent, we have double-digit unemployment. The average unemployment in the 12 counties I represent is 10.9 percent. There are entire communities that depend largely on the coal industry, both for direct and indirect jobs, and these jobs would be threatened by this proposed rules change.

To be clear, my amendment does not stop the issuance of permits nor does it prevent OSM, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the EPA from their regulatory responsibilities. My amendment would simply prohibit any funding to be spent on developing, carrying out, or implementing this ill-conceived proposed job-killing rule.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support my amendment to stop the Obama administration from going forward with a regulation that will result in thousands of hardworking Americans losing their jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment stops the Interior Department from protecting nearby streams and rivers from the toxic disposal of coal mine waste. So let me give you the top seven reasons why this amendment should be defeated.

One, it will allow for the continued destruction of America's forests and native vegetation contrary to the statutory requirement to protect that vegetation.

Two, it will interfere with the new requirement for the Clean Water Act and Surface Mining Act, preventing the updating of regulations based upon the best science available.

Three, it will perpetuate the uncertainties that citizens and industry and State regulators are currently experiencing under outdated regulations.

Four, it will continue to allow the worst of the coal mine operators to destroy and pollute America's streams and, by doing so, gain a competitive advantage over the responsible operators.

Five, it will deny the State regulatory officials the ability to issue permits that would withstand legal challenge.

Six, it will prevent the gathering of information needed to predict adverse impacts to land and water resources.

And seven, it will prevent the completion of the National Environmental Policy Act process which provides valuable information to enable an in-

formed decision to be made as to the best alternatives to protect society and the environment while helping to meet America's energy needs.

So that's why I would oppose the Johnson amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman offering this much-needed amendment.

Almost immediately after taking office, Mr. Chairman, the administration put a bull's-eye on Appalachian coal from every angle, including from the OSM. As a representative of Appalachian Kentucky, like Ohio where the gentleman is from, we're losing thousands of jobs because of these policies. And now, by its own admission, the OSM and the U.S. Department of the Interior are placing 7,000 mining jobs across the country on the chopping block, representing 9 percent of the industry, by reopening the long-settled stream protection rule.

And so I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this to our attention with this amendment. A report that was leaked by OSM indicates amending this rule will cause coal production to drop drastically or remain stagnant in 22 States. So it comes as no surprise to me that officials from Kentucky, West Virginia, Utah, Wisconsin, Texas, and others have blasted this proposal as nonsensical and difficult to follow.

Mr. JOHNSON has the right idea with this amendment, which would prohibit OSM from moving forward with this rule during this fiscal year. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to take this opportunity to remind, the rule was reclarified in a 5-year process that ended back in 2008, and now the current administration wants to reopen that rule and redo it completely in just a matter of months, with no science, no data to support it and no justification. And I would remind my colleague that the only reason, the number one reason for passing this amendment is for the up to 29,000 jobs that it is potentially going to save.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) who worked in the Interior Department on this very issue and is quite expert on it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I'm from California so forgive me, but I also was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior in the mid-nineties, and we set up a program

called the Appalachia Clean Streams Program to deal precisely with the issues that have risen over the years from the pollution and contamination from the various coal mines, including mountaintop removal. This effort underway by the Department is to deal with the ongoing problem. The continuing problem, mountaintop removal in mining, does contaminate and does destroy streams.

I could not believe the clarity of the water in the streams when I visited West Virginia. They would make the swimming pools in Los Angeles envious. Nothing was alive, nothing at all, because of the contamination from the mines. I just ask for the opportunity to go ahead.

Mr. MORAN. I very much appreciate the insight from the gentleman from California.

At this point, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would essentially destroy efforts to put an end to the damage that is wrought by mountaintop removal.

Now, many of my colleagues who are not familiar with mountaintop removal, what happens is you take mountains that look like this, and then you turn them into this. This is what happens. And the consequence of doing that, you blow off the top of these beautiful mountains. You push all of the stuff that you've blown up into the valleys that surround it, poisoning streams, poisoning the people who live nearby, poisoning the water supply that feeds much of Appalachia. This is damage that is irreversible. It will never be like this again because nothing grows here.

Now, I know a lot of people try to justify mountaintop removal by saying this is an economic boon for the region. In fact, since mountaintop removal became a prevalent practice, mining jobs have actually declined by more than 50 percent. This is not good for the people of Kentucky and Appalachia. It's not good for the economy, and it's certainly not good for the environment.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have numerous efforts now in Federal Government finally trying to put an end to this destructive, immoral practice. Many in my State gathered in Frankfort just last week to protest what's happening here, to our State, to our children, and to our economy. We can do much better. The last thing we need to do right now is to say to our country and to the people of Appalachia, we're not going to try to preserve these beautiful mountains that God gave us. This is a tipping point in our history.

□ 1900

Generations from now our grandchildren will ask if we don't stop this practice now, if we don't give the government the resources, they will say: How could you let this become this?

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 583 OFFERED BY MR. REED

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to change any rate of salary or basic pay pursuant to section 1113 of Public Law 111-32.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that addresses pay for foreign service officers. It will ensure that the expected 24 percent pay raise does not go into effect in fiscal year 2011.

It is my understanding that we have an agreement between the majority and minority on this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the Community Connect broadband grant program administered by the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment would eliminate funding for the community connect broadband grant program which is administered by the Department of Agriculture's Rural Utilities Service.

Now, eliminating this program would save over \$13.4 million. This is endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste.

Look. We're all for broadband development, and we're all for rural

broadband development. It turns out there are a lot of different Federal programs that try to do this. This is one in particular that does not have a good history. In fact, in 2005 and in 2009, Inspector General reports have raised questions about this specific grant program. And that is why I have raised this issue today.

As I said, I think as a supporter of rural broadband development, I want to see programs that work and are effective. This one has some serious questions about it. And that is the substance of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 496 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

Mr. MATHESON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (other than for the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security) is hereby reduced by \$600,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment addresses issues of nonessential travel by Federal employees that are not involved in the Department of Defense or Homeland Security.

Simply stated, the amendment says that appropriations made available by this act are hereby reduced by \$600 million for all departments except for the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Defense.

I originally was going to do an amendment that specifically talked about reducing nonessential travel. I was concerned about a point of order. So this amendment does not specifically mention nonessential travel. However, based on advice of the fiscal commission, the travel cuts could be proposed. And both Democrats and Republicans on the fiscal commission thought that this was a productive area to look for savings.

I decided to structure this amendment in a way that would not be subject to a point of order. But its intent is to reduce nonessential travel by Federal employees in departments outside of the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security.

That is a description of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we in this bill made it a point of being very careful about the cuts to the DOD and Homeland Security. We think it's the reasonable approach that's in the base bill. We do not need this type of a heavy, deep cut in the defense of the country here and abroad.

So I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MATHESON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. My amendment affects departments other than Defense and Homeland Security. It's only for nonessential employees in other Federal departments outside of those two.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Is this an across-the-board cut of the other agencies?

Mr. MATHESON. It's a goal across all of the other departments, all of the other appropriations areas, except Defense and Homeland Security are excluded.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. But it's across the board?

Mr. MATHESON. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I'm in strong opposition to across-the-board cuts. We were elected to make choices. And on this bill we've made our choices, and we think we've done a fairly decent job of spreading the pain across the board.

But to have an across-the-board cut would mean putting our decision-making on automatic pilot, refusing to make decisions. And that's what we were elected to do.

So I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. I don't want to prolong this debate. I just want to point out, absent concerns of a point of order I would have prescriptively said this is specific to do with nonessential travel of Federal employees.

Due to concerns about a point of order, we structured this amendment where it says this is a cut of \$600 million. However, the intent and hopefully the report language when folks in these agencies look at the debate that's taking place right here on the House floor is that it's addressing nonessential travel.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 274 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay any employee, contractor, or grantee of the Internal Revenue Service to implement or enforce the provisions of, or amendments made by, Public Laws 111-148 and 111-152.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1910

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and complements the amendments offered earlier by my friends, Congressman REBERG and Congresswoman EMERSON. This amendment prevents the IRS from using any funds in fiscal year 2011 to pay any employee, contractor, or grantee to enforce the individual mandate, employer mandate, or any other part of the Health Care Reform Act, including tax increases.

It didn't take long for the IRS to move in after passage of the Health Care Reform Act to enforce all of these new tax provisions. Indoor tanning services saw taxes rise by 10 percent within 5 months of the bill's enactment. This year, brand name drug manufacturers will see their taxes go up. Next year, it's medical devices. And the list goes on. Yet, 2 weeks ago there was a glimmer of hope. Federal District Judge Roger Vinson became the second Federal judge to declare the health care law unconstitutional. But we know these rulings are not enough to keep the administration from moving forward with its takeover of our health care system. In fact, the headlines the day after Judge Vinson's decision read: "White House: We won't compromise on the individual mandates."

Just this week, the administration proposed to increase the IRS budget by 9 percent and expects to hire more than 5,100 employees to get the job done. In making its request, the IRS explained that the "tax changes associated with the health care reform are huge. Implementation of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 presents a major challenge to the IRS. ACA (The Health Care Reform Act) represents the largest set of tax law changes in more than 20 years, with more than 40 provisions that amend the tax laws."

Mr. Chairman, we've been forced to enter into a new era in our health care system, and it's one that is driven by the IRS. The Congressional Budget Office predicted last year that the IRS will need to hire 15,000 new employees and will need at least \$10 billion in order to meet its responsibilities under the act. This is not what Americans ex-

pect or deserve. The only way to keep the IRS from intruding into our health care system is to take away its funding. This amendment is a step by prohibiting any funds from being used to hire anyone to enact this bill as we move forward.

I urge my colleagues to support individuals and families and our Nation's small businesses by supporting this amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in the budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5 of the 112th Congress which states, "It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI. The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague alleges that my amendment would create a net increase in budget authority in the bill, thus giving rise to the point of order. I respectfully disagree for the following reasons:

Number one, the challenged provision in this point of order relates to the IRS's ability to ensure small business owners do not take advantage of the limited tax credit that currently exists. This tax credit is already in place. The IRS is already supposedly enforcing this provision. So I do not agree with the conclusion that this amendment, which simply limits the IRS from hiring more employees, would allow abuse of the tax credit.

Number two, I would remind my colleagues that last session, during our consideration of YouCut, CBO indicated that over the next 10 years the IRS will require between—

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I don't think the gentlelady is addressing the point of order. She is reiterating the argument.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would like to hear further remarks from the gentlewoman from Washington on this point of order.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Number two, CBO has indicated that over the next 10 years the IRS will require between \$5 and \$10 billion in funding to implement this law.

Number three, just last week the IRS said it will need at least 1,054 new employees and new facilities at a cost of

more than \$359 million in fiscal year 2012. Eighty-one workers will be responsible for ensuring that tanning salons pay a new 10 percent excise tax that went into effect in 2010 and is enforceable in 2011; total cost, \$11.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, with the points raised above and the established savings, it is clear that the offsets are not needed and my amendment is in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington violates section 3(j) (3) of House Resolution 5. Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the Chair of the Committee on Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 467 OFFERED BY MR.
GOODLATTE

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

The Acting 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 by this Act may be used to develop, promulgate, evaluate, implement, provide oversight to, or backstop total maximum daily loads or watershed implementation plans for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

For the past 2 years, we've seen the administration and the Environmental Protection Agency take overzealous action in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, with the potential to dramatically affect jobs, the economy, and local government budgets throughout the six-State region.

The EPA has proposed arbitrary limits on the amounts of nutrients that can enter the Chesapeake Bay and how these nutrients enter the bay. At the same time, the EPA is seeking to expand their regulatory authority by seizing authority granted to the States and converting the bay's cleanup effort into a process that is a top-down approach with mandatory regulations.

These overzealous regulations will affect everyone who lives, works, and farms in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, and the cost of complying with these requirements will be devastating during our current economic downturn, resulting in many billions of dollars in

economic losses to States, cities, towns, farms and other businesses, large and small.

The EPA's approach is far from the best approach to restore the Chesapeake Bay. I believe that each individual State and the localities in each State know better how to manage the State's water quality goals than the bureaucrats at the EPA.

I'm sure that there are some who wonder why what is happening in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed is important to their district. While EPA's unprecedented actions are starting in the Chesapeake Bay, they are coming to a watershed in your region of the country in your State. The EPA has stated in the document "A Coming Together for Clean Water: EPA's Strategy for Achieving Clean Water" that "The EPA will use the Chesapeake Bay as a demonstration for strengthening total maximum daily load pollution-reduction plans. The Chesapeake Bay Watershed will be a model for watershed protection in other parts of the country."

It is important that we in Congress tell the EPA to slow down. The EPA does not have the authority to micro-manage States' water quality goals, and we must stop their power grab.

I want to be clear, we all agree more must be done to restore the bay, and this is not meant to cut off the good work that is happening in the bay watershed. We have made substantial investments to clean up the bay. This amendment will not stop work that is going on in the States or the voluntary programs managed by Federal agencies that work with those on the ground to restore water quality. What this amendment will do is stop the EPA's regulatory power grab. It will stop the EPA from taking over responsibilities that have traditionally been left to the States.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment forward. I think it's very worthwhile and I support him, and I appreciate him bringing the amendment forward.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, 6 weeks ago, the Environmental Protection Agency, six States, including Mr. GOODLATTE's own State of Virginia and the District of Columbia, ended years of stalling and released detailed plans to reduce Chesapeake Bay pollution to meet minimal water quality standards over the next 15 years. Meeting those science-based and legally required goals is going to require a significant

and sometimes costly effort from all the citizens, towns, cities and States that are part of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

This year's Chesapeake Bay Foundation State of the Bay Report suggests that recent pollution-cutting measures are in fact beginning to show results.

□ 1920

We've seen increased crab and oyster populations and an increase in underwater grasses. The bay is coming back to life. The agreed-upon, negotiated, detailed, multistate plans have the potential to finally restore the Chesapeake Bay if everyone does his part.

The amendment, though, would block any Federal agency's ability to work with the States in meeting pollution reduction targets for the entire Chesapeake Bay watershed. If we don't meet this obligation, the farmers, municipalities, and businesses in all the States will be economically harmed.

If this amendment were to pass, it would not relieve the farms, businesses, and municipalities from their requirements in the court ordered settlement, but it would turn the pollution limits into an unfunded mandate since it would also block any Federal agency from providing technical and Federal assistance to bring farms, businesses, and municipalities into compliance with pollution reduction goals.

Clearly, this amendment is designed to and will unravel the current effort to finally put a limit on nutrient and sediment pollution in the Chesapeake Bay. Agriculture accounts for 42 percent of today's nitrogen, 46 percent of today's phosphorus, and 72 percent of the sediment entering the Chesapeake Bay.

This amendment would break up the existing Federal, State, local, and private partnership by prohibiting any Federal financial assistance to farmers, municipalities, and businesses that are working to improve the Chesapeake Bay watershed. It would set aside the tremendous progress this Congress has made in restoring the bay.

The pollution of the Chesapeake Bay is also a jobs killer for the citizens in its watershed. If this amendment passes, it will ultimately result in a loss of thousands of fishing, crabbing and tourism jobs.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, now is not the time to retreat on our commitment to restore this great estuary nor to kill the thousands of jobs that their survival depends upon. So I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Conservation Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Virginia's amendment.

The Total Maximum Daily Load is a mandatory diet to restrict nutrient and sediment runoff from point and nonpoint sources in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. EPA's proposed regulations will have a devastating economic impact on my constituents and throughout Pennsylvania. Unquestionably, the bay is in need and is truly worthy of our support, but this is just one more example of how EPA is trying to bypass congressional authority through backdoor regulations and unfunded mandates.

EPA has based the Chesapeake Bay TMDLs on its own model even though it is inconsistent with the models prepared by the Department of Agriculture. The head of USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service has recently gone so far as to say EPA's data on conservation practice is erroneous. Agriculture is not receiving the credit it deserves towards reducing nutrient and sediment runoff; yet EPA is forcing the bay States to move forward on unreasonable mandates, using the agency's flawed bay model. EPA will not even perform an economic analysis of the TMDL when the proposed unquestionability will have severe economic impacts on our Nation's farmers and rural communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to vote in its favor.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague that would prohibit the use of funds made available by this bill to "develop, promulgate, evaluate, implement, provide oversight to, or backstop total maximum daily loads or watershed implementation plans for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed." In essence, the amendment would prohibit the EPA from spending any funds on the Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load initiative in order to monitor and oversee pollution reduction into the Bay. It would result in rolling back the progress we have made on pollution reduction and restoring the Chesapeake over the decade. It would negatively impact not only the physical landscape of the Bay, but also the economic import and success of the Bay. And it would unfairly place the financial burden of reducing pollution squarely on the Chesapeake Bay states.

The Chesapeake Bay is North America's largest and most productive estuary, with thousands of tributaries and 64,000 square miles of watershed that includes six states and the District of Columbia. The Bay supports more than 3,600 species of plants, fish and

animals, is home to 29 species of waterfowl, and is a major resting ground along the Atlantic Migratory Bird Flyway. In addition, the Chesapeake is a commercial and recreational resource for the more than 15 million people who live in its basin, as well as visitors and tourists. Taking care of the Chesapeake Bay is vital to the environment and the economy, for recreation and natural resources, and for wildlife and the way of life in the Bay area. We use the Bay for recreation, agriculture, industry and navigation.

Just to give you a sense of the economic importance of the Bay, the 2008 Fisheries Economics of the U.S. report by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration indicated that commercial seafood industry in Maryland and Virginia contributed \$2 billion in sales, \$1 billion in income, and more than 41,000 jobs to the local economy. The economic benefits of saltwater recreational fishing contributed \$1.6 billion in sales which in turn contributed to more than \$800 million of additional economic activity and roughly 13,000 jobs. The majority of this is from the Chesapeake Bay.

