because they cannot meet the standard.

As has been pointed out by Mr. DOYLE and several of the other speakers, it is also true that industry has developed new incandescent light bulbs that do meet the standard. What they haven't done is develop a new incandescent light bulb that meets the standard at existing cost. What gets left out of the equation by my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle is the cost to purchase these new bulbs, whether they are the squiggly tailed CFLs or the new, more energy-efficient incandescents.

We're not opposed, I'm not opposed to CFL lighting. I'm not opposed to the new incandescents. But I am opposed to telling my constituents that they have no choice at all, that they have to go and fork over $1.50 or $2.50 or $6. Or in the case of the LEDs that Mr. WAXMAN just referred to, a minimum of $12, and the average price of the new LED lighting at Home Depot or Lowe's is $40 a bulb.

Now, I'm young enough to remember when I was a renter and I would move into an apartment, and when I went into the apartment, there were no light bulbs. The people who left took the light bulbs with them. So I would have to go out and buy 20 or 30 or 40 light bulbs. Well, if light bulbs are 20 cents apiece, or 25 or 30 or even 40 cents apiece, that is an expense but it's not exorbitant. You go out and replace 40 light bulbs at $6 a pop, you're spending some money that, to our constituency, to our voters, Mr. Speaker, that's real money.

Again, we're not opposed to new technology. We're not opposed to more energy-efficient incandescents. But why take the low end of the market off the market? Why not give our constituents, i.e., our consumers, our voters, the choice? If you're Al Gore and you want to spend $10 a light bulb, more power to you. More power to you. But if you're a young family that's just getting started, give us the option to go out and spend for a package of four or a package of six the equivalent of 25 cents apiece, or 30 cents apiece, or as I purchased last week at a food store here in Virginia, 37.5 cents apiece for four 60-watt light bulbs.

We're saying let the market work. We're saying let people make their own choices. Why in the world does the Federal Government have to tell people what kind of lights to use in their home? That's not anywhere in the constitutional requirement of the Federal Government.

And this bill that was passed in 2007 had a lot of preemptions of State and local. It preempted State and local building codes. It required historical buildings to meet certain standards by the year 2050. It had so many bad things in it that this one, while offensive, was kind of the least of the evils.

But it is also, Mr. Speaker, what the average voter, the average consumer understands. When I go to the grocery store or to Wal-Mart or to Home Depot, let me decide what kind of lighting, let me decide what kind of energy efficiency I want.

Now, it is a true statement that these new bulbs are more energy efficient; but if it takes you 10 years to realize the efficiency and the only way you do it is by leaving it on all of the time, it is spending money to save money that some people don't have. Again, purchase a classic 100-watt or 60-watt incandescent light bulb for less than 50 cents, you might use it, you might not. But if you use it all week, it is going to cost you less than a nickel. And if you use it like the average consumer, it is going to cost you a penny to 2 cents a week to use.

So do you save money? The CFL that I bought last week for $6 or $5.99 is guaranteed for 10 years and says it will save over $40, but you've got to use it for 10 years. You know, I don't think that's a very good deal, with all due respect to my friends on the other side.

What we're saying is let's get the Federal Government out of something that they shouldn't have gotten into in the first place. Let's go back and let the market operate. If these new CFLs and these new incandescents are as good as they claim to be, people are going to want to buy them. But if they are not or if they can't afford the upfront cost, don't force them to. Don't take off the market the very thing that provides price competition in the market. Even the new incandescents cost on average $1.50 to $2 a pop. And I haven't seen a CFL—I've seen them for $10 or $12, the average price is around $6 or $7—I haven't seen them even in the most energy-efficient package for less than about $2.50 or $3 apiece. And, again, if you're buying a lot of light bulbs at one time, that's real money, Mr. Speaker.

What we say is let's repeal this part of the bill. Let's also say with regards to mercury that you cannot mandate mercury. That's the section that Mr. WAXMAN was apparently referring to. We're not banning fluorescents. We are simply saying you cannot require mercury to be used in the CFLs.

