

12, 2011, there were over 100,000 foreign ABTC holders—but no Americans.

Today's legislation simply levels the playing field by directing the Department of Homeland Security to establish an APEC Business Travel Card that will allow Americans to use the card to gain expedited entry into participating APEC economies when they go abroad and use Customs and Border Protection's, or CBP's, Global Entry program for expedited reentry back into the United States. This will make travel throughout the Asia-Pacific region easier for American businessmen and -women and will help them to more efficiently sell their products overseas.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), for his hard work on this bill as well as fellow APEC Caucus cochairs, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), for their support as well.

The future of the United States is tied to the Asia-Pacific region. With the hosting of the APEC summit by the United States in less than a month, it is important that the APEC Business Travel Card program is established. I urge my colleagues to support this bill as well.

In conclusion, I want to thank the leadership of this House for working with me and the gentleman from Texas to get this bill scheduled for House consideration.

□ 1400

Mr. TURNER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and am prepared to close once the gentlelady does.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2042 represents a small but important step towards facilitating travel and enhancing business ties with our Asia-Pacific region, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. TURNER of New York. Mr. Speaker, in closing, this bill is an opportunity to facilitate travel, promote economic growth, and enhance security.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2042 would require the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Department of State, to establish a program to issue APEC Business Travel Cards to eligible United States business leaders and government officials.

Under this program, U.S. citizens actively engaged in APEC business would receive expedited screening in international travel within the 21 APEC member economies.

H.R. 2042 requires DHS to integrate application procedures for and issuance of APEC Business Travel Cards with other appropriate DHS international trusted traveler programs such as Global Entry, NEXUS, and SENTRI.

I strongly support those three DHS trusted traveler programs, which facilitate international travel for pre-approved, low-risk passengers while allowing DHS to focus its resources on higher-risk and unknown passengers.

H.R. 2042 is supported by the Obama Administration, and I also support the bill.

However, I am dismayed that with just 19 days left in the First Session of the 112th Congress, H.R. 2042 is the first Committee on Homeland Security bill to reach the House floor.

I would note that the last time the Committee brought legislation to the House floor was when I was still Chairman—at the end of December 2010.

With respect to H.R. 2042, let the record reflect that the path to the floor involved bypassing Committee consideration. I did not object to this approach, given that the APEC conference is slated to commence in Hawaii next month.

The Democratic Members of the Committee are committed to ensuring that the full breadth and depth of homeland security issues facing our Nation are addressed.

To date, eighty homeland security bills have been introduced and referred to the Committee. The subject matter of these bills range from border security to aviation security to counterterrorism to preparedness and response.

Unfortunately, only a handful of homeland security bills have actually been considered in Committee and only one has been reported to the House. That bill is now pending before another Committee.

The failure of the Committee on Homeland Security to advance meaningful homeland security legislation that speaks to the oversight finding of the Committee in the 112th Congress is inexcusable.

Though I recognize that the hour is late on the congressional calendar, I sincerely hope that consideration of H.R. 2042 today signals the commencement of a more active legislative period for the Committee.

Nevertheless, I urge the House to support H.R. 2042 today.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the APEC Business Travel Cards Act because it is another measure that helps create a favorable environment for job creation. As a co-chair of the APEC Caucus, I strongly believe that continued engagement in the Asia-Pacific region is critical to U.S. economic growth. The Asia-Pacific region is the most economically dynamic region in the world, home to two-thirds of the world's population and over half of all global trade. The legislation before us will help American businesses be more competitive in these growing markets. The easier our businesses can access these foreign markets, the more they can sell American goods and services abroad. The United States already recognizes the APEC Business Travel Card held by foreign nationals, giving them expedited travel processing. It is past time that we allow American businesses leaders around the country the same travel benefits that foreign APEC businesses travelers have been enjoying for years. This is a common sense bill that streamlines travel for American businesses that are trying to grow and reach customers in foreign markets. This legislation is long overdue and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New York (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2042.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1904, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 444 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 444

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1904) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommmit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule of H.R. 1904, the Southeast Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011. It makes in order every amendment that was filed with the Rules Committee.

So this is, like the Texas victory last night, a very fair rule and continues the record of the Rules Committee in this Congress of making as many amendments in order as possible which otherwise conform to the House rules. That's been the goal of Chairman DREIER in his continuing record of fairness and openness in the formulation of this open rule.

Madam Speaker, this Resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1904, the "Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011, and makes in order every amendment that was filed with Rules Committee.

So this is a very fair rule, and continues the record of the Rules Committee in this Congress of making as many amendments in order as possible which otherwise conform to House Rules, which has been the goal of our Chairman, Mr. DREIER, in continuing the record of fairness and openness in the formulation of this rule.

H.R. 1904, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011, introduced by the Gentleman from Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, would authorize a fair value exchange and conveyance of land between the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Arizona Town of "Superior," and the Resolution Copper Mining LLC in Southeast Arizona, for the multiple purposes of protection of sensitive habitat and cultural areas, as well as facilitating the development of the largest undeveloped copper resource in the world right here in the United States.