When we don't expend efforts to care for the Bay, that also has an economic impact. For example, in the area of commercial and recreational fisheries, the blue crab population continues to be threatened by poor water quality. When the broader impact on restaurants, crab processors, wholesalers, grocers, and watermen is added up, the decline of crabs in the Bay meant a cumulative loss to Maryland and Virginia of about \$640 million between 1998 and 2006. Similarly, Oyster populations are threatened due to a combination of overharvesting, disease, and poor water quality. The decline of the Bay oyster over the last 30 years has meant a loss of more than \$4 billion for Maryland and Virginia. In the area of public health, one study estimated the cost associated with exposure to polluted recreational marine waters to be \$37 per gastrointestinal illness, \$38 per ear ailment, and \$27 per eye ailment due to lost wages and medical care. And with regard to clean water specifically, an EPA study indicated that clean water can increase the value of single family homes up to 4,000 feet from the water's edge by up to 25%. Perhaps most important, an EPA study of drinking water source protection efforts concluded that for every \$1 spent on source water protection, an average of \$27 is saved in water treatment costs.

Unfortunately, deterioration of the Bay and how to best address the problem has been a concern for more than two decades. When I served in the Virginia House of Delegates, I was part of a joint Virginia-Maryland legislative task force that first recommended the creation of a multi-state commission to address Bay issues. We filed a report in 1980 which recommended "the need for improved coordination of Bay-wide management to meet the long-term needs of the people of both Maryland and Virginia."

We have made great strides since then with the combined efforts of the federal government, state and local governments in the watershed, the Chesapeake Bay Commission, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, EPA, and all of their private partners over the last two decades. But we are far from done.

One of the most significant challenges facing the Bay today is pollution from wastewater

treatment plants, development, transportation, stormwater runoff and runoff from agricultural lands. Prohibiting this funding would have a major impact on the water quality throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed states. It would significantly restrict efforts to reduce nutrient and sediment runoff as well as monitoring and oversight of these efforts, all necessary to help protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay.

The amendment is opposed by the Nature Conservancy, League of Conservation Voters, National Wildlife Federation, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Environmental Defense Fund, Greenpeace, National Audubon Society, National Marine Sanctuary Foundation, National Wildlife Refuge Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Ocean Conservancy, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Alaska Wilderness League, American Bird Conservancy, American Rivers, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Native Ecosystems, Center for Plant Conservation, Clean Water Action, Conservation Lands Foundation, Conservation Northwest, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environmental Working Group, Geos Institute, Marine Conservation Biology Institute, Marine Fish Conservation Network, Oceana, Oregon Wild, Population Action International, Southwest Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, The Wilderness Society, Trust for Public Land, Union of Concerned Scientists, World Wildlife Fund, and Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.

For the foregoing reasons, I oppose the amendment and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the Chesapeake Bay is a natural and national treasure. It is the largest estuary in the United States of America.

The health of the Chesapeake Bay is under constant assault from all sources of pollution: urban runoff, farm runoff, storm water runoff. We have been working for years and years, in fact decades, to try and clean up the bay, and it has been like running in place because, every time we take action, more pollution flows into the bay.

That's why, under the Obama administration, they've taken important action to try and finally get ahead of the curve and restore the health of the bay. Will Baker, who is the President of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, described the approach of the Obama administration as something that may well represent the bay's best and last chance for restoration. As Mr. MORAN pointed out, if we don't do that, the watermen, the sports fishermen, and the tourist industry will be badly hurt.

I'm not sure that the gentleman from Virginia, who introduced this amendment, recognizes the impact it might have on farmers, because none of the funds in this act, including from EPA and the Department of Agriculture, may be used for a number of purposes, including watershed implementation plans for the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Now, we spoke to USDA's general counsel. Their office told us that this could well deprive farmers of some of their valuable agricultural conservation funds. The last I checked, Maryland received in fiscal year 2009 \$28 million. In the State of Virginia, the farmers received about \$16 million to help them with their conservation efforts because, as good stewards of the land, they have been part of the team effort to protect the Chesapeake Bay.

As Mr. MORAN said, if you take these funds away, you are denying them some of the tools they have effectively used. So this won't only hurt the watermen and the sports fishermen; it is also going to hurt the farmers; and collectively it is going to hurt the largest estuary in the United States.

Let's work to save the bay, not undermine its health.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to make two points.

First of all, the gentleman from Virginia is quite correct. The Chesapeake Bay is getting healthier, and that's a very, very good thing, all of which is happening as a result of the voluntary, incentivized, State-controlled regulation of this process. None of it has occurred under this TMDL provision that the gentleman from Maryland referred to, because of the fact that it is only now being imposed on farmers. They are very concerned about it, as are small cities and towns, as are homebuilders and others. This will have a devastating economic impact on the entire bay region, small cities and large included.

The second point is that we checked with the Department of Agriculture, and we checked with counsel on the Agriculture Committee. They agree that this restricts only those purposes described in the legislation related to the implementation of this language related to what the EPA is trying to do with their TMDL.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This is very important. We talked to the general counsel at the Department of Agriculture. Mr. GOODLATTE is wrong on this.

He says—his amendment says none of the funds may be intended to fund EPA. But his amendment actually doesn't mention EPA. It says no Federal funds period. That means that the farmers, the agribusiness throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed, would lose about \$100 million in conservation efforts if this amendment were to be approved.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that miles of the Chesapeake Bay have died, largely because of the fertilizer that washes into the bay. The vegetation at the bottom feeds on that nitrogen, and it grows like it's on steroids. When it decomposes, it sucks up all the oxygen in the water, and as a result, nothing can live in large areas of the Chesapeake Bay—no crabs, no oysters, no fish.

Nothing. It's dead, even the plant life can't survive when the oxygen has been so depleted in the process of decomposition.

This amendment needs to be defeated.

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

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

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

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

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 497 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

Mr. MATHESON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Sec. _____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act (other than for Department of Defense and the U.S. Postal Service) is hereby reduced by \$280,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut funding in the CR, other than the Department of Defense and the U.S. Postal Service, other than those two, by \$280 million. Now, \$280 million is the amount of money that would be saved if Federal civilian agencies, except DOD and the Postal Service, were to reduce their vehicle fleet budgets by 20 percent.

If adopted, it is my intention that these Federal agencies determine where to cut their portion of the \$280 million in cuts specifically towards finding savings in their vehicle fleet budgets.

This is a bipartisan idea supported by the chairs of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROYCE. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The bipartisan deficit reduction commission has looked at the work of the GAO on this issue. The GAO has tried to get Federal agencies to look at reducing their vehicle fleet. They have put out studies, and one of the interesting examples was where the GAO found automobiles in a parking lot that had not even been used for 3 years that had been purchased.

Their point is this: With 650,000 vehicles that the government uses now,

there is a way to put in place, if you followed the recommendations of the GAO, a way to reduce that fleet and save money. And the Government Accountability Office has said that the government agencies are badly managing their vehicles.

Now, we know that with one government agency, the Department of Energy, that decided to put in place these recommendations, they reduced their fleet. In their budget going forward, they can reduce their fleet by 35 percent.

What we are saying with this amendment is we are following the recommendation of the GAO. The Heritage Foundation endorses this. It certainly was supported by the bipartisan deficit reduction commission.

We have got a deficit of \$1.5 trillion and growing. This is a way to shut it down and a way that has been recommended to us by the GAO to move forward. We support this bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, here the gentleman goes again. He is attempting to cut without specifying where the cuts come from.

There's no tough choices identified in the amendment. All it says is just to reduce the appropriations by \$280 million, exempting DOD and Postal Service. But across-the-board cuts is a way for us to escape responsibility for making choices that people elected us to do, and this amendment does not specify where the cuts come from or who is to make the cuts.

I guess he would leave it up to the bureaucrats to decide where to cut, but that's what we were elected to do, Mr. Chairman, and so I oppose the amendment. I sympathize with the desire to cut more spending, but I want it done in a judicious and specific way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Kentucky about the challenges of across-the-board cuts. I feel like I was elected to come up with suggestions. If I could draft an amendment that would be ruled in order, I would specifically say it should be about the spending cuts, but I can't legislate on an appropriations bill.

So I would hope that as we look at this amendment, we understand that people read the record of this conversation, it was the intent of Congress when I looked at this amendment that agencies are supposed to reduce their vehicle purchases by 20 percent as the best that Mr. ROYCE and I can do under the rules of the House. We are trying to offer a specific opportunity to cut spending. We think we have identified it well during this discussion. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services who develops or promulgates regulations or guidance with regard to Exchanges under subtitle D of title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18021 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply prevents the Department of Health and Human Services from implementing the exchange as created under ObamaCare.

The exchange does not allow the American people to choose the benefits in their health plans. Instead, it will force the American people into a one-size-fits-all program where government bureaucrats limit their health insurance options. The government will control which plans are allowed to be offered in each State. It will control which companies will be allowed to sell health insurance plans in each State and will control the benefits contained in those health insurance plans.

Exchanges, as they are being designed, will only serve to further strain cash-strapped States by forcing them to use their employees or hire new employees to create and run them.

Recently, several Republican Governors sent a letter to Secretary Sebelius criticizing the exchange and asking her to provide States with complete flexibility in operating the exchange—most importantly, the freedom to decide which licensed insurers are permitted to offer their products.

I urge adoption of amendment No. 79.

FEBRUARY 7, 2011.

Hon. KATHLEEN SEBELIUS,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SEBELIUS: Many of us believe the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) should be repealed by Congress if the courts do not strike it down first. But, with no assurance of either outcome, we face the decision of whether to participate in the bill by operating state exchanges, or to let the federal government take on that task, if the bill remains in effect in 2014.

In addition to its constitutional infringements, we believe the system proposed by the PPACA is seriously flawed, favors dependency over personal responsibility, and

will ultimately destroy the private insurance market. Because of this, we do not wish to be the federal government's agents in this policy in its present form.

We wish states had been given more opportunity to provide input when the PPACA was being drafted. We believe in its current form the law will force our health care system down a path sure to lead to higher costs and the disruption or discontinuation of millions of Americans' insurance plans. Though we still have grave concerns with other provisions of the PPACA, we suggest the following improvements: provide states with complete flexibility on operating the exchange, most importantly the freedom to decide which licensed insurers are permitted to offer their products; waive the bill's costly mandates and grant states the authority to choose benefit rules that meet the specific needs of their citizens; waive the provisions that discriminate against consumer-driven health plans, such as health savings accounts (HSA's); provide blanket discretion to individual states if they chose to move non-disabled Medicaid beneficiaries into the exchanges for their insurance coverage without the need of further HHS approval; deliver a comprehensive plan for verifying incomes and subsidy amounts for exchange participants that is not an unfunded mandate but rather fully funded by the federal government and is certified as workable by an independent auditor; commission a new and objective assessment of how many people will end up in the exchanges and on Medicaid in every state as a result of the legislation (including those "offloaded" by employers), and at what potential cost to state governments. The study must be conducted by a neutral third-party research organization agreed to by the states represented in this letter.

We hope the Administration will accommodate our states' individual circumstances and needs, as we believe the PPACA in its current form threatens to destroy our budgets and perpetuate and magnify the most costly aspects of our health care system. While we hope for your endorsement, if you do not agree, we will move forward with our own efforts regardless and HHS should begin making plans to run exchanges under its own auspices.

Sincerely,

Governor Robert J. Bentley; Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter; Governor Nathan Deal; Governor Mitch Daniels; Governor Terry E. Branstad; Governor Bobby Jindal; Governor Haley Barbour; Governor Brian Sandoval; Governor John R. Kasich; Governor Tom Corbett; Governor Dennis Daugaard; Governor Sam Brownback; Governor Paul R. LePage; Governor David Heineman; Governor Susana Martinez; Governor Mary Fallin; Governor Nikki Haley; Governor Bill Haslam; Governor Rick Perry; Governor Scott Walker; Governor Gary R. Herbert.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia). The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Defunding the health insurance exchanges that we created in the Affordable Care Act will hurt small businesses, which are the driving force of our economy. It destroys jobs, takes away consumer choice and increases the deficit.

By gaining access to the exchanges, small businesses will prosper from

what large employers have enjoyed for years: large group rates, lower administrative costs and greater transparency. The exchanges also give small businesses and their employees access to a fuller range of plans. They give families across America access to the information that they need in order to be able to buy the best plan at a competitive price that suits their needs.

The exchange has created a competitive marketplace for health insurance so that small businesses and middle class families across America can benefit from lower prices and more choices.

This is basic free market principles at work. One would think the majority would support any attempt to bring competition to health care but, instead, they are carrying the water for big insurance companies who do not want competition. They want to preserve their monopoly. They want a captive market, forced to pay whatever exorbitant rates they feel like charging. That will not bring down health care costs or cut the deficit. The health insurance exchanges help slow the surging cost of health care by introducing competition into the marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment which will threaten our economy, harm our small businesses and will destroy jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's leadership on this. If you notice the common theme, Mr. Chairman, it's that these folks want the government to be in charge of our health care, these folks over here want patients to be in charge of our health care, and it kind of runs throughout all of the issues as they relate to health care.

Now, the exchanges may seem like a great idea, but there's a big problem with the way that they are set up. They don't work. You don't have to believe us. Goodness gracious. Twenty-one Governors have sent a letter to Secretary Sebelius, and what did they say? They need complete flexibility on operating so that they have the freedom to decide which insurers offer the products in their State. If that weren't true, it would mean that the government, the Federal Government is offering it.

What they are asking for: waiving the costly mandates, which means, Mr. Chairman, that the mandates are crushing the States across this great land. They have asked for waiving the provisions that discriminate against all sorts of plans.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, that you won't be able to keep what you like. You won't be able to keep what you like.

So this is pretty simple. These folks want the government to be in charge of our health care. These folks want patients to be in charge of our health

care. We come down on the side of patients.

Support the amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, again, I would simply urge adoption of the amendment to defund the exchanges.

As a former State legislator, the legislators I have talked to in Colorado and around the country all urged the same thing that I have spoken to: Defund the exchanges; defund this bill.

Let's put real solutions in place that will actually decrease the cost of care, increase the quality of care, and we can begin that process tonight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1940

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, again, the question here is whose side are you on? The only people that I talk to who are against the exchanges are the big insurance companies and their representatives, because they are the only ones that stand to gain by keeping the status quo and not having the exchanges. The little guy, the consumer wants the exchange. Why? Because he can get affordable coverage, because he can get a good benefit package, because there is transparency, because he can find out what's being offered and how much it costs him. And the insurance companies don't want any of that because they want to continue with business as usual, keep raising rates.

Now, we all know how it works. The large employers, they can go out and get group coverage, but if you are an individual or you are a small business, it's very hard to do that. And that's why we set up the exchanges, because basically it's like a larger insurance pool. And now the small business, the individual can go on the exchange, they can find out what's going on, they can see what the rates are, and there's competition.

As the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, the Republicans always used to be for competition. This is the marketplace. This is capitalism. This is what we are providing here. It's a choice. More choices for the little guy. That's what this is all about. And I for the life of me do not understand again why the Republicans would not want to have the exchanges except for the same reason, they are siding with the big insurance companies. They are not worrying about the consumer and the average American.

It's also the fact that we're talking about portability. Right now, if you have a job and you're afraid to go to another job, and maybe a better job, or something that you'd like to do because you are afraid that you're going to lose your health insurance, well, now you don't do that. You can change your jobs. You can do something better. You can improve your life. You can live the American Dream because now you don't have to worry about not being able to find a good, affordable in-

surance policy. This is another aspect of the exchanges that are really so important.

Really, the exchanges are the heart of what we're trying to do, which is cover all Americans, provide access to good insurance coverage for all Americans, and make it at a reasonable cost. That is not the case now, and it will only be the case if these exchanges, as part of the larger health care reform, become law and continue to become law.

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

Ms. DELAURO. How much time is left on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

For 15 million Americans, this is another Friday night without a paycheck. And instead of working together to create jobs, here we are again relitigating the health care bill, the bill we talked about last year, last month, last week, yesterday, this morning. Here we are. We should be creating jobs, but here we are.

Now, the exchange does three things. It says that small businesses and families and individuals can get the same purchasing power that big corporations do when they buy their health insurance. It says you can choose among private competitors, insurance companies, and see who makes the best offer to you. And it says you make the choice that you want.

This should sound very familiar to the Members on the other side because it's exactly what they have as Members of Congress in the Federal health insurance program. So I would think that the Members on both sides would want their constituents to have the same health care opportunities that they do. If you believe that's the case, then the right vote on this amendment is "no."

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, do I have any time left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 13 seconds remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. In my 13 remaining seconds, to quote Mr. GARAMENDI here, What are the health insurance exchanges? It's called the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program. We in the Congress have the benefit of enjoying a health care exchange where we can have our choice, pick the plan that suits our needs, get it at competitive rates. Why do we not want to extend this for the rest of the country? It should not just be the purview of those who serve in the United States Congress.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleagues of testimony that was given before the House Budget Committee by Mr. Foster, the chief actuary of Medicare, who blew a hole in the two primary promises of ObamaCare. The first promise, that people get to keep the health care that they have if they liked it, he said that's not going to happen. The second promise, that it would lower the cost of health care, he said that's not going to happen. This is the chief actuary of Medicare.

I didn't have the opportunity to speak on this floor when this bill came through the House of Representatives, but I do now, because the people of Colorado spoke on November 2 when they said, enough is enough, let's get Congress doing the people's business, creating jobs, getting government out of the way.

Let's find real solutions for the health care bill, solutions that will actually bring commonsense reforms to lower the cost of health care, increase the quality of care, not result in 800,000 job losses, not result in promises made to the people that can't be kept. We have got to do something soon. And I hope it's voting. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 329, 330 AND 331 OFFERED BY
MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments 329, 330 and 331 be considered en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 329

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

SEC. _____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for "Department of Energy, Power Marketing Administrations, Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration" is hereby reduced to \$0.