So I would urge an ''aye'' vote on the pending legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that the Republican majority in the House would even craft a bill such as the BULB Act, much less actually bring it to the floor for a vote. This bill is based on inaccurate and downright false claims like the one made by the Wall Street Journal when it outrageously tried to say that by setting energy efficiency standards for light bulbs, ''Washington will effectively ban the sale of conventional incandescent light bulbs.'' Nothing could be further from the truth.

The lighting efficiency standards enacted by Congress in 2007 do not ban incandescent light bulbs, they simply make those bulbs 25 to 30 percent more efficient and help incentivize the development of even more efficient lighting using alternative technologies, such as compact fluorescent lighting or light emitting diodes.

Major light bulb manufacturers such as Philips, Osram Sylvania, and General Electric have already developed more efficient incandescent bulbs that consumers can purchase in the store today that meet the new standards. Clearly, statements like the one made by the Wall Street Journal are incorrect, because incandescent bulbs to meet the standard already exist developed solely because the standard is in place.

The standard is also spurring manufacturers to develop even more efficient lighting options than just these new incandescent bulbs, creating R&D and high-tech manufacturing jobs in the U.S. In Silicon Valley alone, Philips employs over 700 people and hired more than 100 people at its LED facility in San Jose, California in 2010. We need to encourage this kind of work, not roll back standards that led to the shipping of bulb manufacturing overseas.

The standard is good for the environment, too—it will save the amount of electricity generated by more than 30 large power plants, and prevent the emission of global warming pollution equivalent to the amount released by 14 million cars and light trucks each year. Critics may argue that by promoting the use of compact fluorescent bulbs, the standard would increase exposure to mercury, but on this they are also wrong—the reduction in mercury emissions from coal power plants that would be achieved because less electricity is needed for lighting is ten times greater than the mercury that could escape from a compact fluorescent bulb in a landfill.

Repealing the lighting efficiency standard would cost the typical consumer around $100 per year in additional energy costs. In essence, Republicans want to institute an energy tax on consumers in order to cling to some antiquated vision of the past.

As a representative of Silicon Valley, I know that we must look to the future and do everything that we can to promote the development and domestic manufacture of new technologies that will help us use less energy and grow our economy. That is why I support the new lighting efficiency standards and vehemently oppose H.R. 2147, the BULB Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2417.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAVAACK) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

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

□ 1832

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. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. LANKFORD (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, the bill had been read through page 23, line 10.

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

An amendment by Mr. TIERNEY of Massachusetts.

An amendment by Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

An amendment by Mr. SCALISE of Louisiana.

An amendment by Mr. WOODALL of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) 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 162, noes 246, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

AYES—162

Ackerman	Fudge	Neal
Alexander	Garamendi	Olver
Amash	Green, Al	Pallone
Andrews	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Baca	Grijalva	Paul
Baldwin	Hanabusa	Payne
Barletta	Harris	Pelosi
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Becerra	Herrera Beutler	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Higgins	Poe (TX)
Berman	Himes	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Blumenauer	Hirono	Rahall
Boswell	Hochul	Rangel
Boustany	Holt	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Honda	Richardson
Brady (TX)	Hoyer	Richmond
Buchanan	Israel	Rooney
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Jackson Lee (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Carney	Jones	Scalise
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Cassidy	Keating	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Schrader
Chu	Kind	Schwartz
Cicilline	Kissell	Scott (VA)
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Landry	Serrano
Clay	Langevin	Sherman
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Shuler
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Sires
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Slaughter
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Speier
Costa	LoBiondo	Stark
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Stearns
Courtney	Lowey	Sutton
Crowley	Luján	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Tierney
DeFazio	Maloney	Tonko
DeGette	Markey	Tsongas
DeLauro	Matsui	Van Hollen
Dicks	McClintock	Velázquez
Doggett	McCollum	Walz (MN)
Duncan (TN)	McDermott	Wasserman Schultz
Edwards	McGovern	Watt
Ellison	McIntyre	Waxman
Engel	Meeks	Welch
Eshoo	Michaud	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Moran	Woolsey
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Wu
Filner	Nadler	Yarmuth
Fortenberry	Napolitano	
Frank (MA)		