One of the key pillars of a viable economy, and job creation, is the sound and environmentally responsible development of our own domestic natural resources. This bill does that. Its passage will facilitate responsible copper mining within our own country, putting thousands of Americans to work with good paying jobs, and, over time, bringing billions in return for both the federal government and state and local governments.

In spite of predictable interest group scare tactics against this legislation, H.R. 1904 does not waive any existing environmental rules or regulations regarding mining. The companies involved not only must pay fair market value

for the equal value exchange, but must comply with all mining laws and regulations regarding the environment.

Passage of this bill will result in a higher amount of habitat acreage being protected than before, so the environmental community should be on board with this bill.

Copper is one of the key components used in virtually all manufacturing and electronics. For those concerned with so-called "green energy," nearly 5 tons of copper is necessary to manufacture a single 3 megawatt wind turbine. And that is just one example to show how copper is used nearly everywhere. For our country develop our own God-given natural resources not only helps our own economy, creates jobs, but also reduces our dependence on foreign sources and helps with our balance of trade with other nations.

This bill is strongly supported by state and local government officials in Arizona including Governor Jan Brewer, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Mining Association, and the Associated General Contractors of America.

This is a good bill, and a fair Rule. I urge their adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today's bill continues an effort started by the Republican majority earlier this year, an effort to give away valuable American resources to foreign companies. Today the majority is proposing to take sacred land from Native American tribes and give it away to foreign corporations, one of which is partly owned by the Chinese Government. I stand here today in fierce opposition to this attempted fire sale of American resources that is being conducted under the guise of job creation.

Today's bill is not written for the American worker. It was written for foreign mining giants that hope to profit from our generosity. These firms are hoping that this Congress will be charitable enough to give away millions of tons of copper to foreign companies that have no responsibility to create American jobs. Indeed, one of those companies is a leader in robotics and say that they can control a mine from 600 miles away. The likelihood that they plan to create a number of jobs does not hold together.

Copper is one of the most scarce resources on the globe, and yet the majority is proposing to give this asset away. Let me say that again—give this asset away. Under this bill, the United States receives no royalties from these foreign companies for any copper found in our soil.

Furthermore, today's bill is not the solution to our jobs crisis. The proposed legislation gives federally protected land to companies that specialize in replacing miners with robots that do the same job. The majority hopes this will create jobs at some unnamed point in the future. But in addition to this approach being naive, the majority could be doing more to create jobs than simply relying on hope.

The truth is that we could be standing here today actually doing job creation. We could be voting to put money directly into the hands of firefighters, police officers, and teachers. We could be investing in new roads, railroads, and schools and creating thousands of jobs for construction workers across our country.

But once again, the majority seems to believe that their job is to help foreign corporations grow their bottom line. It is not. Giving away our natural resources to foreign companies will do nothing but leave American workers in the dust and we much poorer.

I strongly oppose today's proposed legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and the underlying legislation. More than ever, we need to take tangible action to create jobs, not sell our national interests to the highest foreign bidder.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am so accustomed to coming here and making repeated assertions regarding my friends on the Republican side. But today, we are really about the business of undertaking added emphasis on regulation and doing nothing about jobs.

Let me refer to an article that occurred in The New York Times on October 4, written by Bruce Bartlett, an editorial opinion. Mr. Bartlett held senior policy roles in the Reagan and the George H.W. Bush administrations and served on the staff of the distinguished former Member of this House of Representatives, the departed Jack Kemp, and on the staff of RON PAUL. He says, "Republicans have a problem. People are increasingly concerned about unemployment, but Republicans have nothing to offer them."

And I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle don't jump up and start about their 15 forgotten bills. They're not only forgotten; they're forgettable. And they're forgettable for the reason that they don't create jobs. But here we are today dealing with three suspensions and one other measure, and we've been out almost as much as we've been in session, and we still aren't addressing the subject of jobs.

Continuing with Mr. Bartlett, he says, "The GOP opposes additional government spending for jobs programs and, in fact, favors big cuts in spending that would be likely to lead to further layoffs at all levels of government."

He goes on, but the specific takeaway that impressed me in his article that I wish to share is, "In my opinion, regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue

an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.”

I want to address the subject of regulation because it seems that I keep hearing this thing that the business community needs certainty. Well, the American people need certainty as well, and certainty about their health and certainty about employment and certainty about housing. And toward that end, I don't just distinguish one little category, it's a hole here in this country. And in the period when we did not have regulation, my recollection of the no-regulation period led us to what we see and have experienced on Wall Street when there is no regulation.

What do we think caused this great downturn in the economy? Was it because students weren't going to school? Was it because people weren't going to work? Was it because we had coal ash gas? Or did it occur because we didn't have regulation that we should have had that would have manifested itself?

□ 1420

Madam Speaker, I believe I may be the only speaker, and toward that end, rather than continue, I will reserve the balance of my time and have my colleague know that I will be prepared to close when he is finished.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the gentleman from Florida knows, I do like baseball this time of year. One of the statistics that I saw the other day is that Pete Rose had 29 of his 4,000-plus hits off of pitchers who would eventually become dentists. It is a true statement. It has almost no impact on anything, but it is a true statement. Some of the rhetoric we've heard so far is true, but has no impact on what we're talking about.

Madam Speaker, 15 different times Republicans have come on the floor of this House and have introduced jobs bills. Those jobs bills are still sitting over in the Senate. Thousands of jobs would be up and available right now if the Senate were actually to move on any of those 15. This is the 16th jobs bill that we have brought to the floor.

One of the issues we have here is there is a need in our lives for copper. The business community needs copper. Individuals need copper. In our personal lives we need copper. If you want to build a three-megawatt turbine for wind generation power, you need five tons of copper to do that. If you want to build a hybrid car or an electric car, you need at least 55 pounds of copper to build the car. The average home has 435 pounds of copper in that home. In fact, the study I looked at said each individual in his lifetime will consume 935 pounds of copper. I'm not quite sure how we do that. I certainly hope the verb “consume” was not literal, but more a hypothetical word, because I really have not had much copper on my Cornflakes lately.

But we will consume copper. Whether we produce copper or not, we consume copper. We need copper. The fact of the matter is the United States now imports 30 percent of all the copper. We are relying upon other countries to produce copper.

Why is this a jobs bill? For those people who vote for this bill, we will be establishing the opportunity to develop a mine that could produce a quarter of our needs for copper for the next 40 years. We will move us to self-sufficiency; and, more importantly, we will create jobs with this particular bill. Indirect and direct jobs are 3,700 for this mine; 3,000 jobs for the construction of this facility, 500 who are already in the pre-permitting phase right now. That's what the opportunity is.

If we vote against this bill, we'll still be providing jobs, but jobs overseas for miners in Chile; for the smelting factories in China, where we have to send the stuff because we don't have enough smelters right here to do. We will produce jobs, but we have either the choice of producing jobs in America so that we can create American jobs and have American self-sufficiency, or we can create jobs abroad. It's our choice on this particular bill.

This is a jobs bill. Whether you vote for it or against it, it is still a jobs bill. I just hope we vote for it because I hope our priority is creating American jobs for American need of copper, which there is no way to get around. We have to have this crucial mineral, and this is the place in which to do it.

This particular bill will be a land transfer in which the Federal Government makes out like a bandit in it. The Federal Government will get 5,400 acres of land. The industry gets 2,400 acres to try and get this production going. The city of Superior gets 500 acres, 30 of which go to their cemetery. That's the purpose of this bill.

This bill is viable for our economy, for our job creation, and for natural resources. It does it in a responsible way. And all the scare tactics out there that have been waved about before don't exist. There is not one single, solitary environmental rule that is waived for the creation of this mine. Not one.

Twice this bill has been introduced before this Congress by a Democrat sponsor. It's the same bill, except this one doesn't provide a rock-climbing park for the State of Arizona. Other than that, it's the same bill with the same considerations and the same restrictions and the same guarantees.

Madam Speaker, if the gentleman has another speaker or wishes to take some time, then I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend and colleague for the information.

I would like to ask my friend a question. Is there anything in this measure that requires the copper that you just spoke about—and I don't disagree with many of the facts that you put forward—but is there anything in this bill

that requires that copper to remain in the United States of America?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I will be happy to do it. In fact, I want the sponsor to respond specifically to that in just a second.

But the answer is, clearly, we have a desire for copper. We have a demand for copper. The concept of free enterprise and the balance of trade that we need will demand that the majority of that copper be used here. If you want to try to come up with amendments to try and mandate that, there are some potential amendments that will be debated on this floor in this very good, fair structured rule. However, you have to be very careful that sometimes when you try and make these mandates and put them in law, it makes it very difficult to enforce those particular mandates.

And I will tell you that one of the amendments that will be debated here on the floor has wonderful intention but is almost impossible to enforce. So will it happen? Of course, it will happen, because we have that need; we have that desire right now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I appreciate the answer. I'll take that as a no, that there is nothing in the bill to cause the copper to remain in the United States.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. There is nothing in statute—only in reality—that will force it to be used here.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I understand. But when you step up to the plate, you have to hit the ball. You can't fake like you're hitting the ball.

The gentleman from Utah and I use baseball analogies. I don't know whether he has a dog in this World Series fight or not, but I appreciate he and I going back and forth on that.

I do recognize that you did respond as I thought you would about the America's job creators provision that occurs. I do encourage that people—I normally don't advertise for the other side—but you have jobs.gov. And what it says is: empower small businesses and reduce government barriers to job creation; fix the Tax Code to help job creators; boost the competitiveness for American manufacturers; encourage entrepreneurship and growth; maximize American energy production; and pay down America's unsustainable debt burden and start living within our means.

All of that is practical. All of that seems to make sense. But in the final analysis, it's not putting a teacher, a firefighter, or a police officer to work. And we're talking about right now is when we have this problem. If we don't have this problem by the time we empower small businesses, then let's empower some of them then. Let's do

some things to make sure that some money gets in their hands, rather than dance around this issue.

We need some direct programs from the United States Federal Government to help States, counties, and municipalities in this country, and to help individuals, particularly those that are on the front lines dealing with these particular issues. But you haven't done anything, which is almost laughable, and you put on your Web site that you have 15 "forgettable" bills.

I guess what we're trying to do—and it does make a little bit of sense to me—that we should point to the other body and say that we have passed measures here in the House of Representatives that have gone to the other body and not become law. Well, my last recollection is that we passed over 400 measures when we were in the majority and they went over to the U.S. Senate; and here's where the catch is that people don't seem to understand. The arcane rules of the Senate require that they have 60 votes. And the majority does not have 60 votes. In almost every measure that may have helped this country, the Republicans stood in opposition and, quite frankly, obstructed the passage of legislation. I guess now you're joining us in saying that they're doing the same things to you in the House of Representatives.

Well, I accept that if that's your argument. But let's make it very clear that it is in the United States Senate and that here we aren't originating nor are we evidently working with them to address the subject of the need for jobs, housing, and education in this country.

□ 1430

After another week away from Washington, thanks to my Republican friends, we're back here considering this bill on an issue that I think very few of my colleagues, myself included, fully understand.

The Republicans have been in charge for 294 days, and they have not brought one job-creating bill to the floor in that time, not one. I do make an exception that I believe all of us recognize has been in the works through several administrations, and that is the various trade agreements, which in some respects are going to create jobs but in other respects are going to cause the loss of jobs. And I don't think that that equation is full yet; but, yes, that did pass the House of Representatives.

While Americans continue to struggle to find work, this Republican majority has been more interested in going on recess than in passing legislation. The truth is, Madam Speaker, the House has only been in session 109 days, and we're almost in November—109 days. During this limited time, my friends on the other side haven't found time to send a single appropriations bill to the President, not one.

When we are in Washington, look at the bills that my colleagues have debated passionately—defunding Planned Parenthood, defunding the National

Public Radio, promoting the use of inefficient light bulbs. Madam Speaker, this would be comical if it weren't so serious.

Let me also remind my colleagues that only a paltry 43 bills have been signed into law this year, less than half the average first-session total for Congresses since 1991, even compared to other years following shifts in control of the House.

I believe that Americans want action to help our economy now. They want us to consider the President's jobs bill now. They want us to quit wasting time on trivial issues that are only meant for 30-second political sound bites. They want us to do our jobs. But these friends on the other side just don't get it.

Four years ago, their Presidential nominee talked about "country first." But in the House of Representatives, time after time after time we see the Republican leadership ignore the needs of out-of-work Americans. And the bill before us today is more of the same, another enormous rip-off for struggling American workers disguised as a jobs bill. In fact, this time it's not even disguised very well.

The underlying bill is a massive land giveaway to foreign companies looking to mine copper on American land. And that's why I put the question to my good friend about whether that copper was going to stay in the United States. Let me repeat that. This bill benefits foreign mining giants, first and foremost, at a time when millions of Americans are unemployed and families right here in this country are struggling to pay their bills.

The two companies that stand to benefit the most from this bill—British-owned Rio Tinto and Australian-owned BHP Billiton—are highly profitable titans in the mining world. As the bill is currently written, American taxpayers will receive no share of the expected billions in profits generated by this mining. All profits will be enjoyed by foreign companies.

And claims that H.R. 1904 will lead to the creation of thousands of good-paying American jobs are dubious at best. Both companies, the two I mentioned, are pioneers in developing automated and remote-control mining technologies. Seriously? We're creating jobs for foreign robots instead of American workers? No offense to R2-D2, but there are American workers who need help. On top of that, any American jobs that may be created will be years in the future. This bill does nothing to create good jobs right now when we need them the most.

My friends in the majority want this process to seem fair. Yes, they made in order all the amendments submitted, but that's not the same as an open rule. Let me be crystal clear: This is not an open rule. Once again, the Rules Committee is breaking the promises of this new majority. Clearly, the Republican leadership is more interested in shutting down debate and fostering a

more closed House rather than living up to their campaign promises of a more open House of Representatives.

Despite these broken promises, Madam Speaker, I'm pleased that the Democratic amendments—that my good friend mentioned are made in order—will insert some common sense into H.R. 1904 if they are in fact adopted. And as I heard him say that they ought to be debated and what have you, but they are not real in terms of their mandate.

Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. GARAMENDI have offered an amendment to try to create more than just jobs for robots. Their amendment would require that these foreign companies actively recruit and hire local employees—and I hope everybody votes for that amendment—that all the oil produced, they say, from the mine be processed in the United States, and that all equipment used at the mine will be made in the United States. I hope everybody supports that amendment.

Mr. MARKEY's amendment would require that these foreign companies pay a simple royalty to the United States on all minerals extracted from this site. If mining is done on U.S. land, the American people should be able to share in the profits.

Finally, what is most disturbing about H.R. 1904 is a complete lack of respect for sacred Native American sites that will be swept into mining operations. Native people won't even be able to comment on the land transfer until after it has occurred.

Now, I've seen that often in our area—I represent Native Americans, Seminoles and Miccosukee—and repeatedly where developers have gone forward, not just in mining but the artifacts of our great history in this country, and have caused us to pause. And we should be very careful with this particular measure because we don't want to repeat that that I've seen happen time and again in Florida. That's insulting and completely disrespectful to native traditions and culture.

And my friends on the other side of the aisle should be ashamed by the blatant mistreatment of Native Americans by this bill. Mr. LUJAN's amendment to exempt all Native American sacred and cultural sites from land conveyance under this bill is not just commendable, it is critically important and deserves the support of every Member in this body.

Madam Speaker, this is not a jobs bill, and there's no effort by this Republican majority to bring up a jobs bill. We shouldn't be wasting our time. We should not be wasting the American people's time with trivial bills that benefit foreign countries while our own citizens struggle to find work.

I urge a "no" vote. And on this business of the "forgettable 15," I urge that we do something to create jobs and not just try to give the impression that we are creating jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Minnesota Twins pitcher Jim Kaat, who should be

in the Hall of Fame—so for today we'll call it "Coppers Town" Hall of Fame—once said to a reporter that he was working on a new pitch. He called it a strike. You've heard a lot of accusations so far about this particular bill, most of which are balls, low, outside and in the dirt.

I now yield 4 minutes to the sponsor of this bill, a Representative from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), to actually pitch some strikes about what this bill actually will do.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman from Utah, and I appreciate the House spending time to consider this important jobs bill legislation this week.

The need for this land exchange legislation and ensuing copper mine was one of the very first initiatives brought to my attention by the people of my district. Those folks are excited about the economic development and sustainable growth that this project will bring.

□ 1440

They are anxious for these high-priority conservation lands to be placed in Federal stewardship. And they are sick of waiting for Congress to act.

H.R. 1904 may be new legislation, but this initiative is not. Over the past 6 years, this land exchange has been subject to intensive review, public consideration, and modification. It has been introduced in four separate Congresses, twice by Democrats, twice by Republicans. This proposal truly has bipartisan support on the ground in our State and across the country. The mayor of the town of Superior, an elected Democrat, testified in support of H.R. 1904. Democrat and Republican county supervisors in each affected economy endorse my bill. The governor supports my bill. This legislation is a win-win.

H.R. 1904 specifically facilitates a land exchange that will bring into Federal stewardship 5,500 acres of high-priority conservation lands in exchange for 2,600 acres of national forest system lands containing the third-largest undeveloped copper resource in the world. It is the richest copper ore body in North America ever discovered.

The United States currently imports over 30 percent of the country's copper demand. This project could produce enough copper to equal 25 percent of our demand, contributing significantly to U.S. energy and mineral independence.

Let me be clear. This is not going to be a new mine. The majority of the infrastructure is already in place. We are simply opening up the resource to the country's vital needs.

Today, more than 500 employees and contractors are at work in Arizona on this project as they prepare for us to take action on this bill. Upon passage, the private company will be able to employ 3,000 workers during the 6-year construction period. And ultimately, the project will support over 3,700 jobs, providing for \$220 million in annual

wages over the life of the project. These are good-paying jobs.

This is good old Superior right here who needs this. The total economic impact of the project is estimated to be over \$61.4 billion, over \$1 billion per year, and another \$19 billion in Federal, State, county, and local tax revenues. Fourteen billion dollars in Federal tax revenue—in these tough fiscal times, I think we can all agree that the Treasury could use that.

This bill is not only a jobs bill, it's a conservation bill. In exchange for opening up the third-largest undeveloped copper resource in the world, the Federal Government acquires 5,500 acres of high-priority conservation lands containing endangered species, sensitive ecosystems, recreational sites, and historical landmarks. Many of these lands being conveyed are landlocked by Federal lands, and the consolidation of the Federal lands will also contribute to better, more economically efficient Federal land management.

Today, The Arizona Republic, the largest newspaper in the State, issued an editorial in support of H.R. 1904. In that article, the editorial board highlights the big benefits of my legislation: jobs, tax revenue, and conservation. In the article they state, "The bill, with its combination of benefits, has every reason to get bipartisan support."

They continue, "In today's economy, it's hard to imagine that Members of Congress would fail to give this bill a resounding approval in the House."

Madam Speaker, I would like to submit the full editorial for the RECORD.

My legislation strikes the right balance between resource utilization and conservation. We can preserve lands that advance the important public objectives of protecting wildlife habitat, cultural, and historical resources, while enabling an economic development project to go forward that will generate economic and employment opportunities for the State and local residents.

Pass the rule and vote "yes" on H.R. 1904.

[From the Arizona Republic, Oct. 25, 2011]

A BILL TO LAUNCH 1,000-PLUS JOBS

Congress has a rare opportunity to create jobs, preserve a ribbon of river in the desert, raise tax revenue and boost production of a strategic mineral. Without spending a dime.

All it takes is a "yes" vote on a land exchange that would allow the Resolution Copper project to go forward. The proposed mine, near Superior, is at the site of the third largest undeveloped copper resource in the world.

The projected annual production volume is huge: enough to meet more than 25 percent of the current U.S. demand for copper over the next 40 years.

Resolution Copper, jointly owned by Rio Tinto and BHP Billiton, plans to put \$6 billion into building and running the mine.

Now that's economic stimulus.

But the project requires swapping private and federal property. A bill to approve it is scheduled to go to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives this week.

The Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011 is sponsored by Rep.

Paul Gosar, a Flagstaff Republican. This is the third version of the swap, which was proposed by his predecessors, Democrat Ann Kirkpatrick and Republican Rick Renzi.

The bill, with its combination of benefits, has every reason to get bipartisan support. Democratic Rep. Ed Pastor grew up in a mining town and knows the importance of this industry to rural Arizona.

Rep. Raúl Grijalva has stood in the way of the land exchange over the years. It's time for him to step aside.

The concerns he raised have been answered. The one remaining issue is the opposition of the San Carlos Apaches, and Resolution Copper has committed itself to extensive consultation with tribes.

Here's what a "yes" vote brings:

Jobs: 3,000 during construction and 1,400 when the mine is at full production.

Taxes: \$19 billion in federal, state and local revenues.

Conservation: Nearly 7 miles of the lower San Pedro River, named one of the "Last Great Places on Earth" by the Nature Conservancy, transferred from private into public ownership.

Ripple effect: An additional 2,300 jobs in the Superior area generated by mining needs and worker spending.

In today's economy, it's hard to imagine that members of Congress would fail to give this bill a resounding approval in the House.

With the able help of Arizona Sens. Jon Kyl and John McCain, it should get a "yes" in the Senate, as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would ask the gentleman from Arizona to respond.

Rio Tinto, the company from Australia, has a mine that is controlled by people that are 800 miles away from the mine.

Now, I heard you distinctly, and let me make it very clear. I remember this measure being offered by the lady that you won office from previously as well. And I'm one who seriously encourages that we protect our congressional areas.

But when you say it's going to create 3,000 jobs, let me give you a "for example" of how the local community does not work, and then ask you to respond. In the Everglades, we, many Members of this Congress, rightly have dealt with trying to preserve this area. So we have, with the Army Corps of Engineers and a variety of other people, a lot of earth moving and a variety of undertakings that are taking place.

In the meantime, one of my cities, Pahokee, has gone almost out of business. They're doing a remarkable job trying to stay afloat, and the area has diminished while all of this work is going on around them.

Now, how are you going to stop Rio Tinto, who can operate mines with robots, how are you going to stop them from bringing their Australian people? How are you going to stop the British from bringing their workers? Because, as in my city and counties that I'm talking about, when these big companies come in to do all of this work, they bring their workers with them, and we don't have the kind of jobs that are needed. And in this instance, you're talking about robots running large measures of it.

So how does that create jobs?

Mr. GOSAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. You're talking about robots. What I am talking about is trust. Trust is a series of promises kept. And what we see is right here in this picture. We have over 500 jobs that have been established here. We have seen the investment of this company in the local communities helping job creators, as far as truckers, independent construction organizations, trying to stay in business because, as you saw before, this is Superior, Arizona. This is what we've done to Main Street America. You see all the boarded up streets, all the buildings that are here.

What they've done is come in and established trust because what they've done is actually put people back to work. You talk about robots, but what I'm talking about is trust, which is actually what's happening on the ground.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, and I will yield to you additionally, I still didn't hear you address how you are going to cause these foreign companies—I'm not talking about that immediate amount of cement, and I'll grant you, 500 workers, but I heard you say 3,000.

I'll also grant you that it's temporary, and I'll make you a bet, and I hope you and I are here that when and if this measure passes and it does all the things that you say it's going to do, I'd like for you to come with me and I'll go with you, you come with me to Pahokee, where we passed all of these things and all of these people came from other areas and they made money, but the people in the area didn't.

Now I understand that you have to have somebody to hammer a nail and to drive a truck to get something put up. But when it's all said and done, your area isn't going to have anything other than robots that are going to be controlling this, with the exception of a handful of people.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOSAR. That's absurd. I've gone into the mine. I have actually seen the company. I've actually seen the work forces in here. I've actually gone down to the bottom of the mine. I got suited up and have been part of that. That's not appropriate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. You mean a copper mine or Rio Tinto's mine?

Mr. GOSAR. I have been in this copper mine. I have been in the shaft.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. You mean the one in Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. I have been in the one in Arizona.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I'm not quarreling with that. I'm talking about when Rio Tinto comes and this bill allows them to go forward in a way that allows them to robotize many of the—look, I'm not against technology. But what I'm saying to you is I don't see as how ultimately, that foreign compa-

nies are going to cause local communities to have increased employment that's sustainable.

Do you understand what I'm saying?

Mr. GOSAR. But I'm pointing back to the same purpose that I've actually seen trust exhibited here where they've actually hired people. I've seen the native people being hired. I've seen the local people being hired here, and that's a part of trust that we've got to get back to in this country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. All right. At least we had a fair exchange, and perhaps if we had more time with measures like this we could do similar. But I would hope then my argument about the Native American measures does not fall on deaf ears when you take into consideration the need to preserve our cultural heritage and artifacts that might be swept up in mining.

Mr. GOSAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1450

Mr. GOSAR. We've spent an exorbitant amount of time trying to discuss this with our Native Americans. We actually have law that we've gone through the area in exchange that shows no actual artifacts at all.

So the thing about it is that we want to make sure that that has occurred. And for the better part, since the 109th Congress, we've actually dialogued with the Native Americans, and what we have seen is an over-and-over exchange. So what has transpired is actually—

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time just to ask you one more question that requires a "yes" or a "no," and that is: You support Mr. LUJÁN's measure then that will make sure that that happens, an amendment that's coming up. Are you going to vote for that?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. LUJÁN's amendment is immaterial because it's already been done and it's already been held up by the—

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. So you aren't going to vote for it?

Mr. GOSAR. It's already been supported by documentation already presented. It's duplicative.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I get the picture.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I'm just trying to envision in my own mind all those robots that are working in the Rio Tinto mine in my State that have also developed the land plan that have developed those communities there. They really have disguised themselves extremely well.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the chair for bringing this measure to the floor, and to the sponsor, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

This is an extremely important measure for the State of Arizona. I

would invite those opposed to this legislation to walk down the streets of Superior or walk down the streets of Globe or Miami, Arizona, and see those empty streets, empty classrooms, and to try to say that these jobs aren't real, that mining jobs are not real; or to meet the hundreds of people, as I have, as well, who have gone to this mine and have toured it, and not one robot did I meet, not one, that I'm aware of. And the notion that a mine is going to be operated by robots owned by some foreign company somewhere rather than local workers who will pay a lot of taxes, who will generate other jobs that are ancillary is just unbelievable.

The notion that a foreign company can't have a significant investment in this country just runs afoul of everything we know about what has gone on for centuries here. The gentleman talks about a foreign company and they would only employ foreign workers. How about BMW in South Carolina, for example? Do they only employ foreign workers? No. Other car companies, other mining companies—part of the reason we have so few U.S. mining companies is because regulations here have driven them out of business. And so we relied on foreign mining companies to come in and actually make the investment to hire American workers. And make no mistake, there will be thousands of American workers hired here.

Walk the streets of Superior right now and meet the hundreds of people already working on this venture and try to convince them that these jobs are not real. I would invite anybody opposing this legislation, just try to do that. Try to tell somebody who finally has a paycheck to take home that that is not a real job or that other jobs that are going to be created here are not real.

It's all fine and dandy for people in Washington to try to tell people in a local community that have seen mining jobs in the past that have gone that when new mining jobs come that those jobs somehow are not real or that because a foreign company happens to have some ownership here that that makes it less of a job for them and that we should be able to tell them, "I'm sorry, you can't have your job because a foreign corporation has made an investment here." How arrogant is that? That's just wrong. We shouldn't have that.

So I applaud the gentleman for bringing this to the floor. This has been a long time in coming. Many of us have worked for years on this to get this land exchange to go. And the gentleman is right. This is a win-win for everyone. It is a win for the Federal Government and others who want to see pristine lands preserved because far more acres are actually preserved here, sensitive, environmentally sensitive acres, than are actually given up to the mine. Most of the mining here will take place between 4,000 and 7,000 feet underground.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman.

This is good for everyone and it means real jobs. The notion that these jobs are not real, that this bill does not create jobs is simply not the case. It doesn't square with the facts.

I urge adoption of this rule so we can debate this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1904, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act. It's one of the 40 bills that we have highlighted in the Western Jobs Caucus Frontier Report. The Jobs Frontier is our report of 40 different bills that will create jobs immediately.

I find the conversation curious. For my good friend from Florida, I wonder, the administration has just approved for the sale of Cirrus Aviation, that will be producing airplanes in this country owned by a foreign country, and so maybe the argument could be made, well, maybe those jobs aren't created and run by robots. So I now would direct our attention to maybe Daimler, Toyota, and maybe Honda. All have manufacturing facilities here, and I know they use robots, and I don't see the gentleman from Florida trying to shut them down.

What we're doing at this point in our history is driving the unemployment off the scale high because we're making ludicrous arguments against jobs creation bills across the spectrum.

In 1993 the U.S. accounted for 20 to 21 percent of all mining exploration. Today we are at 8 percent. It's because people have blocked the new mines throughout the West.

All we're trying to do here is make a land exchange, and the company giving up land is giving up twice the amount of land they are receiving in order to account for the value of the copper underground. We're trying to put about 1,500 long-term mining jobs in place in Arizona. Those jobs are going to be in the \$60,000 to \$85,000 a year range. They'll pay taxes. They'll come off unemployment. They'll come off welfare and food stamps. So we cut the cost of government simultaneously with increasing the revenues. That's a business model that always succeeds.

The price of copper is what's driving this to be a mine site that is now economic. Previously, 10, 15 years ago, the price of copper was about 75 cents. Today, it's almost \$4. So it's those economics that are encouraging us in this country to start producing from mines where we have not previously. This mine, by itself, would account for about 25 percent of the production in this country, needed in this country, for the next 50 years.

It's a good project. Let's approve the rule. Let's get on to debate of the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I will be the final speaker.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I tell my colleague that I am prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. With that in mind, Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, which I will not use.

I want to make it very clear to my colleagues that I'm not against foreign investment in the United States of America. I'm not against real jobs being created in the United States of America, including Arizona and including Superior. I'll tell Mr. GOSAR, I'll give you one Superior and I will match you with one Pahokee and one South Bay, Florida, where the jobs didn't come when the other circumstances that would take place in the community did.

I respect the mining industry, and I believe the mining industry can do their job in an environmentally and culturally sensitive way; and there are demonstrative evidences that take place all over this Nation that show that. But what I'm trying to get across here is that my colleagues on the other side are still not in the business of seeing to it that we immediately do something about firefighters, police officers, and school teachers in this country. And I assure you that that's something that we have not done in the 109 days that we have been here and almost 104 days that we have not.

Please, let's get about the business of doing something about the massive unemployment in this country that is desperately in need of the attention of this institution—the House and the other body.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, in closing, this is the map of the area which we're talking about. Everything that's orange there—or copper color—are historic or existing mines in this particular area. The yellow one is where this mine would take place. This is the mining district of the State of Arizona. Actually, even Arizona has the color copper in its State flag.

We are talking about jobs in Arizona versus jobs in where we are importing copper from now. We are importing copper from Chile, Canada, Peru, and Mexico—in that order.

□ 1500

We can either create jobs there or we can create jobs in Arizona. We can either develop our own resources or we can allow ourselves to rely on resources from foreign places. We can go forward in what we are trying to do here, realizing that even firemen and policemen need copper before they can actually do their work. All of us are going to have to have this mineral. We might as well get our minerals here, develop our jobs here, use our future here.

This is a great bill, and it is a fair rule in which all of the amendments—one technical and three which have nice sounds to them but which are going to be very difficult to put into reality if they actually are to pass—will be debated here on the floor.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I wish to reiterate once again the fairness of this structured rule. I urge this rule's adoption, and I urge the adoption of the underlying legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam 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, this 15-minute vote on House Resolution 444 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules on H.R. 2447.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 178, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 803]

YEAS—245

Adams	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Akin	Dold	Hurt
Alexander	Donnelly (IN)	Issa
Altmire	Dreier	Jenkins
Amash	Duffy	Johnson (IL)
Amodel	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Austria	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Bachus	Ellmers	Jones
Barletta	Emerson	Jordan
Bartlett	Farenthold	Kelly
Barton (TX)	Fincher	King (IA)
Bass (NH)	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Benishek	Flake	Kingston
Berg	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Berkley	Fleming	Kissell
Biggert	Flores	Kline
Bilbray	Forbes	Labrador
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lance
Black	Franks (AZ)	Landry
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Lankford
Bonner	Gallegly	Latham
Bono Mack	Gardner	LaTourette
Boustany	Garrett	Latta
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Brooks	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Long
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Bucshon	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Goodlatte	Lummis
Burton (IN)	Gosar	Lungren, Daniel
Calvert	Gowdy	E.
Camp	Granger	Mack
Campbell	Graves (GA)	Manzullo
Canseco	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Cantor	Griffin (AR)	Marino
Capito	Griffith (VA)	Matheson
Carney	Grimm	McCarthy (CA)
Carter	Guinta	McCaul
Cassidy	Guthrie	McClintock
Chabot	Hall	McCotter
Chaffetz	Hanna	McHenry
Coble	Harper	McKeon
Coffman (CO)	Harris	McKinley
Cole	Hartzler	McMorris
Conaway	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers
Cravaack	Hayworth	Meehan
Crawford	Heck	Mica
Crenshaw	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Culberson	Herger	Miller (MI)
Davis (KY)	Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary
Denham	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Dent	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)

Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, RANGEL, CARNAHAN, Ms. HAHN, Messrs. RICHMOND, FRANK of Massachusetts, and ELLISON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BARTLETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Ms. BUERKLE. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 803, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 235th birthday for the Marines, I want Members to know that in the audience is the Montford Point Marines. November 10 will be 235 years for the Marines. We are paying a special tribute today to the Montford Point Marines. They are in the House today, they are in the gallery, and I would like the men and women of this body to give them a standing ovation for their service to the United States. We thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, this is one of the greatest bipartisan efforts, Mr. BACHUS and both sides of the aisle and the leadership. I wish I could say what they say—y'all help me—ooh rah! Anyway, let's pass this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). Members are reminded that the rules of the House prohibit references to occupants of the gallery.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2447) to grant the Congressional Gold Medal to the Montford Point Marines, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 804] YEAS—422

Adams Akin Altmire
Aderholt Alexander Amash

Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones

Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman Giffords Renacci
Bachmann Lewis (GA) Wilson (FL)
Buerkle Paul
Capps Polis