AMENDMENT NO. 330

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

SEC. _____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for "Department of Energy, Power Marketing Administrations, Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration" is hereby reduced to \$0.

AMENDMENT NO. 331

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

SEC. _____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for "Department of Energy, Power Marketing Administrations, Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration" is hereby reduced to \$0.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, these amendments eliminate as no longer necessary the Federal administrative subsidy for the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration and the Western Area Power Administration. These massive energy subsidies amount to what I call unauthorized megamarks. These energy subsidies, that began three decades ago to develop only the West and South, now cost the rest of America billions of dollars.

In fact, the Northeast, Florida, the Midwest, the Great Lakes States are heavily subsidizing the power systems of the West and South. I have a map here that kind of shows the parts of America that have a Federal power umbrella and those that don't. And it's really shocking to look at what the utility rates are. In Idaho, with federal energy subsidies, it costs residential consumers \$7.98 per kilowatt hour. But guess what, in Ohio, that has no subsidy, it costs those residential consumers \$11.34. In Wyoming, with power subsidies, it costs \$8.39. But in Connecticut, with no subsidy, it costs those citizens \$19.35 a kilowatt hour.

To achieve real budget savings, we must address megamark spending, not just district-targeted earmarks, but massive megamarks. These regional Federal power subsidies illustrate the problem. In fact, those subsidies, over only some regions, are privileges that the other regions of our country can't afford anymore. These regions have outlived their welcome in terms of subsidy. Those regions need to compete in the free market just like the rest of our regions do. No more free rides, because America can't afford it anymore.

My part of America can't afford the largesse given to the energy power marketing authorities in the other regions. The Southeastern Power Administration has never been operationally self-sufficient. It has cost the taxpayers \$545 million, over half a billion dollars, since created in 1950.

Similarly, the Southwestern Power Administration has never been operationally self-sufficient, costing the taxpayers over \$707 million since it was created in 1944. And WAPA, the Western Power Authority, has never been operationally self-sufficient. It has

cost the taxpayers over \$7 billion since being created in 1978.

Twenty-seven years of continued appropriations to only some regions seems like plenty of time for those agencies to have business plans in place to yield self-sufficiency and compete in the real marketplace like the rest of us are expected to do.

□ 1950

In my region of the Nation, we have no Federal power subsidy. Ohioans pay 11.3 cents per kilowatt hour, but Utah only pays 8.7 cents. Arkansas only pays 8.8 cents. But New York pays 18.6 cents. New York has no Federal power marketing subsidy. Citizens where I live tax themselves separately and locally through local tax levies for economic development. The Federal Government has never helped us on our power costs. Our energy is provided through investor-owned utilities, and we have no Federal cushion to depend on. That's the reason recession causes tremendous hardships in free market regions like our own. How are Federal power subsidies to just some regions fair to all our taxpayers? After three decades, it's time to let three unauthorized power marketing administrations stand on their own two feet and compete in the free market, just like our region does. Balance our budget, cut the subsidies, cut the Mega-marks, cut regional favoritism that benefits the few at the expense of the many.

I ask to include in the RECORD a full State-by-State power cost analysis so all Americans can know who is being subsidized and who is eking it out and trying to compete in the real marketplace, the free marketplace. I ask Members here to support the Kaptur amendment to eliminate the Federal administrative subsidies for power marketing authorities.

Now let me point out that some of our power marketing authorities are doing it right, paying their own way. Take Bonneville, they did it right. There's a way to do it right and a way to do it wrong, and we shouldn't reward inefficiency. We should allow these subsidized institutions to compete in the free market and not make the other parts of America that are burdened by high unemployment and high power costs, to be giving favored treatment to other parts of the country that are not carrying their own load forward. Again, take a look at the privileged parts of America and then ask yourself who's paying for it. It's pretty clear what's going on here.

The Southeastern Power Marketing Administration was budgeted to be zero funded in the President's FY11 budget. The amendment would allow this 2010 funding to go to zero. But under the continuing resolution, they will continue to be funded at their 2010 levels in spite of being eliminated in the budget. There is a lot of book-keeping going on here that doesn't treat all parts of America fairly. I ask my colleagues to do what we've had to

do in our region, compete in the real marketplace. Support the Kaptur amendments.

AVERAGE RETAIL PRICE OF ELECTRICITY

(Cents per kWh)

Rank (residential)	State	Residential	Commercial	Industrial
1	HI	28	25.86	21.87
2	CT	19.35	16.49	14.41
3	NY	18.66	16.05	9.73
4	NY	16.61	13.98	11.68
5	AK	16.44	14.12	13.99
6	NH	16.31	14.22	12.77
7	VT	15.96	13.42	9.46
8	RI	15.94	12.88	12.89
9	ME	15.73	12.41	8.72
10	CA	15.23	14.21	11.05
11	MA	15.18	15.28	13.19
12	MA	14.54	11.64	9.45
13	DE	13.84	11.38	9.61
14	PA	12.84	10.24	7.61
15	WI	12.57	9.96	6.81
16	MI	12.51	10.12	7.19
17	NV	12.42	9.94	7.5
18	TX	11.61	9.19	6.31
19	IL	11.5	8.84	6.72
20	FL	11.5	9.77	8.84
21	OH	11.34	9.78	6.32
22	CO	11.12	9.13	6.96
23	AZ	11.05	9.52	6.75
24	AL	10.87	10.28	6.04
25	NM	10.63	8.72	6.07
26	MO	10.56	8.88	5.67
27	VA	10.55	7.68	6.74
28	IA	10.46	7.91	5.38
29	MN	10.46	8.37	6.31
30	NC	10.28	8.19	6.15
31	GA	10.26	9.06	6.18
32	MS	9.98	9.33	6.36
33	TN	9.98	9.66	6.63
34	KS	9.97	8.15	6.15
35	IN	9.61	8.4	5.96
36	MO	9.22	7.54	5.56
37	MT	9.18	8.5	5.58
38	OK	9.17	7.42	5.2
39	NE	9.02	7.66	5.96
40	LA	8.97	8.53	5.9
41	SD	8.94	7.58	5.89
42	OR	8.86	7.66	5.47
43	AR	8.82	7.25	5.42
44	WY	8.79	7.48	4.98
45	WV	8.78	7.66	5.86
46	UT	8.77	7.23	4.99
47	KT	8.59	7.86	5.06
48	ND	8.15	7.19	5.67
49	ID	7.98	6.69	5.18
50	WA	7.97	7.31	3.96

States in italic are located in Power Marketing Administrations (PMA) States.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the amendments propose a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendments are not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress which states, "It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease of such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI."

The amendments propose a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section. I ask for a ruling.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky makes a point of order that the amendments offered en bloc by the gentlewoman from Ohio violate section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, only in Washington would they say that if you ask organizations to compete in the free market, it costs more money to the Federal Government. Only in Washington would that kind of book-keeping exist. So I am troubled by the

point of order, but I would just say that I thank the gentleman for expressing his point of view. This will not be the last time we hear about power marketing authorities and their inability to compete in the private marketplace this year.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendments propose a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendments are not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

Mr. WEINER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to Saudi Arabia.

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act for "International Military Education and Training" may be used for assistance to Saudi Arabia.

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act for "Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs" may be used for assistance to Saudi Arabia.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, to the great relief, I'm sure, of all those assembled, I don't intend to take the full 5 minutes.

The amendment I propose is one that I think that both sides of the aisle will rally around. It's very simple. It limits any aid in this bill going to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Why we would be providing any aid to Saudi Arabia at all has been an eternal mystery to me, given their propensity to exporting terrorists, given that they had exported 15 of the 19 homicide bombers on September 11, given that just in December when the WikiLeaks came out, it was learned in a quote from the Secretary of State, "It has been an ongoing challenge to persuade Saudi officials to treat terrorist funding as an important priority." Given that the Saudis have textbooks that say things like this in them. This is what they teach to their children:

"The Prophet said, The hour of judgment will not come until Muslims fight the Jews and kill them. O Muslim. O Servant of God. There is a Jew behind me. Come and kill him." They have textbooks that also lash out at Christians.

It is also important to note that in this House year after year, we've elimi-

nated aid to the Saudis, only to have it come back. As you see on this chart, 2005—it was actually defeated that year—but every subsequent year, this House voted to ban aid to Saudi Arabia, and it comes rising back up like a Shakespearean specter. This language strikes the Presidential waiver, and says no more aid to Saudi Arabia.

I reserve the balance of my time
Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. The underlying FY10 bill already prohibits assistance to Saudi Arabia, unless the Secretary of State determines that it is in our U.S. national interest. Maintaining a relationship with Saudi Arabia is critical to our national security, and I am concerned this amendment could jeopardize that relationship.

Our two countries enjoy robust counterterrorism intelligence sharing. Saudi-U.S. collaboration helped thwart the package bomb from Yemen. Saudi Arabia is a critical strategic ally with whom we share mutual enemies and mutual threats. I believe this amendment goes too far, and I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEINER. I simply say, with the greatest respect to Madam Chair, that we have spoken in this body repeatedly. The Saudis don't need our money. They've got plenty of their own money. It's the money that they use when they jack up gas prices and give us no help in trying to deal with them. It's the money that they use to export terrorism. They don't need any of our money.

I understand there is a Presidential waiver. This may come as a surprise that my friends now want to give the President that authority to override Congress. I think we should take it away and say no aid to Saudi Arabia.

I ask for a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2000

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The Acting CHAIR. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. WEINER. The gentleman from New York is on a roll, so he'll ask for Weiner amendment 101.

The Acting 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 new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for mohair under section 1201 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8731).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011,

the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you.

Once again, I have no intention of taking the full measure of my time. This is an amendment that has been discussed on this floor many times. Unfortunately, it keeps coming back. We provide subsidies believe it or not—

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

When the gentleman is ready to yield, I want to say we support the amendment.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you. I appreciate it. I'm going to be very brief. Just let me explain. This is an amendment that—

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield? What are the names?

Mr. WEINER. Now I would say to the ranking member, I'm from Queens. I'm from New York City. So I thought mohair was a guy named Moe who had long hair. But I now know that it is a subsidy that dates back to World War I when our uniforms were made with mohair and there was a strategic imperative to make sure we had enough. We provide a subsidy. This has not been used in military uniforms now for about 55 years.

Congressman CHAFFETZ and I have been agitating to try to eliminate this subsidy. There's still \$1 million of funding going to about 12 farmers. No goats lost anything for the purpose of this picture. This is what a mohair looks like.

I would urge my colleagues to end this wasteful subsidy.

I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I have to ask my friend from New York if sheep are carnivorous. Do they bite human beings? That's my question. I understand that they can be carnivorous.

Mr. WEINER. Reclaiming my time, first of all, show some respect. They're goats. Second of all, and if you are referring to a press conference that went awry that I had where I perhaps might have been bitten by a goat, I will say this: I believe that there is nothing wrong with these animals. We want them to have as much hair as they need. And if you want to give them a haircut, you should do it with your own money. It shouldn't be on the taxpayers' dime.

So I urge a "yes" vote on the Wiener amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. So there's not a feed subsidy for them. I just want to make sure, Mr. Chairman, because I understand there was an incident. We do support the amendment.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR.
NEUGEBAUER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for repair, alteration, or improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, 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, this discussion we have been having for the last 3 or 4 days is really about what the American people said on November 2. They said that these huge deficits are unacceptable. The fact is that we're going to run a \$1.6 trillion deficit this year and our debt is almost \$14.1 trillion. Projections are that if we continue on this pace, that will double in the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, the American people said this is unacceptable. And so what are the American people doing in their own lives at home? Well, they're addressing needs versus wants. And what they're saying is there are some things that they need, and then there's some things that they want. But what they understand in these tough economic times, where we have a number of our American citizens unemployed, is that a lot of people are having to prioritize how they spend. And maybe there's a fence in the backyard that needs replacing, or maybe the deck in the backyard needs new boards, but they're postponing those.

And so basically this is a very simple amendment. Basically, the White House has two accounts: one for basically daily maintenance. That account has \$13 million, and this amendment does not address that account. But as they do in Washington, do you know what happens if you want to get more money? You add more accounts, and you just rename them. And there is another account called renovations and upgrades. And so what we're saying is that there's \$2 million worth of upgrades that the White House would like to do. It includes things like doing a plumbing survey and some things like computer system upgrades. We think that possibly those are items that can wait until our economy gets rolling again, until we quit having these record deficits.

And so it is a very simple amendment, Mr. Chairman. We just think that the White House can postpone those expenses, things that they would like but not necessarily need. This will still allow the White House to mow the yard, do the painting, do the maintenance at the White House; but it says

these capital expenditures of over \$2 million should be postponed for another year or two until we get our deficit spending down.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I would like to say that there is an account in our financial services bill for repair and restoration at the White House, and the funding for that is \$495,000, or 20 percent less than the fiscal year 2010 levels. And these requested funds would provide for an alternate electric feed, which we understand is because the power there fails occasionally, computer system upgrades, a plumbing system survey to begin addressing their leaky plumbing.

However, the language of Mr. NEUGEBAUER's amendment doesn't just strike funding in this account. This amendment actually states that none of the funds made available by this act may be used for repair, alteration or improvement of the executive residence at the White House.

And this is really a sweeping prohibition because it prohibits all repairs at the White House. So what happens if a pipe bursts? What happens if there is a hole in the drywall or the plaster? What if there's an electrical fire or a broken window? What if a safety or security issue needs to be addressed? And I dare say that most people, most everybody, even if they were tightening their belts, they would still have to deal with those emergency issues.

And at the end of the day, the White House is the most visited residence in the country. It's an office, it's a museum, and it's a home. And regardless of who occupies the White House, the building needs to be maintained.

We have already reduced the account that pays for repairs and alterations by 20 percent. Do we really, really want to prohibit all repairs and all alterations at the White House, which is our house?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Well, I would say to the gentlewoman that there is ample money for maintenance involved in the White House. As I said, in section 1519, there is \$13 million available for electrical issues, for painting issues, for maintenance issues.

I think what we are saying, and I would be glad to work with the gentlewoman in the conference report if she wants to be more specific, but the three projects that this administration requested actually totaled \$2 million: \$1.5 million for an electrical system, computer system upgrades of \$255,000 and a plumbing system survey. This is a set of drawings for \$250,000.

I would submit to you that the American people are making some pretty

tough choices and that certainly the White House is a treasure of this country; but, Mr. Chairman, so are our children and our grandchildren a treasure. And if we don't start making some tough choices here, then we are not going to have a future for our children, which should be one of our more treasured assets.

I would be glad to work with the gentlewoman in a conference report. But this amendment has merits because basically it says to the President—and I think the President would agree—you know what, if other American families are not making improvements to their house right now that aren't necessarily necessary this year, I don't think the President would want his either.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2010

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas has no other speakers, let me say one thing—that this amendment doesn't specify the account being reduced. It cuts all repairs and alterations.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), my brother.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank you for the time. I recognize that you do not support the amendment, but some folks still cannot help themselves.

This is not about the White House; it's about who lives in the White House. First, there was an amendment to cut his staff. Then there was an amendment that was taken away about not allowing him a teleprompter, and now there's an amendment that says you can't fix the leaks in the White House. You know, we have a plumbing system at the White House that hasn't been repaired since Harry Truman. That's a long, long time.

So, yes, there are difficult times in this country, but when you have a house visited by many, many tourists throughout the year, you should be careful as to the wiring, about the kind of things that could happen with water, about the kind of things that could happen with safety. And after all, whether we like this President or not, this is the residential place and the office space for our President, for the next one, and the ones to follow.

I think this is a proper investment, and personally, I think it gets pretty petty when we don't even allow this President to have leaks fixed in the White House.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, do I have any time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Missouri has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentlelady. I won't take but 30 seconds. Just to mention the fact, I've been around long enough to recall when money was requested for the Vice President's mansion when Dick Cheney was living

there. That money was provided. This side didn't object when money was put into the White House when George Bush was the resident. This is kind of mean-spirited games. It's really beneath us. Let's not do this kind of stuff.

Mrs. EMERSON. I urge opposition to this amendment, as well-intentioned as it may be, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I kind of resent the insinuation that my amendment is addressed to this President. It's not addressed to this President. It's addressed to this country, and by the way, I was over at the White House during the White House Christmas party. The White House looked like it was in pretty good shape, and I can attest that the plumbing was actually working as well.

But what I would say, Mr. Chairman, is there's a lot of people that would want to come to this floor tonight and make excuses why we can't begin to cut spending in this country. You know what—the American people are tired of our excuses. This is a good amendment. There's been a lot of good amendments. Yes, these are difficult choices, but these are the kind of choices that we're going to have to make if we're going to ensure that our American families have a future, that we get this economy back going, that we create jobs, and we do not leave a legacy of debt for our children and our grandchildren.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled "Water Quality Standards for the State of Florida's Lakes and Flowing Waters" published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency on December 6, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 75762 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits any funding in this bill to be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled Water Quality Standards for the State of Florida's lakes and flowing waters. Like all Floridians, I want clean and safe water, but this debate is not over whether we want clean water for Florida; it is over how we reach that goal and at what cost.

This EPA mandate, which singles out Florida, will drive up the cost of doing business, double water bills for all Floridian families, and destroy jobs. By some estimates, this will cost our States an estimated approximately \$2 billion. At a time when we should be attracting new companies in Florida, we cannot afford new regulations which will drive businesses out of our State and destroy jobs.

Our unemployment rate is over 12 percent and at 15 percent in some parts of my district. New, costly regulations are not going to improve those numbers. The EPA has repeatedly refused to allow third-party review of the science behind the proposed mandate, and they have failed to complete an economic analysis. This regulation is not grounded in science, and all Florida should not have to serve as the guinea pig in this radical experiment.

That's right, Mr. Chairman, Florida is the first State being required to comply with this Washington, D.C., mandate, and according to a recent New York Times article, an EPA official said they have no plans to implement the regulation in any other State. So I ask you, how is that fair?

But during the upcoming months I will be working with our agriculture commissioner, a former colleague here, Adam Putnam, who says that this will impact 14,000 jobs in Florida.

I'd also be willing to work with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and other concerned State and Federal agencies to develop a plan that can be agreed upon by all parties. We cannot allow an unaccountable EPA to act dictatorial in this issue that affects every Floridian.

Until the EPA is willing to consider Florida's unique needs and economy, this regulation must not go into effect. A recent poll shows that 68 percent of Floridians do not want this Washington, D.C., mandate. Dozens of Florida job creators and associations, as well as 60 national companies, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the American Farm Bureau, have sent letters to Congress to oppose this mandate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES,
Tallahassee, FL, February 17, 2011.

Hon. THOMAS J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives, Longworth Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY: I am writing in strong support of your amendment to H.R. 1, the 2011 Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act that will prevent the Environ-

mental Protection Agency (EPA) from implementing, administering, or enforcing the proposed numeric nutrient criteria for Florida.

For several years now, Florida has been working to improve its water quality and, in many respects, our efforts have been a model for other states. Until 2009, Florida was working cooperatively with EPA to improve our water quality standards. In 2009, in an attempt to settle a lawsuit brought by environmental groups, EPA decided to abandon that cooperative approach, federally preempt our state water quality standards, and impose new criteria on the state. Many are concerned that these new criteria are not based on sound science, including EPA's own Science Advisory Board, which has expressed serious concerns about the science used by EPA to support the regulation.

This issue is particularly important given the economic impacts of the proposed regulation. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection estimates that this federal mandate may force municipal wastewater and stormwater utilities to spend as much as \$26 billion in capital improvements to upgrade their facilities. The Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services has estimated that the regulation will impact over 14,000 jobs. Given the reality of Florida's economic situation, these estimates are of great concern.

Given all of this, I was proud to join Florida's Attorney General Pam Bondi in filing a lawsuit against EPA over these rules. EPA's flawed regulation must be set aside so that we can return to an effort to improve Florida's water quality that is cooperative, economically feasible, and based on sound science. I am deeply grateful for your leadership in offering this amendment and strongly encourage your colleagues to support it.

Sincerely,

ADAM H. PUTNAM,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the equivalent of sticking your head in the sand—I use that analogy because we're talking about Florida—hoping that a growing problem somehow will miraculously go away.

Back in 2009, a consent decree was reached in Federal court between EPA and numerous Florida environmental groups to set numeric limits for nutrients in the State's lakes, rivers, and streams. Such numeric standards are the only way to make progress correcting ecological problems. The need for the standards contained in this consent decree was demonstrated repeatedly by Florida's Department of Environmental Protection. They pointed out that 1,000 miles of the State's rivers and streams, 350,000 acres of Florida's lakes, and 900 square miles of its estuaries were contaminated by nutrient pollution from sewage discharges and fertilizer or manure runoff.

But this amendment would block these standards from being used. I fail to understand how the supporters of this amendment think that it's okay for folks to dump manure, fertilizer,

and sewage into lakes and rivers without regard to the health of these waters or to the health of the people who depend upon these waters.

This water quality rule was published last November, but the regulations don't go into effect until March of next year. The major activity by EPA that this amendment would prevent is an education effort to help the communities, businesses, and the public meet these new standards.

The amendment also would block EPA from improving the regulations to meet the legitimate concerns of the public. That's what EPA is trying to do, reach out, get their ideas. There's a good question as to how much longer tourists will keep flocking to Florida if its lakes, streams, and rivers are in a death spiral, flushed with the water quality of cesspools.

□ 2020

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

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

Mr. MORAN. May I inquire how much time we have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 3 minutes. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to finish on this amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has the right to close.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would yield the remaining 3 minutes to the very distinguished lady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to amendment 13, which would defund Florida's new clean water rules. This amendment will harm Florida's economy and threaten the natural ecosystems on which we rely.

This past November, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency approved a final regulation setting new water quality standards for Florida's lakes and streams. This clean water rule is desperately needed to address the nutrient pollution contaminating more than 1,000 miles of State rivers and streams, 350,000 acres of lakes, and 900 square miles of estuaries.

Potential tourists to Florida often envision images of pristine beaches, beautiful waterways, and vibrant coastal ecosystems with great fishing and recreational opportunities. That is why so many people flock to our State. Florida's waterways, beaches, and coastal ecosystems are critical parts of the economic engine that drive Florida's \$65 billion a year tourism industry.

But without the new clean water standards, this could all evaporate. Already algae outbreaks plague many of our lakes and rivers, depleting oxygen levels and suffocating living organisms. Nutrient pollution results in massive fish kills, waterways clogged

with toxic green slime, beach closures, and reduced waterfront property values.

We need these new clean water standards because the current standards for determining when someone is polluting is vague, and therefore unenforceable. Waiting until the waterway is choked with sewage, fertilizer, or manure is simply no way to manage our water.

For over 10 years the State of Florida labored to produce a clean water rule but never quite got there. In the absence of State action, EPA had to act to protect Florida's waters. EPA produced a rule built on years of data collected by the State and based on the best science available.

The clean water rule is also the product of tens of thousands of public comments, numerous public meetings and workshops, and years of consultations between the State of Florida's Department of Environmental Protection and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

While EPA took over finalizing new standards, they did not take a "my way or highway" approach. They listened to Florida's citizens and regulated entities, made many adjustments, and included plenty of flexibility.

To begin with, the final nutrient standards are comparable to the State's own draft standards. In some areas they are more stringent, but in other areas, they are less stringent. The major difference between the State and Federal rule is that the EPA actually finalized it rather than continuing the foot-dragging.

And as a practical matter, all this amendment will really do is hurt the very stakeholders its proponents say they want to help.

EPA built in a 15-month delayed implementation to allow it to provide technical assistance to stakeholders and ensure compliance is achieved in the most efficient, cost-effective way possible. EPA is using this time to hold workshops, seminars, and other meetings of regulated entities to achieve this end. But with this amendment, that all goes away. These regulated entities will still have to comply with the law, but now they'll be on their own.

Perhaps even worse for the regulated entities, this amendment will prevent State water managers from utilizing the flexibilities of the rule. It would prevent the EPA from working with the State to develop and implement a process to review and approve site-specific alternative criteria proposed by regulated entities. This makes no sense.

This rule provides flexibility to regulated entities and to the State. If the amendment passes, it would be devastating to Florida's economy.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment, my colleagues, is simply to say that the United Nations is a very valuable building and the renovations that are occurring right now are necessary, but—

Now, the renovations that are occurring on the U.N. ultimately are necessary, but the cost that is occurring is not. There's a huge overrun.

I want to be clear that the opposition I have with this amendment is not to obstruct the U.N. from making a safe environment for the workers and the visitors that come there but to encourage reform and use best business practices considering that the taxpayers are funding about a quarter of the amount of money they're spending for renovations.

You know, we had a hearing here in Congress looking at what it would cost to build and renovate the United Nations. And they presented a figure. Well, Donald Trump, who's built a lot of hotels, a lot of apartment houses, came in and he said, "I could do the same thing for half the money." That was half the money back when he offered that. So he said using better business practices, he could do it for a lot less money.

So I believe my colleagues that the U.N. has had a history of wasting money.

Let me give you one example.

In 2003, in the Secretary General's bulletin, he banned all smoking in the U.N. Well, the U.N. spent \$130,000 on a ventilation system to accommodate smokers in the cafeteria. Well, I'm not clear why they did that.

The architect was starting to get into so many problems, they terminated him. By so doing, they paid him \$44 million after the termination.

So these are the kinds of things that I am worrying about, and I think the

U.N. auditors have expressed the same concern that I have in the whole process of procurement and contract management on the U.N. renovations and building construction programs.

The GAO expressed their concern regarding the U.N.'s weakness in existing internal oversight and procurement.

So all I'm asking simply is in this time of a weak economy, we should hold off continuing to renovate the U.N. until we practice best business practices and we make sure that they're not continuing to have overruns.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Stearns amendment because it would exacerbate security vulnerabilities at the United Nations headquarters in New York City.

The United Nations Capital Master Plan addresses a number of serious life safety and security concerns to staff, diplomats, and visitors. The U.N. receives approximately 5,000 accredited delegates annually from around the world and 300,000 tourists, about 40 percent of whom are Americans. Almost 4,300 people work at the U.N. headquarters complex, including 1,280 Americans.

The U.N. headquarters complex, the majority of which is 55 years old, is not compliant with New York City building and life safety codes or modern security requirements.

□ 2030

The major building systems are inefficient, beyond their useful life, increasingly difficult to maintain and repair. For example, the life safety systems are a great concern, including inadequate sprinkler and alarm systems and the lack of an automatic shutdown of ventilation systems in the event of a fire. Hazardous materials, such as asbestos, are still present in the facilities.

Providing the U.N. with safe and functional headquarter facilities will enable the organization to operate more effectively is what we all want.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEARNS. Let me just mention a little thing more about my amendment.

Basically, as I've told my colleagues, this is a cost overrun on renovations in the U.N., and more importantly, with this huge economic downturn that we've had, I think we need to go back and look at the procurement process at the U.N.

I want to say something that's different from the U.N. amendment. I had

an amendment, 429, dealing with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. This amendment was ruled out of order, and it was because the amendment basically did not specify the individuals whose defense by the United States taxpayers has been supported, would be stopped payment by my amendment 429.

To put it into perspective, the amendment I had was saying that people like Franklin Raines, who was the CEO of Fannie Mae, and these other executives, while they were hiding huge amounts of debt, were collecting huge bonuses, including the board of directors of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; and at the same time, the inspector general found that these people were hiding this debt, and now taxpayers have to pay for their defense and bail them out. But the ironic thing and the tragic thing is that taxpayers have to pay the lawyers to defend all these people that actually were hiding the debt and looting these companies.

So my amendment is basically saying that taxpayers should stop paying the legal fees for these executives that were hiding the debt and acted illegally. But understanding that this is out of order, I'm not going to offer this amendment. I will look for another opportunity to make my case.

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

My amendment would prohibit funds from the United States from being used for the design, renovation, or construction of any headquarters of the United Nations located in the United States.

The U.N. headquarters will undergo renovations, as planned, with an estimated cost of more than double the original amount expected. The renovations are necessary, but the cost to do so is not. I want to be clear that my opposition is not to obstruct the U.N. from making a safe environment for their workers and visitors, but to encourage reform through better business practices—considering taxpayers are responsible for 22% of the U.N.'s budget.

Time after time, we have asked American families to tighten their belts and exercise fiscal restraint. Why should they do with less and not the U.N.? It is time that this Congress lead by example. Our constituents deserve more than the perceived normal rhetoric of "Do as we say, not as we do."

Congress held a full-scale hearing to determine if the U.N. estimates in fact reflected the lowest cost option. According to Donald Trump's testimony at the U.S. Senate hearing, the costs associated with the renovations would be overwhelmingly more than the U.N.'s estimate. Trump who has experience in these matters, testified he could complete the project for \$700 million. That's nearly half the amount than the U.N. projected they needed. The U.N. has a proven history of wasting hard-earned taxpayer's dollars and I am certainly not surprised to expect anything less from the U.N. when discussing the expenditures spent for their headquarters. The architect, that was later terminated, was given \$44 million. To me, this does not reflect the lowest cost option. Furthermore, the U.N. spent \$130,000 on a ventilation system to accommodate smokers

in the cafeteria. Why would you spend so much to ventilate smoke in a cafeteria despite a 2003 Secretary General's Bulletin banning smoking in the U.N.? What's even more alarming is that even the U.N.'s own auditors had concerns regarding the possible inaccuracy of the project's estimated calculations and weaknesses in procurement and contract management. Moreover, in 2006 the GAO expressed their concerns regarding the U.N.'s weaknesses in existing internal oversight and procurement. It seems to me that this issue deserves more attention than the hearing conducted 5 years ago.

Without proper planning and oversight, I fear that these funds would just be wasted. More hearings and further investigations need to be conducted before irresponsibly spending funds from this bill. With my amendment, the U.N. will be prohibited from continuing this gross disregard of hard-earned taxpayer dollars. Due to these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

It is my understanding that the Appropriations Committee never intended for any of the funds included in the continuing resolution be used for legal expenses defending Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's former senior executives. My amendment is a certainty in an uncertain world. An assurance to our constituents that this gross abuse of taxpayer funds ends today.

The amendment I offer would prohibit funds made available by this act to be used for the payment of attorneys' fees or other legal expenses of any former senior executive officer of the Federal National Mortgage Corporation or Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation.

In response to the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression, America hastily engaged, with my strong opposition, in a strategy of multiple bailouts to avoid the complete collapse of our financial system. We now know, as I believed then, that this strategy was no cure to our financial crisis and would leave taxpayers exposed to vast financial risk.

When the Government took over Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae in September 2008, taxpayers unknowingly inherited \$160 million in defending the failed firms. Of the \$160 million in taxpayer dollars spent, \$24.2 million was spent in defense of Fannie Mae's top senior executives. According to an in-depth report from the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, these Fannie Mae executives were accused of taking action to manipulate profits, generating \$115 million in improper bonuses. Two years before this report was published, Fannie Mae was found to have overstated its preceding six years of past earnings by \$6.3 billion.

Currently, employment contracts protect executives when sued and the company pays for legal defense. Some believe there should be no government liability to these legal fees because of the executives' breach of responsibility to the company and its stockholders. I agree responsible Americans should not have to pay for the irresponsibility of others and that is why I offered this amendment.

As you may recall, the 1,900 page legislation placing these GSEs under conservatorship failed to address a resolution to these entities, allowing the Federal Housing and Finance Agency (FHFA) to continue paying the legal fees of their executives. Poor crafted legislation is the reason this injustice has been allowed to carry on. When asked why funding

of legal defense has not been cut off, the acting director of the FHFA, said: "I understand the frustration regarding the advancement of certain legal fees associated with ongoing litigation involving Fannie Mae and certain former employees. It is my responsibility to follow applicable Federal and State law."

I am outraged that billions of dollars have gone to benefit an indiscriminate number of private financial institutions that utilized reckless investment strategies. American's deserve more than for us to just "understand" their frustration; our responsibility to the taxpayers is much more than that. We must be diligent in ensuring the investigation of these issues are a top priority for the 112th Congress. The time has come to make sure that we are doing everything we can to minimize any further taxpayer exposure to the irresponsible behavior of these companies.

The nationalization of private assets was clearly un-American and, as free-enterprising Americans, we needed to let our markets determine the winners and the losers. Unfortunately, the winners were not the American taxpayers of this country and, after billions spent and much debate, we are left with unanswered questions and unpaid legal fees showing no sign of ending.

This financial crisis affects every hard-working, taxpaying American. We should not be paying for the legal defense of the people whose reckless actions forced this economic crisis on us. I hope that members of this 112th Congress recognize the dire importance of this issue and vote in favor for the American taxpayer.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 414 by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Amendment No. 519 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 246 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 263 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 526 by Mr. WU of Oregon.

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 409 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 296 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. MCDERMOTT of Washington.

Amendment No. 177 by Mr. HERGER of California.

Amendment No. 323 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 566 by Mr. BOREN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 146 by Mr. FORBES of Virginia.

Amendment No. 333 by Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 498 by Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 467 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 79 by Mr. GARDNER of Colorado.

Amendment No. 151 by Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 414 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 269, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

AYES—156

Ackerman	Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Richmond	Sherman	Tsongas
Andrews	Edwards	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)	Shimkus	Van Hollen
Baca	Engel	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Shuler	Velázquez
Bass (CA)	Eshoo	Levin	Ruppersberger	Sires	Vislousky
Berkley	Farr	Lewis (GA)	Rush	Slaughter	Wasserman
Berman	Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	Sánchez, Linda	Smith (TX)	Schultz
Bishop (NY)	Filner	Lowe	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (WA)	Waters
Blumenauer	Foxx	Maloney	Schakowsky	Speier	Watt
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Markey	Schiff	Sutton	Waxman
Bralley (IA)	Franks (AZ)	Matheson	Schwartz	Thompson (CA)	Weiner
Broun (GA)	Fudge	Matsui	Scott (VA)	Tierney	Wilson (FL)
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano	Tonko	Wu
Canseco	Gibson	McDermott		Towns	Yarmuth
Capps	Green, Al	McGovern			
Capuano	Green, Gene	McNerney			
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	Meeks			
Chu	Grimm	Michaud			
Cicilline	Gutierrez	Miller (NC)			
Clarke (NY)	Hanabusa	Miller, George			
Clay	Hanna	Moore			
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Moran			
Clyburn	Higgins	Murphy (CT)			
Cohen	Hinchey	Myrick			
Connolly (VA)	Hirono	Nadler			
Conyers	Holt	Napolitano			
Costello	Honda	Neal			
Courtney	Hoyer	Olver			
Crowley	Insee	Owens			
Cuellar	Israel	Pallone			
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell			
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)			
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Payne			
DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi			
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)			
Deutch	Keating	Polis			
Dicks	Kildee	Price (NC)			
Dingell	Kind	Rahall			
Doggett	King (NY)	Rangel			
Donnelly (IN)	Kingston	Reyes			
Doyle	Kucinich	Richardson			
			Adams	Fortenberry	McKinley
			Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
			Akin	Gallely	Rodgers
			Alexander	Gardner	Meehan
			Altmire	Garrett	Mica
			Amash	Gerlach	Miller (FL)
			Austria	Gibbs	Miller (MI)
			Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary
			Bachus	Gohmert	Mulvaney
			Baldwin	Gonzalez	Murphy (PA)
			Barletta	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
			Barrow	Gosar	Noem
			Bartlett	Gowdy	Nugent
			Barton (TX)	Granger	Nunes
			Bass (NH)	Graves (GA)	Nunnelee
			Becerra	Graves (MO)	Olson
			Benishek	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
			Berg	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
			Biggart	Guinta	Pearce
			Bilbray	Guthrie	Pence
			Bilirakis	Hall	Perlmutter
			Bishop (GA)	Harper	Peterson
			Bishop (UT)	Harris	Petri
			Black	Hartzler	Pitts
			Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Platts
			Bonner	Hayworth	Poe (TX)
			Bono Mack	Heck	Pompeo
			Boren	Heinrich	Posey
			Boswell	Heller	Price (GA)
			Boustany	Hensarling	Quigley
			Brady (TX)	Herger	Reed
			Brooks	Herrera Beutler	Rehberg
			Buchanan	Himes	Reichert
			Bucshon	Holden	Renacci
			Buerkle	Huelskamp	Ribble
			Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
			Burton (IN)	Hultgren	Rivera
			Butterfield	Hunter	Roby
			Calvert	Hurt	Roe (TN)
			Camp	Issa	Rogers (AL)
			Campbell	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
			Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
			Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
			Cardoza	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
			Carnahan	Jones	Rooney
			Carney	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
			Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Roskam
			Carter	Kelly	Ross (AR)
			Cassidy	King (IA)	Ross (FL)
			Chabot	Kinziger (IL)	Royce
			Chaffetz	Kissell	Runyan
			Chandler	Kline	Ryan (OH)
			Clarke (MI)	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
			Coble	Lamborn	Sarbanes
			Coffman (CO)	Lance	Scallie
			Cole	Landry	Schilling
			Conaway	Langevin	Schmidt
			Cooper	Lankford	Schock
			Costa	Latham	Schrader
			Cravaack	LaTourette	Schweikert
			Crawford	Latta	Scott (SC)
			Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Scott, Austin
			Critz	Lipinski	Scott, David
			Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
			DeGette	Loeback	Sessions
			Denham	Long	Sewell
			Dent	Lucas	Shuster
			DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
			Diaz-Balart	Lujan	Smith (NE)
			Dold	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
			Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Southerland
			Duffy	E.	Stark
			Duncan (SC)	Lynch	Stearns
			Ellison	Mack	Stivers
			Ellmers	Manzullo	Stutzman
			Emerson	Marchant	Sullivan
			Farenthold	Marino	Terry
			Fincher	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (MS)
			Fitzpatrick	McCauley	Thompson (PA)
			Flake	McClintock	Thornberry
			Fleischmann	McCotter	Tiberi
			Fleming	McHenry	Tipton
			Flores	McIntyre	Turner
			Forbes	McKeon	Upton

Walberg Westmoreland Woolsey
 Whitfield Yoder
 Walsh (IL) Wilson (SC) Young (AK)
 Walz (MN) Wittman Young (FL)
 Webster Wolf Young (IN)
 Welch Womack
 West Woodall

NOT VOTING—8

Culberson Hinojosa Peters
 Giffords McCollum Quayle
 Harman Paul

□ 2056

Messrs. ROYCE, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, ALTMIRE, CAMPBELL, MCINTYRE, BECERRA and MACK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WU, INSLEE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. SCHIFF, GUTIERREZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. WATT and COSTELLO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 519 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 68, noes 357, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

AYES—68

Amash Johnson (IL) Polis
 Baldwin Kaptur Quigley
 Barton (TX) Kucinich Rahall
 Becerra Labrador Rohrabacher
 Blumenauer Lee (CA) Rokita
 Boswell Lewis (GA) Royce
 Braley (IA) Lofgren, Zoe Sánchez, Linda
 Campbell Lummis T.
 Capuano Lynch Sanchez, Loretta
 Chabot Manzullo Schakowsky
 Clay Markey Sensenbrenner
 Coble Matsui Serrano
 Cohen McClintock Stearns
 Conyers McDermott Thompson (CA)
 Duncan (TN) McGovern Tierney
 Eshoo Meeks Upton
 Filner Miller, George Velázquez
 Flake Moore Vislosky
 Frank (MA) Neal Walsh (IL)
 Graves (GA) Olver Waters
 Gutierrez Payne Welch
 Heller Peterson Wu
 Jackson (IL) Petri Yarmuth

NOES—357

Ackerman Bartlett Black
 Adams Bass (CA) Blackburn
 Aderholt Bass (NH) Bonner
 Akin Benishek Bono Mack
 Alexander Berg Boren
 Altmire Berkley Boustany
 Andrews Berman Brady (PA)
 Austria Biggert Brady (TX)
 Baca Bilbray Brooks
 Bachmann Bilirakis Brown (GA)
 Bachus Bishop (GA) Brown (FL)
 Barletta Bishop (NY) Buchanan
 Barrow Bishop (UT) Bucshon

Buerkle Grimm
 Burgess Guinta
 Burton (IN) Guthrie
 Butterfield Hall
 Calvert Hanabusa
 Camp Hanna
 Canseco Harper
 Cantor Harris
 Capito Hartzler
 Capps Hastings (FL)
 Cardoza Hastings (WA)
 Carnahan Hayworth
 Carney Heck
 Carson (IN) Heinrich
 Carter Hensarling
 Cassidy Herger
 Castor (FL) Herrera Beutler
 Chaffetz Higgins
 Chandler Himes
 Chu Hinchey
 Cicilline Hirono
 Clarke (MI) Holden
 Clarke (NY) Holt
 Cleaver Honda
 Clyburn Hoyer
 Coffman (CO) Huelskamp
 Cole Huizenga (MI)
 Conaway Hultgren
 Connolly (VA) Hunter
 Cooper Hurt
 Costa Inslee
 Costello Israel
 Courtney Issa
 Cravaack Jackson Lee
 Crawford (TX)
 Crenshaw Jenkins
 Crowley Johnson (GA)
 Cuellar Johnson (OH)
 Cummings Johnson, E. B.
 Davis (CA) Johnson, Sam
 Davis (IL) Jones
 Davis (KY) Jordan
 DeFazio Keating
 DeGette Kelly
 DeLauro Kildee
 Denham Kind
 Dent King (IA)
 DesJarlais King (NY)
 Deutch Kingston
 Diaz-Balart Kinzinger (IL)
 Dicks Kissell
 Dingell Kline
 Doggett Lamborn
 Dold Lance
 Donnelly (IN) Landry
 Doyle Langevin
 Dreier Lankford
 Duffy Larsen (WA)
 Duncan (SC) Latham
 Edwards LaTourette
 Ellison Latta
 Ellmers Levin
 Emerson Lewis (CA)
 Engel Lipinski
 Farenthold LoBiondo
 Farr Loebsack
 Fattah Long
 Fincher Lowey
 Fitzpatrick Lucas
 Fleischmann Luetkemeyer
 Fleming Luján
 Flores Lungren, Daniel
 Forbes E.
 Fortenberry Mack
 Foye Maloney
 Franks (AZ) Marchant
 Frelinghuysen Marino
 Fudge Matheson
 Gallegly McCarthy (CA)
 Garamendi McCarthy (NY)
 Gardner McCaul
 Garrett McCotter
 Gerlach McHenry
 Gibbs McIntyre
 Gibson McKeon
 Gingrey (GA) McKinley
 Gohmert McMorris
 Gonzalez Rodgers
 Goundalez McNerney
 Goodlatte Meehan
 Gosar Terry
 Gowdy Mica
 Granger Michaud
 Graves (MO) Miller (FL)
 Green, Al Miller (MI)
 Green, Gene Miller (NC)
 Griffin (AR) Miller, Gary
 Griffith (VA) Moran
 Grijalva Mulvaney

Murphy (CT) Turner
 Murphy (PA) Van Hollen
 Myrick Walberg
 Nadler Walden
 Napolitano Walz (MN)
 Neugebauer Wasserman
 Noem Schultz
 Nugent Watt
 Nunes Waxman

NOT VOTING—8

Culberson Hinojosa Peters
 Giffords McCollum Quayle
 Harman Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2100

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 246 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 74, noes 348, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

AYES—74

Alexander Gardner McHenry
 Amash Garrett Miller (MI)
 Berg Gohmert Miller (NC)
 Bishop (UT) Goodlatte Miller, George
 Blackburn Gosar Mulvaney
 Blumenauer Gowdy Olver
 Bono Mack Graves (GA)
 Boswell Hall Pearce
 Boustany Heinrich Peterson
 Broun (GA) Heller Pitts
 Burgess Hensarling Rehberg
 Burton (IN) Herger Rogers (MI)
 Canseco Inslee Rokita
 Carnahan Johnson (IL) Scalise
 Cassidy Johnson (OH) Schweikert
 Chabot Jordan Scott, Austin
 Cohen Kind Smith (NE)
 Cooper King (IA) Stutzman
 DeFazio Labrador Tipton
 Doggett Lamborn Turner
 Duncan (SC) Long
 Fincher Luetkemeyer Upton
 Flake Lummis Walsh (IL)
 Foxx Manzullo Woodall
 Franks (AZ) McClintock Young (IN)

NOES—348

Ackerman Barton (TX) Boren
 Adams Bass (CA) Brady (PA)
 Aderholt Bass (NH) Brady (TX)
 Akin Becerra Braley (IA)
 Altmire Benishek Brooks
 Andrews Berkeley Brown (FL)
 Austria Berman Buchanan
 Baca Biggert Bucshon
 Bachmann Bilbray Buerkle
 Bachus Bilirakis Butterfield
 Baldwin Bishop (GA) Calvert
 Barletta Bishop (NY) Camp
 Barrow Black Campbell
 Bartlett Bonner Cantor

Capito	Hirono	Pelosi	West	Wittman	Yarmuth	Mulvaney	Rogers (AL)	Stearns
Capps	Holden	Perlmutter	Westmoreland	Wolf	Yoder	Murphy (PA)	Rogers (MI)	Stutzman
Capuano	Holt	Petri	Whitfield	Womack	Young (AK)	Myrick	Rohrabacher	Sullivan
Cardoza	Honda	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (FL)	Woolsey	Young (FL)	Neugebauer	Rokita	Terry
Carney	Hoyer	Platts	Wilson (SC)	Wu		Nugent	Rooney	Thompson (PA)
Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)				Nunes	Roskam	Thornberry
Carter	Huizenga (MI)	Polis				Olson	Ross (FL)	Tiberi
Castor (FL)	Hultgren	Pompeo	Courtney	Harman	Peters	Palazzo	Royce	Upton
Chaffetz	Hunter	Posey	Ellmers	Hinojosa	Quayle	Paulsen	Runyan	Walberg
Chandler	Hurt	Price (GA)	Giffords	McCollum	Schock	Pearce	Scalise	Walsh (IL)
Chu	Israel	Price (NC)	Graves (MO)	Paul		Peterson	Schilling	Webster
Ciulline	Issa	Quigley				Petri	Schmidt	West
Clarke (MI)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall				Pitts	Schweikert	Westmoreland
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Rangel				Platts	Scott (SC)	Whitfield
Clay	(TX)	Reed				Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Cleaver	Jenkins	Reichert				Posey	Sensenbrenner	Wittman
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Renacci				Price (GA)	Sessions	Woodall
Coble	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes				Rehberg	Shuster	Yoder
Coffman (CO)	Johnson, Sam	Ribble				Ribble	Simpson	Young (AK)
Cole	Jones	Richardson				Rigell	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Conaway	Kaptur	Richmond				Rivera	Smith (TX)	
Connolly (VA)	Keating	Rigell				Roe (TN)	Southerland	
Conyers	Kelly	Rivera						
Costa	Kildee	Roby						
Costello	King (NY)	Roe (TN)						
Cravaack	Kingston	Rogers (AL)						
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)						
Crenshaw	Kissell	Rohrabacher						
Critz	Kline	Rooney						
Crowley	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen						
Cuellar	Lance	Roskam						
Culberson	Landry	Ross (AR)						
Cummings	Langevin	Ross (FL)						
Davis (CA)	Lankford	Rothman (NJ)						
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard						
Davis (KY)	Larson (CT)	Royce						
DeGette	Latham	Runyan						
DeLauro	LaTourette	Ruppersberger						
Denham	Latta	Rush						
Dent	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)						
DesJarlais	Levin	Ryan (WI)						
Deutch	Lewis (CA)	Sánchez, Linda						
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (GA)	T.						
Dicks	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta						
Dingell	LoBiondo	Sarbanes						
Dold	Loeb sack	Schakowsky						
Donnelly (IN)	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff						
Doyle	Lowey	Schilling						
Dreier	Lucas	Schmidt						
Duffy	Lujan	Schrader						
Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Schwartz						
Edwards	E.	Scott (SC)						
Ellison	Lynch	Scott (VA)						
Emerson	Mack	Scott, David						
Engel	Maloney	Sensenbrenner						
Eshoo	Marchant	Serrano						
Farenthold	Marino	Sessions						
Farr	Markey	Sewell						
Fattah	Matheson	Sherman						
Filner	Matsui	Shimkus						
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (CA)	Shuler						
Fleischmann	McCarthy (NY)	Shuster						
Fleming	McCaul	Simpson						
Flores	McCotter	Sires						
Forbes	McDermott	Slaughter						
Fortenberry	McGovern	Smith (NJ)						
Frank (MA)	McIntyre	Smith (TX)						
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Smith (WA)						
Fudge	McKinley	Southerland						
Galleghy	McMorris	Speier						
Garamendi	Rodgers	Stark						
Gerlach	McNerney	Stearns						
Gibbs	Meehan	Stivers						
Gibson	Meeks	Sullivan						
Gingrey (GA)	Mica	Sutton						
Gonzalez	Michaud	Terry						
Granger	Miller (FL)	Thompson (CA)						
Green, Al	Miller, Gary	Thompson (MS)						
Green, Gene	Moore	Thompson (PA)						
Griffin (AR)	Moran	Thornberry						
Griffith (VA)	Murphy (CT)	Tiberi						
Grijalva	Murphy (PA)	Tierney						
Grimm	Myrick	Tonko						
Guinta	Nadler	Towns						
Guthrie	Napolitano	Tsongas						
Gutierrez	Neal	Van Hollen						
Hanabusa	Neugebauer	Velázquez						
Hanna	Noem	Visclosky						
Harper	Nugent	Walberg						
Harris	Nunes	Walden						
Hartzler	Nunnelee	Walz (MN)						
Hastings (FL)	Olson	Wasserman						
Hastings (WA)	Owens	Schultz						
Hayworth	Palazzo	Waters						
Heck	Pallone	Watt						
Herrera Beutler	Pascrell	Waxman						
Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Webster						
Himes	Paulsen	Weiner						
Hinche	Payne	Welch						

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2103

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 106, in the fury of 2-minute votes, I mistakenly missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 263 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

AYES—177

Adams	Duncan (SC)	Hurt	McGovern
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins	McKeon
Akin	Ellmers	Johnson (IL)	McNerney
Amash	Emerson	Johnson (OH)	Meehan
Bachmann	Engel	Johnson, Sam	Meeks
Bachus	Farenthold	Jones	Michaud
Barletta	Fincher	Jordan	Miller (NC)
Bartlett	Fleischmann	Kelly	Miller, George
Barton (TX)	Fleming	King (IA)	Moran
Benishek	Flores	Kingston	Murphy (CT)
Berkley	Forbes	Kline	Nadler
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Labrador	Napolitano
Black	Galleghy	Lamborn	Neal
Blackburn	Gardner	Landry	Noem
Boren	Garrett	Lankford	Nunnelee
Brooks	Gerlach	Latham	Oliver
Broun (GA)	Gibbs	Latta	Owens
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo	Pallone
Bucshon	Gohmert	Long	Pascrell
Buerkle	Goodlatte	Lucas	Pascrell
Burgess	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer	Pastor (AZ)
Burton (IN)	Graves (GA)	Lummis	Paulsen
Calvert	Graves (MO)	Mack	Payne
Camp	Griffin (AR)	Manzullo	
Campbell	Griffith (VA)	Marchant	
Cantseco	Guinta	Marino	
Carter	Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)	
Chabot	Hall	McClintock	
Chaffetz	Harper	McCotter	
Coble	Harris	McHenry	
Conaway	Hartzler	McIntyre	
Cravaack	Hastings (WA)	McKinley	
Crawford	Heller	McMorris	
Critz	Heger	Rodgers	
Culberson	Huelskamp	Mica	
Denham	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	
DesJarlais	Hultgren	Miller (MI)	
Diaz-Balart	Hunter	Miller, Gary	

NOES—243

Ackerman	Eshoo	McGovern
Alexander	Farr	McKeon
Altmire	Fattah	McNerney
Andrews	Filner	Meehan
Austria	Fitzpatrick	Meeks
Baca	Flake	Michaud
Baldwin	Fortenberry	Miller (NC)
Barrow	Fox	Miller, George
Bass (CA)	Frank (MA)	Moore
Bass (NH)	Frelinghuysen	Moran
Becerra	Fudge	Murphy (CT)
Berg	Garamendi	Nadler
Berman	Gibson	Napolitano
Biggert	Gonzalez	Neal
Bilbray	Gosar	Noem
Bishop (GA)	Granger	Nunnelee
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Oliver
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Owens
Bonner	Grijalva	Pallone
Bono Mack	Grimm	Pascrell
Boswell	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Boustany	Hanabusa	Payne
Brady (PA)	Hanna	Pelosi
Brady (TX)	Hastings (FL)	Pence
Bralley (IA)	Hayworth	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Heck	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Heinrich	Polis
Cantor	Hensarling	Pompeo
Capito	Herrera Beutler	Price (NC)
Capps	Higgins	Quigley
Capuano	Himes	Rahall
Cardoza	Hinche	Rangel
Carnahan	Holden	Reed
Carney	Holt	Reichert
Carson (IN)	Honda	Renacci
Cassidy	Hoyer	Reyes
Castor (FL)	Inslee	Richardson
Chandler	Israel	Richmond
Chu	Issa	Roby
Ciulline	Jackson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Clarke (MI)	Jackson Lee	Ross (AR)
Clarke (NY)	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rush
Coffman (CO)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Kildee	Ryan (WI)
Cole	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly (VA)	King (NY)	T.
Conyers	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Kissell	Sarbanes
Costa	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Costello	Lance	Schiff
Courtney	Langevin	Schrader
Crenshaw	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	LaTourette	Scott, David
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Levin	Smith (NJ)
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (KY)	Lipinski	Speier
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Stark
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Stivers
DeLauro	Lowey	Sutton
Dent	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Lungren, Daniel	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	E.	Tierney
Doggett	Lynch	Tipton
Dold	Maloney	Tonko
Donnelly (IN)	Markey	
Doyle	Matheson	
Dreier	Matsui	
Duffy	McCarthy (NY)	
Edwards	McCaul	
Ellison	McDermott	

Towns Wasserman Wolf
 Tsongas Schultz Womack
 Turner Waters Woolsey
 Van Hollen Watt Wu
 Velázquez Waxman Yarmuth
 Visclosky Weiner Young (IN)
 Walden Welch
 Walz (MN) Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Bilirakis Hirono Quayle
 Dicks Lewis (CA) Rogers (KY)
 Giffords McCollum Schock
 Harman Paul
 Hinojosa Peters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2106

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, during the rollcall
 vote on the Broun Amendment No. 263 to
 H.R. 1, I was unavoidably detained. Had I
 been able to vote, I would have voted in favor
 of prohibiting funds in H.R. 1 from being used
 to pay dues to the United Nations.

AMENDMENT NO. 526 OFFERED BY MR. WU

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 87, noes 338,
 not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

AYES—87

Ackerman Hirono Pelosi
 Becerra Honda Pingree (ME)
 Berkley Israel Polis
 Bishop (NY) Johnson (GA) Quigley
 Capps Jones Rangel
 Capuano Kaptur Roybal-Allard
 Carnahan Keating Ruppersberger
 Carney Kissell Sánchez, Linda
 Cicilline Kucinich T.
 Clay Langevin Sarbanes
 Courtney Lee (CA) Cuellar
 Crowley Levin Schrader
 Cummings Lewis (GA) Scott, David
 DeFazio Lofgren, Zoe Serrano
 DeLauro Lowey Sewell
 Deutch Lynch Sherman
 Doggett Markey Sires
 Edwards Matsui Slaughter
 Ellison McDermott Thompson (CA)
 Eshoo McGovern Tierney
 Farr McIntyre Tonko
 Filner Meeks Tsongas
 Frank (MA) Miller, George Velázquez
 Garamendi Moore Wasserman
 Garrett Murphy (CT) Schultz
 Gohmert Nadler Waters
 Hastings (FL) Neal Weiner
 Higgins Olver Welch
 Himes Pallone Woolsey
 Hinchey Pascrell Wu

Adams Emerson Lungren, Daniel
 Aderholt Engel E.
 Akin Farenthold Mack
 Alexander Flores Maloney
 Altmire Fincher Manzullo
 Amash Fitzpatrick Marchant
 Andrews Flake Marino
 Austria Fleischmann Matheson
 Baca Fleming McCarthy (CA)
 Bachmann Flores McCarthy (NY)
 Bachus Forbes McCaul
 Baldwin Fortenberry McClintock
 Barletta Foxx McCotter
 Barrow Franks (AZ) McHenry
 Bartlett Frelinghuysen McKeon
 Barton (TX) Fudge McKinley
 Bass (CA) Gallegly McMorris
 Bass (NH) Gardner Rodgers
 Benishek Gerlach McNeerney
 Berg Gibbs Meehan
 Berman Gibson Mica
 Biggert Gingrey (GA) Michaud
 Bilbray Gonzalez Miller (FL)
 Bilirakis Goodlatte Miller (MI)
 Bishop (GA) Gosar Miller (NC)
 Bishop (UT) Gowdy Miller, Gary
 Black Granger Moran
 Blackburn Graves (GA) Mulvaney
 Blumenauer Graves (MO) Murphy (PA)
 Bonner Green, Al Myrick
 Bono Mack Green, Gene Napolitano
 Boren Griffin (AR) Neugebauer
 Boswell Griffith (VA) Noem
 Boustany Grijalva Nugent
 Brady (PA) Grimm Nunes
 Brady (TX) Guinta Nunnelee
 Braley (IA) Guthrie Olson
 Brooks Gutierrez Owens
 Brown (GA) Hall Palazzo
 Brown (FL) Hanabusa Pastor (AZ)
 Buchanan Hanna Paulsen
 Bucshon Harper Payne
 Buerkle Harris Pearce
 Burgess Hartzler Pence
 Burton (IN) Hastings (WA) Perlmutter
 Butterfield Hayworth Peterson
 Calvert Heck Petri
 Camp Heinrich Pitts
 Campbell Heller Platts
 Canseco Hensarling Poe (TX)
 Cantor Herger Pompeo
 Capito Herrera Beutler Posey
 Cardoza Holden Price (GA)
 Carson (IN) Holt Price (NC)
 Carter Hoyer Rahall
 Cassidy Huelskamp Reed
 Castor (FL) Huizenga (MI) Rehberg
 Chabot Hultgren Reichert
 Chaffetz Hunter Renacci
 Chandler Hurst Reyes
 Chu Inslee Ribble
 Clarke (MI) Issa Richardson
 Clarke (NY) Jackson (IL) Richmond
 Cleaver Jackson Lee
 Clyburn (TX) Rivero
 Coffman (CO) Jenkins Roby
 Cohen Johnson (IL) Roe (TN)
 Cole Johnson (OH) Rogers (AL)
 Conaway Johnson, E. B. Rogers (KY)
 Connolly (VA) Johnson, Sam Rogers (MI)
 Conyers Jordan Rohrabacher
 Cooper Kelly Rokita
 Costa Kildee Rooney
 Costello Kind Ros-Lehtinen
 Cravaack King (IA) Roskam
 Crawford King (NY) Ross (AR)
 Crenshaw Kingston Ross (FL)
 Critz Kinzinger (IL) Rothman (NJ)
 Cuellar Kline Royce
 Culberson Labrador Runyan
 Davis (CA) Lamborn Rush
 Davis (IL) Lance Ryan (OH)
 Davis (KY) Landry Ryan (WI)
 DeGette Lankford Sanchez, Loretta
 Denham Larsen (WA) Scalise
 Dent Larson (CT) Schakowsky
 DesJarlais Latham Schiff
 Diaz-Balart LaTourette Schilling
 Dicks Latta Schmidt
 Dingell Lewis (CA) Schock
 Dold Lipinski Schwartz
 Donnelly (IN) LoBiondo Schweikert
 Doyle Leobsack Scott (SC)
 Dreier Long Scott (VA)
 Duffy Lucas Scott, Austin
 Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer Sensenbrenner
 Duncan (TN) Luján Sessions
 Ellmers Lummis Shimkus

NOES—338

Shuler Thompson (MS) Webster
 Shuster Thompson (PA) West
 Simpson Thornberry Westmoreland
 Smith (NE) Tiberi Whitfield
 Smith (NJ) Wilson (FL)
 Smith (TX) Towns Wilson (SC)
 Smith (WA) Turner Wittman
 Southerland Upton Wolf
 Speier Van Hollen Womack
 Stark Visclosky Woodall
 Stearns Walberg Yarmuth
 Stivers Walden Yoder
 Stutzman Walsh (IL) Young (AK)
 Sullivan Walz (MN) Young (FL)
 Sutton Watt Young (IN)
 Terry Waxman

NOT VOTING—8

Coble Hinojosa Peters
 Giffords McCollum Quayle
 Harman Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2109

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 174, noes 251,
 not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

AYES—174

Ackerman Courtney Honda
 Andrews Crowley Hoyer
 Baca Cummings Inslee
 Baldwin Davis (CA) Israel
 Bass (CA) Davis (IL) Jackson (IL)
 Becerra DeFazio Johnson (GA)
 Berkley DeGette Jones
 Berman DeLauro Kaptur
 Bilirakis Deutch Keating
 Bishop (GA) Dicks Kildee
 Bishop (NY) Dingell Kind
 Blumenauer Doggett Kissell
 Boswell Doyle Kucinich
 Brady (PA) Edwards Langevin
 Braley (IA) Ellison Larsen (WA)
 Brown (FL) Engel Larson (CT)
 Buchanan Eshoo Lee (CA)
 Butterfield Farr Levin
 Capps Fattah Lewis (GA)
 Capuano Filner Lipinski
 Carnahan Fitzpatrick LoBiondo
 Carney Fortenberry Loehsack
 Castor (FL) Frank (MA) Lofgren, Zoe
 Chandler Fudge Lowey
 Chu Garamendi Luján
 Cicilline Grijalva Lynch
 Clarke (MI) Gutierrez Maloney
 Clarke (NY) Hanabusa Markley
 Clay Hastings (FL) Matsui
 Cleaver Higgins McCarthy (NY)
 Clyburn Himes McDermott
 Cohen Hinchev McGovern
 Connolly (VA) Hirono McNeerney
 Conyers Holden Meeks
 Costello Holt Michaud

Miller (NC) Ros-Lehtinen Sutton
 Miller, George Rothman (NJ) Thompson (CA)
 Moore Roybal-Allard Thompson (MS)
 Moran Ruppertsberger Tierney
 Murphy (CT) Rush Tonko
 Nadler Ryan (OH) Towns
 Napolitano Sánchez, Linda Towns
 Neal T. Tsongas
 Oliver Sanchez, Loretta Van Hollen
 Pallone Sarbanes Velázquez
 Pascrell Schakowsky Vislosky
 Pastor (AZ) Schiff Walz (MN)
 Payne Schrader Wasserman
 Pelosi Schwartz Schultz
 Pingree (ME) Scott (VA) Waters
 Platts Serrano Watt
 Polis Sewell Waxman
 Price (NC) Sherman Weiner
 Quigley Shuler Welch
 Rahall Sires Wilson (FL)
 Rangel Slaughter Woolsey
 Richardson Smith (NJ) Wu
 Richmond Speier Yarmuth
 Rogers (AL) Stark Young (FL)

Scott, David Sullivan West
 Sensenbrenner Terry Westmoreland
 Sessions Thompson (PA) Whitfield
 Shimkus Thornberry Wilson (SC)
 Shuster Tiberi Wittman
 Simpson Tipton Wolf
 Smith (NE) Turner Womack
 Smith (TX) Upton Woodall
 Smith (WA) Walberg Woodall
 Southerland Walden Yoder
 Stivers Walsh (IL) Young (AK)
 Stutzman Webster Young (IN)

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

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 2113

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
 Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 109, I was unavoidably detained. I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 409 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 185, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]
 AYES—241

NOES—251
 Adams Fleming Lummis
 Aderholt Flores Lungren, Daniel
 Akin Forbes E.
 Alexander Foxx Mack
 Altmire Franks (AZ) Manzullo
 Amash Frelinghuysen Marchant
 Austria Gallegly Marino
 Bachmann Gardner Matheson
 Bachus Garrett McCarthy (CA)
 Barletta Gerlach McCaul
 Barrow Gibbs McClintock
 Bartlett Gibson McCotter
 Barton (TX) Gingrey (GA) McHenry
 Bass (NH) Gohmert McIntyre
 Benishek Gonzalez McKeon
 Berg Goodlatte McKinley
 Biggert Gosar McMorris
 Bilbray Gowdy Rodgers
 Bishop (UT) Granger Meehan
 Black Graves (GA) Mica
 Blackburn Graves (MO) Miller (FL)
 Bonner Green, Al Miller (MI)
 Bono Mack Green, Gene Miller, Gary
 Boren Griffin (AR) Mulvaney
 Boustany Griffith (VA) Murphy (PA)
 Brady (TX) Grimm Myrick
 Brooks Guinta Neugebauer
 Broun (GA) Guthrie Noem
 Bucshon Hall Nugent
 Buerkle Hanna Nunes
 Burgess Harper Nunnelee
 Burton (IN) Harris Olson
 Calvert Hartzler Owens
 Camp Hastings (WA) Palazzo
 Campbell Hayworth Paulsen
 Canseco Heck Pearce
 Cantor Heinrich Pence
 Capito Heller Perlmutter
 Cardoza Hensarling Peterson
 Carson (IN) Herger Petri
 Carter Herrera Beutler Pitts
 Cassidy Huelskamp Poe (TX)
 Chabot Huizenga (MI) Pompeo
 Chaffetz Hultgren Posey
 Coble Hunter Price (GA)
 Coffman (CO) Hurt Reed
 Cole Issa Rehberg
 Conaway Jackson Lee Reichert
 Cooper (TX) Renacci
 Costa Jenkins Reyes
 Cravaack Johnson (IL) Ribble
 Crawford Johnson (OH) Rigell
 Crenshaw Johnson, E. B. Rivera
 Critz Johnson, Sam Roby
 Cuellar Jordan Roe (TN)
 Culberson Kelly Rogers (KY)
 Davis (KY) King (IA) Rogers (MI)
 Denham King (NY) Rohrabacher
 Dent Kingston Rokita
 DesJarlais Kinzinger (IL) Rooney
 Diaz-Balart Kline Roskam
 Dold Labrador Ross (AR)
 Donnelly (IN) Lamborn Ross (FL)
 Dreier Lance Royce
 Duffy Landry Runyan
 Duncan (SC) Lankford Ryan (WI)
 Duncan (TN) Latham Scalise
 Ellmers LaTourette Schilling
 Emerson Latta Schmidt
 Farenthold Lewis (CA) Schock
 Fincher Long Schweikert
 Flake Lucas Scott (SC)
 Fleischmann Luetkemeyer Scott, Austin

Adams Camp Fleischmann
 Aderholt Campbell Fleming
 Akin Canseco Flores
 Alexander Cantor Forbes
 Amash Capito Fortenberry
 Austria Carter Foxx
 Bachmann Cassidy Franks (AZ)
 Chabot Chabot Frelinghuysen
 Chaffetz Chaffetz Gallegly
 Coble Gardner
 Conaway Cole Coffman (CO)
 Crawford Cravaack Gibson
 Crenshaw Crenshaw Gohmert
 Culberson Culberson Goodlatte
 Davis (KY) Bishop (UT) Gosar
 Black Dent Denham
 Blackburn Dent DesJarlais
 Bonner DesJarlais Diaz-Balart
 Bono Mack Dold
 Boren Dold Dreier
 Boustany Dreier Duffy
 Brady (TX) Duffy Duncan (SC)
 Brooks Ryan (WI) Duncan (TN)
 Broun (GA) Buchanan
 Buchanan Buchanan Emmons
 Buchanon Buchanon Farenthold
 Cushman Cushman Fincher
 Buerkle Buerkle Farenthold
 Burgess Burgess Fincher
 Burton (IN) Fitzpatrick
 Calvert Calvert Flake

Quayle Stearns
 King (IA) King (NY) Kingston Kinzinger (IL) Kline Labrador Lamborn Lance Landry Lankford Latham LaTourette Latta Lewis (CA) LoBiondo Long Lucas Luetkemeyer Lummis Lungren, Daniel E. Mack Manzullo Marchant Marino McCarthy (CA) McCaul McClintock McCotter

NOES—185

Ackerman Deutch Levin
 Altmire Dicks Lewis (GA)
 Andrews Dingell Lipinski
 Baca Doggett Loebsack
 Baldwin Donnelly (IN) Lofgren, Zoe
 Barrow Doyle Lowey
 Bass (CA) Edwards Lujan
 Becerra Ellison Lynch
 Berkley Engel Maloney
 Berman Eshoo Markey
 Bishop (GA) Farr Matheson
 Bishop (NY) Fattah Matsui
 Blumenauer Filner McCarthy (NY)
 Boswell Frank (MA) McDermott
 Brady (PA) Fudge McGovern
 Braley (IA) Garamendi McNerney
 Brown (FL) Gonzalez Meeks
 Butterfield Green, Al Michaud
 Capps Green, Gene Miller (NC)
 Capuano Grijalva Miller, George
 Cardoza Gutierrez Moore
 Carnahan Hanabusa Moran
 Carney Franks (FL) Murphy (CT)
 Carson (IN) Heinrich Nadler
 Castor (FL) Higgins Napolitano
 Chandler Chandler Himes Neal
 Chu Hinchey Olver
 Cicilline Hirono Owens
 Clarke (MI) Holden Pallone
 Clarke (NY) Courtney Holt
 Clay Honda Pascrell
 Cleaver Hoyer Pastors (AZ)
 Clyburn Inslee Payne
 Cohen Israel Pelosi
 Connolly (VA) Jackson (IL) Perlmutter
 Conyers Jackson Lee Peterson
 Cooper (TX) Jackson Lee Pingree (ME)
 Costa Johnson (GA) Polis
 Costello Johnson, E. B. Price (NC)
 Courtney Kaptur Quigley
 Critz Keating Rahall
 Crowley Kildee Rangel
 Cuellar Kind Reyes
 Cummings Kissell Richardson
 Davis (CA) Kucinich Rothman (NJ)
 Davis (IL) Langevin Roybal-Allard
 DeFazio DeFazio Larsen (WA)
 DeGette Larson (CT) Ruppertsberger
 DeLauro Lee (CA) Rush
 Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shuler

Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez

Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
 Harman
 Hinojosa

McCollum
 Paul
 Peters

Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2116

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 296 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 210, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

AYES—215

Adams
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Benishek
 Berg
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bono Mack
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Canseco
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot

Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Costello
 Crawaack
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Burgess
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Gallegly
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Huelskamp
 Huitzenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Inslee
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan

Kelly
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kissell
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Landry
 Lankford
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lewis (CA)
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel E.
 Mack
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary

Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pence
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Luetkemeyer
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise

NOES—210

Ackerman
 Amash
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Bass (CA)
 Bass (NH)
 Becerra
 Berkeley
 Berman
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonner
 Boren
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Bucshon
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chandler
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly (IN)

Doyle
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Fitzpatrick
 Frank (MA)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Gonzalez
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Gutierrez
 Hanabusa
 Heinrich
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hirono
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Cohen
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kucinich
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebsack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Luján
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Markey

Shilling
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
 Harman
 Hinojosa

McCollum
 Olver
 Paul

Peters
 Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2119

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. MCDERMOTT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 91, noes 333, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

AYES—91

Adams
 Bachus
 Bass (CA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Brady (PA)
 Burgess
 Butterfield
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chabot
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Critz
 Crowley
 Davis (IL)
 DeLauro
 Dicks
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Filner
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Garrett

Grijalva
 Hastings (FL)
 Herrera Beutler
 Hinchey
 Hirono
 Holden
 Honda
 Inslee
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Kucinich
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Markey
 McClintock
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 Meeks
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Nadler
 Olver
 Pallone
 Pascrell

Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reichert
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Schakowsky
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Smith (WA)
 Stark
 Velázquez
 Waters
 Watt
 Webster
 Weiner
 West
 Woolsey
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOES—333

Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Amash

Andrews
 Baca
 Bachmann
 Baldwin
 Barletta

Barrow
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bass (NH)
 Becerra
 Benishek

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

NOT VOTING—9

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
One minute remains on this vote.

□ 2122

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. HERGER
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr.
HERGER) 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 amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 227, noes 197,
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

AYES—227

Adams	Costa	Harper	Ackerman	Fudge	Nadler
Aderholt	Cravaack	Harris	Andrews	Garamendi	Napolitano
Akin	Crawford	Hartzler	Baca	Gerlach	Neal
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	Bachus	Gonzalez	Noem
Altmire	Culberson	Heck	Baldwin	Green, Al	Olver
Amash	Davis (KY)	Heller	Barrow	Green, Gene	Pallone
Austria	Denham	Hensarling	Bass (CA)	Grijalva	Pascrell
Bachmann	Dent	Herger	Becerra	Guthrie	Pastor (AZ)
Barietta	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler	Berkley	Gutierrez	Payne
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)	Berman	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Barton (TX)	Dold	Hultgren	Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bass (NH)	Dreier	Hunter	Bishop (NY)	Hayworth	Pingree (ME)
Benishek	Duffy	Hurt	Blumenauer	Heinrich	Platts
Berg	Duncan (SC)	Issa	Bono Mack	Higgins	Polis
Biggert	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins	Boswell	Himes	Price (NC)
Bilbray	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)	Brady (PA)	Hinchev	Quigley
Bilbray	Emerson	Johnson, Sam	Brooks	Hirono	Rahall
Bilirakis	Emerson	Jones	Brown (FL)	Holden	Rangel
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Jordan	Butterfield	Holt	Reichert
Black	Fincher	Kelly	Capps	Honda	Reyes
Blackburn	Flake	King (IA)	Capuano	Hoyer	Richardson
Bonner	Fleischmann	King (NY)	Carnahan	Huelskamp	Richmond
Boren	Fleming	Kingston	Carney	Inslee	Rothman (NJ)
Boustany	Flores	Kinzing (IL)	Carson (IN)	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kline	Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Broun (GA)	Fox	Labrador	Chandler	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn	Chu	(TX)	Rush
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	Lance	Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Buerkle	Gallely	Landry	Clarke (MI)	Johnson (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Burgess	Gardner	Lankford	Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Burton (IN)	Gibbs	Latham	Kaptur	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Calvert	Gibson	LaTourette	Keating	Langevin	Schiff
Camp	Gingrey (GA)	Latta	Kildee	Larsen (WA)	Schmidt
Campbell	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)	Kind	Larsen (CT)	Schrader
Canseco	Goodlatte	Long	Kissell	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Cantor	Gosar	Lucas	Kucinich	Levin	Scott (VA)
Capito	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer	Langevin	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Cardoza	Granger	Lummis	Larsen (WA)	Lipinski	Serrano
Carter	Graves (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Larsen (CT)	LoBiondo	Sewell
Cassidy	Graves (MO)	E.	Lee (CA)	LoBiondo	Sherman
Cassidy	Griffin (AR)	Gingrey (GA)	Levin	LoBiondo	Shuler
Chabot	Griffith (VA)	Gohmert	Lewis (GA)	LoBiondo	Shuler
Chaffetz	Grimm	Goodlatte	Lipinski	LoBiondo	Slaughter
Chaffetz	Guinta	Gosar	Lipinski	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Coble	Guinta	Gowdy	Lipinski	LoBiondo	

Welch Wolf Wu
Wilson (FL) Woolsey Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Garrett McCollum Sánchez, Linda
Giffords Paul T.
Harman Peters
Hinojosa Quayle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2126

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 323 OFFERED BY MR.
BLUMENAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 185, noes 241,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

AYES—185

Amash Doyle Kucinich
Andrews Dreier Langevin
Baldwin Duffy Larsen (WA)
Bass (CA) Duncan (TN) Larson (CT)
Bass (NH) Edwards Lee (CA)
Benishek Ellison Levin
Berkley Farr Lewis (GA)
Berman Fattah Lipinski
Biggert Filner LoBiondo
Bishop (NY) Fitzpatrick Loebsack
Blumenauer Flake Lofgren, Zoe
Bono Mack Lujan Lynch
Brady (PA) Frank (MA)
Bralley (IA) Franks (AZ)
Broun (GA) Garamendi
Brown (FL) Gardner Matheson
Buchanan Garrett McCarthy (NY)
Campbell Graves (GA)
Cantor Green, Al McDermott
Capps Green, Gene McGovern
Capuano Grijalva Meeks
Carnahan Guinta Michaud
Castor (FL) Gutierrez Miller (FL)
Chabot Hanabusa Miller, George
Chandler Hayworth Moore
Chu Heck Moran
Cicilline Heinrich Murphy (CT)
Clarke (MI) Heller Nadler
Clarke (NY) Hensarling Napolitano
Clay Herrera Beutler Neal
Cleaver Higgins Oliver
Coffman (CO) Himes Pallone
Cohen Hinchey Pascrell
Connolly (VA) Holt Payne
Conyers Honda Pelosi
Cooper Hoyer Petri
Courtney Insee Pingree (ME)
Cravaack Israel Pitts
Crowley Jackson (IL) Platts
Cummings Jackson Lee Polis
Davis (CA) (TX) Quigley
Davis (IL) Johnson (GA) Rangel
DeFazio Johnson, E. B. Reichert
DeGette Jordan Reyes
DeLauro Kaptur Rohrbacher
Dent Keating Roskam
Doggett Kind Rothman (NJ)
Dold King (NY) Roybal-Allard

Royce Sherman Walsh (LL)
Ruppersberger Sires Wasserman
Rush Slaughter Schultz
Ryan (WI) Smith (NJ) Waters
Sánchez, Linda Smith (WA) Watt
T. T. Waxman
Sanchez, Loretta Stark Weiner
Sarbanes Stearns Welch
Schakowsky Sutton Wilson (FL)
Schiff Tierney Wolf
Schrader Tonko Woolsey
Schwartz Towns Wu
Schweikert Tsongas Yarmuth
Scott (VA) Upton Young (IN)
Sensenbrenner Van Hollen

NOES—241

Ackerman Gohmert Nunes
Adams Gonzalez Nunnelee
Aderholt Goodlatte Olson
Akin Gosar Owens
Alexander Gowdy Palazzo
Altmire Granger Pastor (AZ)
Austria Paulsen Paulsen
Baca Griffith (AR) Pearce
Bachmann Griffith (VA) Pence
Bachus Grimm Perlmutter
Barletta Guthrie Peterson
Barrow Hall Poe (TX)
Bartlett Hanna Pompeo
Barton (TX) Harper Posey
Becerra Harris Price (GA)
Berg Hartzler Price (NC)
Bilbray Hastings (FL) Rahall
Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Reed
Bishop (GA) Herger Rehberg
Bishop (UT) Hirono Renacci
Black Holden Ribble
Blackburn Huelskamp Richardson
Bonner Huizenga (MI) Richmond
Boren Hultgren Rigell
Boswell Hunter Rivera
Boustany Hurt Roby
Brady (TX) Issa Roe (TN)
Brooks Jenkins Rogers (AL)
Bucshon Johnson (IL) Rogers (KY)
Buerkle Johnson (OH) Rogers (MI)
Burgess Johnson, Sam Rokita
Burton (IN) Jones Rooney
Butterfield Kelly Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert Kildee Ross (AR)
Camp King (IA) Ross (FL)
Canseco Kingston Runyan
Capito Kinzinger (IL) Ryan (OH)
Cardoza Kissell Scalise
Carney Kline Schilling
Carson (IN) Labrador Schmidt
Carter Lamborn Schock
Cassidy Lance Scott (SC)
Chaffetz Landry Scott, Austin
Clyburn Lankford Scott, David
Coble Latham Serrano
Cole LaTourette Sessions
Conaway Latta Sewell
Costa Lewis (CA) Shimkus
Costello Long Shuler
Crawford Lowey Shuster
Crenshaw Lucas Simpson
Critz Luetkemeyer Smith (NE)
Cuellar Lummis Smith (TX)
Culberson Lungren, Daniel Sutherland
Davis (KY) E. Stivers
Denham Mack Stutzman
DesJarlais Manzullo Sullivan
Deutch Marchant Terry
Diaz-Balart Marino Thompson (CA)
Dicks Matsui Thompson (MS)
Dingell McCarthy (CA) Thompson (PA)
Donnelly (IN) McCaul Thornberry
Duncan (SC) McCotter Tiberi
Ellmers McHenry Tipton
Emerson McIntyre Turner
Engel McKeon Velázquez
Eshoo McKinley Visclosky
Farenthold McMorris Walberg
Fincher Rodgers Walden
Fincher Fleischmann Walz (MN)
Fleming Meehan Webster
Flores Mica West
Forbes Miller (MI) Westmoreland
Fortenberry Miller (NC) Whitfield
Frelinghuysen Miller, Gary Wilson (SC)
Galleghy Murphree Wittman
Gerlach Murphy (PA) Womack
Gerlach Myrick Woodall
Gibbs Neugebauer Yoder
Gibson Noem Young (AK)
Gingrey (GA) Nugent Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords McCollum Quayle
Harman Paul
Hinojosa Peters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2129

Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed his vote
from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 566 OFFERED BY MR. BOREN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 277, noes 149,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

AYES—277

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

Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

NOES—149

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Billbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe y
Lynch
Maloney
Mark ey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone

Shock
Schrad er
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7
Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle

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

□ 2132

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. FORBES
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 184, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]
AYES—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barietta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cravaack
Critz
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham

Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

NOES—184

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Biggart
Billbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinche y
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peterson
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Hall
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrad er
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Kline
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul
Peters
Quayle
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2135

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 116, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 333 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 32, noes 394, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

AYES—32

Brady (PA)	Hinchev	Rush
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Ryan (WI)
Cooper	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Critz	Lewis (GA)	Schwartz
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	Long	Sutton
Fattah	McDermott	Tonko
Fudge	Moran	Upton
Gutierrez	Mulvaney	Velázquez
Himes	Petri	

NOES—394

Ackerman	Brooks	Costello
Adams	Broun (GA)	Courtney
Aderholt	Brown (FL)	Cravaack
Akin	Buchanan	Crawford
Alexander	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Altmire	Buerkle	Crowley
Amash	Cuellar	Cuellar
Andrews	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Austria	Butterfield	Cummings
Baca	Calvert	Davis (CA)
Bachmann	Camp	Davis (KY)
Bachus	Campbell	DeFazio
Baldwin	Canseco	DeGette
Barletta	Cantor	DeLauro
Barrow	Capito	Denham
Bartlett	Capps	Dent
Barton (TX)	Capuano	DesJarlais
Bass (CA)	Cardoza	Deutch
Bass (NH)	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart
Becerra	Carney	Dicks
Benishek	Carson (IN)	Doggett
Berg	Carter	Doid
Berkley	Cassidy	Donnelly (IN)
Berman	Castor (FL)	Doyle
Biggert	Chabot	Dreier
Bilbray	Chaffetz	Duffy
Bilirakis	Chandler	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (GA)	Chu	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (NY)	Cielline	Edwards
Bishop (UT)	Clarke (MI)	Ellison
Black	Clarke (NY)	Ellmers
Blackburn	Clyburn	Emerson
Blumenauer	Coble	Engel
Bonner	Coffman (CO)	Eshoo
Bono Mack	Cohen	Farenthold
Boren	Cole	Farr
Boswell	Conaway	Filner
Boustany	Connolly (VA)	Fincher
Brady (TX)	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Bralley (IA)	Costa	Flake

Fleischmann	Lee (CA)
Fleming	Levin
Flores	Lewis (CA)
Forbes	LoBiondo
Forraberry	Loeb
Fox	Lofgren, Zoe
Frank (MA)	Lowe
Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Gallely	Luján
Garamendi	Lummis
Gardner	Lungren, Daniel E.
Garrett	Lynch
Gerlach	Mack
Gibbs	Maloney
Gibson	Manzullo
Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Gohmert	Marino
Gonzalez	Markey
Goodlatte	Matheson
Gosar	Matsui
Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Granger	McCarthy (NY)
Graves (GA)	McCaul
Graves (MO)	McClintock
Green, Al	McCotter
Green, Gene	McGovern
Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Grijalva	McKeon
Grimm	McKinley
Guinta	McMorris
Guthrie	Hall
Hanabusa	Rodgers
Hanna	McNerney
Harper	Meehan
Harris	Meeks
Hartzler	Mica
Hastings (FL)	Michaud
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Hayworth	Miller (MI)
Heck	Miller (NC)
Heinrich	Miller, Gary
Heller	Miller, George
Hensarling	Moore
Herger	Murphy (CT)
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Higgins	Myrick
Hirono	Nadler
Holden	Napolitano
Holt	Neal
Honda	Neugebauer
Hoyer	Noem
Huelskamp	Nugent
Huizenga (MI)	Nunes
Hultgren	Nunnelee
Hunter	Olson
Hurt	Olver
Inlee	Owens
Israel	Palazzo
Issa	Pallone
Jackson Lee	Pascrell
(TX)	Pastor (AZ)
Jenkins	Paulsen
Johnson (GA)	Payne
Johnson (IL)	Pearce
Johnson (OH)	Pelosi
Johnson, E. B.	Pence
Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter
Jones	Peterson
Jordan	Pingree (ME)
Keating	Pitts
Kelly	Platts
Kildee	Poe (TX)
Kind	Polis
King (IA)	Pompeo
King (NY)	Posey
Kingston	Price (GA)
Kinzinger (IL)	Price (NC)
Kissell	Quigley
Kline	Rahall
Labrador	Rangel
Lamborn	Reed
Lance	Rehberg
Landry	Reichert
Langevin	Renacci
Reyes	Ribble
Ribble	Larsen (WA)
Richardson	Larsen (CT)
Richardson	Latham
Rigell	Rivera
Rivera	Roby
Roby	

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarburgh
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Quayle

Paul
Peters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2138

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 74, noes 351, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

AYES—74

Andrews	Hinchev	Pingree (ME)
Baldwin	Holt	Polis
Bass (CA)	Honda	Quigley
Becerra	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Berman	Jackson Lee	Rohrabacher
Blumenauer	(TX)	Royce
Bralley (IA)	Jones	Rush
Campbell	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu	Kind	T.
Cielline	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Clarke (NY)	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Clay	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Conyers	Luján	Stark
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Tierney
DeFazio	Markey	Tonko
Deutch	McDermott	Towns
Doggett	McGovern	Velázquez
Duncan (TN)	Miller, George	Waters
Edwards	Moore	Waxman
Ellison	Moran	Weiner
Eshoo	Nadler	Welch
Filner	Napolitano	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Olver	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Pallone	
Gutierrez	Payne	

NOES—351

Ackerman	Boren	Chaffetz
Adams	Boswell	Chandler
Aderholt	Boustany	Cleaver
Akin	Brady (PA)	Clyburn
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Coble
Altmire	Brooks	Coffman (CO)
Amash	Broun (GA)	Cohen
Austria	Brown (FL)	Cole
Baca	Buchanan	Conaway
Bachmann	Bucshon	Connolly (VA)
Bachus	Buerkle	Cooper
Barletta	Burgess	Costa
Barrow	Burton (IN)	Costello
Bartlett	Butterfield	Courtney
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Cravaack
Bass (NH)	Camp	Crawford
Benishek	Canseco	Crenshaw
Berg	Cantor	Critz
Berkley	Capito	Crowley
Biggert	Capps	Cuellar
Bilbray	Capuano	Culberson
Bilirakis	Cardoza	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Davis (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Black	Carter	DeLauro
Blackburn	Cassidy	Denham
Bonner	Castor (FL)	Dent
Bono Mack	Chabot	DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslie
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
Hanna
Harman

Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul

Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart

□ 2141

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Stated against:
Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 118 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 498 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 186, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]
AYES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart

Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Fox
LoBiondo
Long
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins

Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

NOES—186

Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Barrow
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Berman
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens

NOT VOTING—8

Giffords
Harman
Hinojosa

LaTourette
McCollum
Paul

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 2144

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 467 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 195, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

AYES—230

Adams	Flake	Landry
Aderholt	Fleischmann	Lankford
Akin	Fleming	Latham
Alexander	Flores	Latta
Altmire	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Amash	Fortenberry	Long
Austria	Fox	Lucas
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer
Barletta	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Bartlett	Gallely	Lungren, Daniel
Barton (TX)	Gardner	E.
Benishek	Garrett	Mack
Berg	Gerlach	Manzullo
Biggert	Gibbs	Marchant
Bilbray	Gibson	Marino
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Black	Gohmert	McCaul
Blackburn	Goodlatte	McClintock
Bonner	Gosar	McCotter
Bono Mack	Gowdy	McHenry
Boren	Granger	McIntyre
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Brooks	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Broun (GA)	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Buchanan	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Bucshon	Grimm	Meehan
Buerkle	Guinta	Mica
Burgess	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Burton (IN)	Hall	Miller, Gary
Calvert	Hanna	Mulvaney
Camp	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Campbell	Harris	Myrick
Canseco	Hartzler	Neugebauer
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Noem
Capito	Heck	Nugent
Carter	Heller	Nunes
Chabot	Hensarling	Nunnelee
Chaffetz	Herger	Olson
Coble	Herrera Beutler	Palazzo
Coffman (CO)	Holden	Pearce
Cole	Huelskamp	Pence
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Peterson
Cravaack	Hultgren	Petri
Crawford	Hunter	Pitts
Crenshaw	Hurt	Platts
Critz	Issa	Poe (TX)
Culberson	Jenkins	Pompeo
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Posey
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Reed
DesJarlais	Jones	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Renacci
Dold	Kelly	Ribble
Donnelly (IN)	King (IA)	Rigell
Dreier	King (NY)	Rivera
Duffy	Kingston	Roby
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Duncan (TN)	Kissell	Rogers (AL)
Ellmers	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Emerson	Labrador	Rogers (MI)
Farenthold	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Fincher	Lance	Rokita

Rooney	Shuster
Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson
Roskam	Smith (NE)
Ross (FL)	Smith (TX)
Royce	Southerland
Runyan	Stearns
Ryan (WI)	Stivers
Schilling	Stutzman
Schmidt	Sullivan
Schock	Terry
Schweikert	Thompson (PA)
Scott (SC)	Thornberry
Scott, Austin	Tiberi
Sensenbrenner	Tipton
Sessions	Turner
Shimkus	Upton

NOES—195

Ackerman	Garamendi
Andrews	Gonzalez
Baca	Green, Al
Baldwin	Green, Gene
Barrow	Grijalva
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez
Bass (NH)	Hanabusa
Becerra	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Hayworth
Berman	Heinrich
Bilirakis	Higgins
Bishop (GA)	Himes
Bishop (NY)	Hinchee
Blumenauer	Hirono
Boswell	Holt
Boustany	Honda
Brady (PA)	Hoyer
Brady (IA)	Inlee
Brown (FL)	Israel
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Jackson Lee
Capuano	(TX)
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Keating
Cassidy	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Kind
Chandler	Kucinich
Chu	Langevin
Ciulline	Larsen (WA)
Clarke (MI)	Larson (CT)
Clarke (NY)	LaTourette
Clay	Lee (CA)
Cleaver	Levin
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)
Cohen	Lipinski
Connolly (VA)	LoBiondo
Conyers	Loebsack
Cooper	Lofgren, Zoe
Costa	Lowe
Costello	Lujan
Courtney	Lynch
Crowley	Maloney
Cuellar	Markey
Cummings	Matheron
Davis (CA)	Matsui
Davis (IL)	McCarthy (NY)
DeFazio	McDermott
DeGette	McGovern
DeLauro	McNerney
Deutch	Meeks
Dicks	Michaud
Dingell	Miller (MI)
Doggett	Miller (NC)
Doyle	Miller, George
Edwards	Moore
Ellison	Moran
Engel	Murphy (CT)
Eshoo	Nadler
Farr	Napolitano
Fattah	Neal
Filner	Olver
Fitzpatrick	Owens
Frank (MA)	Pallone
Fudge	Pascrell

NOT VOTING—8

Bachus	Hinojosa	Peters
Giffords	McCollum	Quayle
Harman	Paul	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2147

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 184, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

AYES—241

Adams	Fleischmann	Long
Aderholt	Fleming	Lucas
Akin	Flores	Luetkemeyer
Alexander	Forbes	Lummis
Amash	Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel
Austria	Fox	E.
Bachmann	Frelinghuysen	Mack
Bachus	Gallely	Manzullo
Barletta	Gardner	Marchant
Bartlett	Garrett	Marino
Barton (TX)	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Bass (NH)	Gibbs	McCaul
Benishek	Gingrey (GA)	McClintock
Berg	Gohmert	McCotter
Biggert	Goodlatte	McHenry
Bilbray	Gosar	McIntyre
Bilirakis	Gowdy	McKeon
Bishop (UT)	Granger	McKinley
Black	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Blackburn	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Bonner	Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Bono Mack	Griffith (VA)	Mica
Boren	Grimm	Miller (FL)
Boustany	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Brady (TX)	Guthrie	Miller, Gary
Brooks	Hall	Mulvaney
Broun (GA)	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Buchanan	Harper	Myrick
Bucshon	Harris	Neugebauer
Buerkle	Hartzler	Noem
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Nugent
Burton (IN)	Hayworth	Nunes
Calvert	Heck	Nunnelee
Camp	Heller	Olson
Campbell	Hensarling	Palazzo
Canseco	Herger	Paulsen
Cantor	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Capito	Holden	Pence
Carter	Huelskamp	Petri
Cassidy	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Chabot	Hultgren	Platts
Chaffetz	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Coble	Hurt	Pompeo
Coffman (CO)	Issa	Posey
Cole	Jenkins	Price (GA)
Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Reed
Cravaack	Johnson (OH)	Rehberg
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Crenshaw	Jones	Renacci
Critz	Jordan	Ribble
Culberson	Kelly	Rigell
Davis (KY)	King (IA)	Rivera
Denham	King (NY)	Roby
Dent	Kingston	Roe (TN)
DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Dold	Labrador	Rogers (MI)
Dreier	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Duffy	Lance	Rokita
Duncan (SC)	Landry	Rooney
Duncan (TN)	Ellmers	Ros-Lehtinen
Emerson	Emerson	Roskam
Farenthold	Farenthold	Ross (AR)
Fincher	Fincher	Latta
Fitzpatrick	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Flake		LoBiondo

Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg

Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 63, noes 362, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

AYES—63

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

NOT VOTING—8

Franks (AZ)
Giffords
Harman

□ 2150

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) on which further pro-

Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Berg
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Canseco
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Ellmers
Farenthold
Flores
Foxy

NOES—362

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishak
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Billray
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler

Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Granger
Hall
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Huelskamp
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kingston
Lamborn
Landry
Long
Luetkemeyer

Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McKinley
Mica
Miller (FL)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Olson
Pearce
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Renacci
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Thornberry
Walberg
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe y
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran

Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling

NOT VOTING—8

Camp
Giffords
Harman

Hinojosa
McCollum
Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2153

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

Peters
Quayle

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 189, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

AYES—237

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

NOES—189

Ackerman	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Andrews	Gutierrez	Petri
Baca	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Baldwin	Hayworth	Platts
Barrow	Heinrich	Polis
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bass (NH)	Himes	Quigley
Becerra	Hinche	Rahall
Berkley	Hirono	Rangel
Berman	Holt	Reichert
Bishop (GA)	Honda	Reyes
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Richardson
Blumenauer	Inslee	Richmond
Boswell	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Braley (IA)	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	(TX)	Rush
Campbell	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Linda
Capuano	Jones	T.
Carnahan	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Kildee	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Kind	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Kucinich	Schiff
Chandler	Langevin	Schmidt
Chu	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Ciilline	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	LaTourrette	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Clay	Levin	Serrano
Cleaver	Lewis (GA)	Sewell
Clyburn	Lipinski	Sherman
Cohen	LoBiondo	Shuler
Connolly (VA)	Loeb	Sires
Coopers	Loftgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Cooper	Lowe	Smith (NJ)
Courtney	Lujan	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lynch	Speier
Cuellar	Maloney	Stark
Cummings	Markey	Stearns
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McDermott	Tierney
DeLauro	McGovern	Tonko
Engel	McIntyre	Towns
Engel	McNerney	Tsongas
Engel	Meeks	Van Hollen
Engel	Michaud	Velázquez
Engel	Miller (MI)	Visclosky
Engel	Miller (NC)	Walz (MN)
Engel	Miller, George	Wasserman
Engel	Moore	Schultz
Farr	Moran	Waters
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Filner	Nadler	Waxman
Fitzpatrick	Napolitano	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Neal	Welch
Fudge	Oliver	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Pallone	Wittman
Gerlach	Pascrell	Wolf
Gonzalez	Pastor (AZ)	Woolsey
Green, Al	Payne	Wu
Green, Gene	Pelosi	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords	McCollum	Quayle
Harman	Paul	
Hinojosa	Peters	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2156

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

AYES—231

Adams	Gerlach	Noem
Aderholt	Gibbs	Nugent
Akin	Gingrey (GA)	Nunes
Alexander	Gohmert	Nunnelee
Altmire	Goodlatte	Olson
Amash	Gosar	Palazzo
Austria	Gowdy	Paulsen
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Pence
Barletta	Griffin (AR)	Peterson
Bartlett	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Barton (TX)	Guinta	Pitts
Benishek	Guthrie	Platts
Berg	Hall	Poe (TX)
Biggert	Harper	Pompeo
Bilbray	Harris	Posey
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Reed
Black	Hayworth	Rehberg
Blackburn	Heck	Reichert
Bonner	Heller	Renacci
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Ribble
Boren	Herger	Rigell
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brooks	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Brown (FL)	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Issa	Rokita
Buchson	Jenkins	Rooney
Buerkle	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Ross (AR)
Calvert	Jones	Ross (FL)
Camp	Jordan	Royce
Canseco	Kelly	Runyan
Cantor	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Cardoza	Kingston	Scalise
Carter	Kissell	Schilling
Cassidy	Kline	Schmidt
Chabot	Labrador	Schweikert
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Coble	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Latta	Sessions
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Costa	Long	Shuler
Costello	Lucas	Shuster
Cravaack	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Crawford	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Critz	E.	Southerland
Culberson	Mack	Stearns
Denham	Manzullo	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Marchant	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Terry
Dold	Matheson	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Tipton
Ellmers	McCotter	Upton
Emerson	McHenry	Walberg
Engel	McIntyre	Walsh (IL)
Farenthold	Fincher	Webster
Fleming	Flake	West
Flores	Fleischmann	Westmoreland
Forbes	Flores	Whitfield
Fox	Forbes	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Fox	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Franks (AZ)	Wolf
Gallely	Gallely	Womack
	Gardner	Woodall
	Garrett	Yoder
		Young (AK)
		Young (FL)
		Young (IN)

NOES—191

Ackerman	Baldwin	Becerra
Amash	Barrow	Berman
Andrews	Bass (CA)	Bishop (GA)
Baca	Bass (NH)	Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer	Heinrich	Perlmutter
Boswell	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Polis
Bralley (IA)	Hinchey	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hirono	Quigley
Butterfield	Holden	Rahall
Capps	Holt	Rangel
Capuano	Honda	Reyes
Carnahan	Hoyer	Richardson
Carney	Inslee	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Chu	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Ciulline	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Clarke (MD)	(TX)	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kaptur	T.
Cohen	Keating	Sánchez, Loretta
Cornollos (VA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kind	Schakowsky
Cooper	King (NY)	Schiff
Courtney	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Crowley	Kucinich	Schrader
Cuellar	Lance	Schwartz
Cummings	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Sewell
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Sherman
DeGette	Levin	Sires
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Dent	Loeb sack	Smith (NJ)
Deutch	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Dicks	Lowe y	Speier
Dingell	Luján	Stark
Doggett	Lynch	Stivers
Donnelly (IN)	Maloney	Sutton
Doyle	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Dreier	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Ellison	McDermott	Tonko
Eshoo	McGovern	Towns
Farr	McNerney	Tsongas
Fattah	Meehan	Turner
Filner	Meeks	Van Hollen
Fortenberry	Michaud	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Frelinghuysen	Miller, George	Walden
Fudge	Moore	Walz (MN)
Garamendi	Moran	Wasserman
Gibson	Murphy (CT)	Schultz
Gonzalez	Nadler	Waters
Granger	Napolitano	Watt
Green, Al	Neal	Waxman
Green, Gene	Olver	Weiner
Grijalva	Owens	Welch
Grimm	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Gutierrez	Pascrell	Woolsey
Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)	Wu
Hanna	Payne	Yarmuth
Hastings (FL)	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—11

Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Peters
Cleaver	Landry	Quayle
Giffords	McCullum	Roby
Harman	Paul	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2159

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 124, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend, the majority leader, to inform us of the planned schedule for the evening.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland, as he and I have discussed throughout the day, we have asked Members to continue to be judicious in their remarks if we want to get out of here at

a reasonable hour, that we have been at this for at least 90 hours, and we continue to debate these amendments. We will anticipate votes again within 2 hours, and we will continue the votes throughout the evening.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. As I understand what the gentleman just said, we will probably have the next series of votes at approximately midnight.

Would the gentleman have in mind when the next series of votes would be after that?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, again, it depends on how Members feel, on the other side of the aisle as well as ours, as to how expeditious they want their remarks to be. We've been at this, again, for 90 hours. We intend to have votes again probably within a couple of hours after midnight, and we will proceed along those lines.

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

I will tell him that I believe, on my side, we have three, perhaps, four amendments—one we think is subject to a point of order. So we have three amendments left on this side. I'm not sure how many you will have on your side.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, the gentleman understands and knows that we have throughout the day offered to reduce debate time; and the gentleman also knows that the majority of the amendments on his side have been debated. If the gentleman is prepared at this point to accept our offer to reduce the amount of time from 10 minutes per amendment down to 6 or 5, I think we could get that done as well.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I gather unanimous consent may be pro-pounded to reduce debate time. I just want to stress we were told yesterday we were debating the whole government. We were then going to debate important public policy questions for 10 minutes. We're now going to get the privilege of debating important public policy questions for 6 minutes.

If this is open government, I think I'm going to have to look for something else because, I think it is, as I said yesterday, a travesty. I do think we ought to make clear what we are talking about. Important public policy questions being debated for 3 minutes on each side. That, as I said, is a travesty.

Mr. CANTOR. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't hear objection on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CANTOR. Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts may have somewhat of a short memory given that, in December, we had a vote on a CR for 1 hour under a closed rule. So, with that, just a little reminder.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, I didn't know how long it was going to take my Republican friends to go from talking about their superior virtue to saying they were just like us. It took less time than I thought.

But I would also say that, in the bills that came out of the committee that I chaired, we always had debate, and we always had open rules. But if the gentleman is saying that he now understands why the people on our side did what we did—and I often disagreed, as I said—he got there more quickly than I thought he would, and that may be the only thing about the way they're running the House that has happened more quickly than we thought it would.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I will tell my friend, the majority leader, I still do not hear objection on our side.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Let me ask: Do we know how many amendments are left on your side, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Less than 50, 18 of which, I think, are subject to a point of order.

Mr. DICKS. We understand that you have 50 amendments left, 18 of which are subject to a point of order. One of ours is. We have three and we have one colloquy. You asked us for a colloquy; we got you a colloquy, okay?

Now, just in the spirit of cooperation, I hope some of you might think about doing what a lot of our Members have done and decide not to offer your amendments so we can get the hell out of here.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Before the gentleman yields back, Mr. Chairman, I think all of us understands how important it is that we finish this bill tonight. Therefore, the shorter we can make our speeches, the better off we all are.

So we hope to ask each one of you, as you offer your amendments and the rebuttals, to be brief, understanding that the rest of us would like to leave here just as quickly as we can.

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

□ 2210

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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. PITTS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MAKING IN ORDER FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to applicable previous orders of the House, each amendment otherwise debatable for 10 minutes instead be debatable for 6 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

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

□ 2213

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 8, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 359, line 22.

AMENDMENT NO. 377 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the construction of an ethanol blender pump or an ethanol storage facility.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers have subsidized ethanol for far

too long. This amendment will simply bring that slowly to a stop.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clearly limits consumer choice, and is yet another attack on our Nation's progress to try and achieve energy security. The technology that he is trying to prohibit basically would allow individuals to have a choice as to whether, what percentage plan they would want, whether E-10, E-30, E-50 or E-85, whatever suits their best needs, their affordability and their performance and gas mileage.

It would actually make us much more dependent long term on foreign oil because you are going to limit the choices that are there. And without the blender pumps that he wants to prohibit, most Americans are left with just one option, and that's the E-10.

If we continue to limit the amount of U.S.-produced ethanol we can use in our vehicles, we will be continuing to be beholden to foreign sources of energy, and we will be importing more oil every year.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this is not a choice at all. It's a mandate. That's why we've got to end it. It's been a boondoggle for 30 years. It remains so. Let's vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. This is limiting consumer choice; it's going to increase our dependence on foreign oil.

I would again ask my colleagues to vote against this ill-founded amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 367 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk, No. 367.

The Acting 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 new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide any benefit described in section

1001D(b)(1)(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(b)(1)(C)) to a person or legal entity if the average adjusted gross income of the person or legal entity exceeds \$250,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 3 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment would be to save the taxpayers roughly \$30.5 million by preventing the funding of Radio and TV Marti.

I have decided to withdraw this amendment in the interest of time and also to work on it in committee with the gentleman from Florida. So we will enter into a colloquy for just 1 minute and go from there.

I happen to feel that we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on Radio and TV Marti over the past 20, 25 years. TV Marti is seen by very few. The gentleman from Florida has a different view. We have agreed to scuttle the debate here and take it up in committee.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

We do have a disagreement here, as I think most of us know. I obviously will continue to work on this issue.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Did the gentleman from Arizona say he was going to withdraw his amendment on Marti?

Mr. FLAKE. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. I was just curious to hear that. Thank you.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Again I will continue to work on this issue. Obviously the issue of freedom is something that I think is cherished by this House. There is a history of supporting freedom, and I know we will continue to support freedom. But we will have ample opportunity to debate this and discuss this and other opportunities.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available for this Act may be used to enter into, after the date of the enactment of this Act, a Government contract that requires a project labor agreement.

□ 2220

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 2011,