NOES—246

Adams	Coble	Garrett
Aderholt	Coffman (CO)	Gerlach
Akin	Cole	Gibbs
Altmire	Conaway	Gibson
Austria	Cooper	Gingrey (GA)
Bachus	Cravaack	Gohmert
Barrow	Crawford	Gonzalez
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bass (NH)	Critz	Gosar
Benishek	Cuellar	Gowdy
Berg	Culberson	Granger
Biggert	Cummings	Graves (GA)
Bilbray	Davis (KY)	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	Denham	Griffin (AR)
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Grimm
Black	Diaz-Balart	Guinta
Blackburn	Dingell	Guthrie
Bonner	Dold	Hall
Bono Mack	Donnelly (IN)	Hanna
Boren	Doyle	Harper
Brooks	Dreier	Hartzler
Broun (GA)	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Hayworth
Buerkle	Ellmers	Heck
Burgess	Emerson	Heinrich
Burton (IN)	Farenthold	Hensarling
Calvert	Fincher	Herger
Camp	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Campbell	Flake	Huizenga (MI)
Canseco	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Cantor	Fleming	Hunter
Capito	Flores	Hurt
Carnahan	Forbes	Inslee
Carter	Foxx	Issa
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Chandler	Gallegly	Johnson, Sam
Clyburn	Gardner	Jordan
Kelly	Myrick	Ryan (WI)
King (IA)	Noem	Schilling
King (NY)	Nugent	Schmidt
Kingston	Nunes	Schock
Kinzinger (IL)	Nunnelee	Schweikert
Kline	Olson	Scott (SC)
Labrador	Owens	Scott, Austin
Lamborn	Palazzo	Sensenbrenner
Lance	Pastor (AZ)	Sessions
Lankford	Paulsen	Sewell
Larson (CT)	Pearce	Shimkus
Latham	Pence	Shuster
LaTourette	Perlmutter	Simpson
Latta	Peterson	Smith (NE)
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Lipinski	Pitts	Smith (TX)
Long	Platts	Smith (WA)
Lucas	Polis	Southerland
Luetkemeyer	Pompeo	Stivers
Lummis	Posey	Sullivan
Lungren, Daniel E.	Price (GA)	Terry
Mack	Quayle	Thompson (MS)
Manzullo	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Marchant	Rehberg	Thornberry
Marino	Reichert	Tiberi
Matheson	Renacci	Tipton
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Turner
McCaul	Rigell	Upton
McCotter	Rivera	Visclosky
McHenry	Roby	Walberg
McKeon	Roe (TN)	Walsh (IL)
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Webster
McMorris Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	West
McNerney	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Mica	Rokita	Wilson (SC)
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Wolf
Miller (NC)	Ross (AR)	Womack
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	Woodall
Mulvaney	Royce	Yoder
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Young (AK)
	Ruppersberger	Young (IN)
	Ryan (OH)	

NOT VOTING—23

Bachmann	Hinchey	Rush
Bartlett	Holden	Sanchez, Loretta
Braley (IA)	Johnson (IL)	Stutzman
Brown (FL)	Loebsack	Towns
Davis (IL)	McCarthy (NY)	Walden
Deutch	Miller, George	Waters
Giffords	Moore	Young (FL)
Gutierrez	Neugebauer	

□ 1857

Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER and ROYCE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, BISHOP of New York, SCALISE, POE of Texas, CARSON of Indiana, CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Messrs. STEARNS and AMASH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) 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 216, noes 190, not voting 25, as follows: