

Bernice Johnson; Hank Johnson, Jr.; Timothy V. Johnson; Walter B. Jones; Barbara Lee; John B. Larson; John Lewis; Zoe Lofgren; Ben Ray Lujan; Carolyn B. Maloney; Edward J. Markey; Doris O. Matsui; Jim McDermott; James P. McGovern; Michael H. Michaud; George Miller; Gwen Moore; James P. Moran; Christopher S. Murphy; Grace Napolitano; Eleanor Holmes Norton; John W. Olver; Bill Pascrell, Jr.; Ron Paul; Donald F. Payne; Chellie Pingree; Jared Polis; David E. Price; Mike Quigley; Rep. Charles B. Rangel; Laura Richardson; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Linda T. Sánchez; Loretta Sanchez; Janice D. Schakowsky; Bobby Scott; José E. Serrano; Albio Sires; Louise McIntosh Slaughter; Jackie Speier; Pete Stark; Mike Thompson (CA); John F. Tierney; Edolphus Towns; Niki Tsongas; Maxine Waters; Anthony D. Weiner; Peter Welch; Lynn C. Woolsey, Members of Congress.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution with great reluctance.

I have had many great conversations and discussions with the sponsor of this resolution since coming to Congress about the issues of war and peace and justice. He even came to my district last year to join me in a town hall on the war in Afghanistan. He's been a great leader on this issue and a great friend.

I agree with the gentleman about the need to bring our troops home from Afghanistan as soon as possible. Recently, I joined a number of my colleagues in writing to the President to make clear our belief that the troop withdrawals from Afghanistan should be "substantial, significant, and orderly." The gentleman from Ohio did not join that letter although as I said, I know he shares the same goals of all those who signed it.

A few weeks ago, I voted for an amendment to H.R. 1 that would limit funding for the war in Afghanistan to \$10 billion, with the hope that those funds would be used by the Defense Department to plan and implement a timetable for the safe and expeditious withdrawal of our troops.

I want an end to these wars. One of the criteria that I have used for supporting those efforts and similar efforts in the past by a number of my colleagues is that we have to allow our military planners to implement that withdrawal in a way that is safe, orderly and responsible.

I doubt that the 30 day-withdrawal deadline in this bill meets that criteria. The bill itself recognizes that by giving the President the option to delay that withdrawal through the end of the year.

Although I am eager to withdraw, I am beset with a nagging question: how practical is it to move 100,000 troops and the associated equipment out of a country half way around the world in 30 days in an orderly, safe, and responsible fashion?

I support getting our troops out of Afghanistan. But we have to do so wisely. We can't waive a magic wand today and they are gone tomorrow or dismiss concerns about their safety. That is why on the issue of how that withdrawal is conducted, I have always supported legislation that defers that question to our military planners.

Again, even the letter that was sent to the President recently by a number of my colleagues, such as BARBARA LEE and JIM MCGOVERN, who like myself opposed the es-

calation of this war and want all of our troops home soon, does not dictate size or set a timetable for those withdrawals after July 2011.

That letter however did make clear that "a significant redeployment from Afghanistan beginning in July 2011 will send a clear signal that the United States does not seek a permanent presence in Afghanistan."

Even though July does not begin for over 100 days from now, sending that letter in March allows the military to have plenty of time to plan for a sizeable withdrawal.

This was the same gist of several bills by Mr. MCGOVERN last year that asked the military to give us their withdrawal plan by a certain date, including any reasons for why a redeployment might be delayed, rather than having Congress mandate that date.

Again, I support this resolution reluctantly because it sends an important signal to the Afghanistan government and its people that the U.S. is not intent on an endless occupation and that after ten years in America's longest war in history, we cannot morally or financially continue to afford this war. To the extent this resolution does that, I am in full support. However, again, my concerns remain about its method.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, once again we are debating this issue. And once again I will vote in support of ending our involvement in Afghanistan.

Our ongoing commitment in Afghanistan has proved exceedingly difficult and costly—and at a time when we can ill-afford the \$100 billion a year to sustain it. After years of war, the economic and military costs are straining our servicemembers, their families, and the country—they are simply too high.

President Obama increased our commitment there while also defining a goal of withdrawal. But our increased efforts have not yielded enough progress.

I have joined with my colleagues in sending a letter, led by Rep. BARBARA LEE, to the President supporting his planned drawdown of the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan beginning no later than July of this year.

It is time to bring this war to a responsible end.

Our brave men and women in uniform have fought well and continue to deserve our full support and commitment to return them home safely to their families and loved ones. They have fought with honor, at great cost, in the face of great challenges. I am humbled by their sacrifice.

While I support the President and our military leadership, I believe we must send a message that the U.S. cannot sustain further commitments in Afghanistan.

I believe the resolution before us today sends that message, and that is why I support it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 16, 2011, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

## PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 174, I call up the bill (H.R. 1076) to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1076

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

### SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO AND RADIO CONTENT ACQUISITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No Federal funds may be made available—

(1) to an organization that is incorporated as of the date of the enactment of this Act for each of the purposes described in subsection (c), or to any successor organization;

(2) for payment of dues to an organization described in paragraph (1); or

(3) for the acquisition of radio programs (including programs to be distributed or disseminated over the Internet) by or for the use of a radio broadcast station that is a public broadcast station (as defined in section 397(6) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 397(6))).

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) OTHER PURPOSES.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) shall not be construed to prohibit the making available of Federal funds to any entity, including an entity that engages in the payment described in such paragraph (2) or the acquisition described in such paragraph (3), for purposes other than such payment or acquisition.

(2) RADIO CONTENT ACQUISITION BY BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS OR DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY.—Subsection (a)(3) shall not be construed to apply to the acquisition of radio programs by the Broadcasting Board of Governors or the Defense Media Activity.

(c) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) To propose, plan and develop, to acquire, purchase and lease, to prepare, produce and record, and to distribute, license and otherwise make available radio programs to be broadcast over noncommercial educational radio broadcast stations, networks and systems.

(2) To engage in research study activities with respect to noncommercial educational radio programming and broadcasting.

(3) To lease, purchase, acquire and own, to order, have, use and contract for, and to otherwise obtain, arrange for and provide technical equipment and facilities for the production, recording and distribution of radio programs for broadcast over noncommercial educational radio stations, networks and systems.

(4) To establish and maintain one or more service or services for the production, duplication, promotion and circulation of radio programs on tape, cassettes, records or any other means or mechanism suitable for noncommercial educational transmission and broadcast thereof.

(5) To cooperate and participate with foreign broadcasting systems and networks in all aspects of international radio programming and broadcasting.

(6) To develop, prepare and publish information, data, reports and other materials in support of or relating to noncommercial educational radio programming and broadcasting.

(7) To otherwise forward and advance the development, production, distribution and use of noncommercial educational radio programs, materials and services, and to assist and support noncommercial educational radio broadcasting pursuant to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, as it may from time to time be amended.

(d) FEDERAL FUNDS DEFINED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term “Federal funds” means, with respect to receipt by a non-Federal entity from the Federal Government, the following:

- (A) Grants.
- (B) Loans.
- (C) Property.
- (D) Cooperative agreements.
- (E) Direct appropriations.

(2) GRANTS OR SUBGRANTS FROM NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—Such term also includes grants or subgrants from Federal funds made available to a non-Federal entity.

(e) CHANGES TO FUNDING FORMULA.—Section 396(k)(3)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396(k)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking “fiscal year” and all that follows and inserting “fiscal year, such amounts shall be available for distribution among the licensees and permittees of public radio stations pursuant to paragraph (6)(B).”; and

(2) in clause (v)(II), by striking “clause (ii)(I) and (III)” and inserting “clause (iii).”

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(2)—

(A) in the matter before clause (i) of subparagraph (B), by inserting “(except for the acquisition of radio programs)” after “public telecommunications services”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “(except for the acquisition of radio programs)” after “public telecommunications services”;

(2) in subsection (k)—

(A) in the 1st sentence of paragraph (3)(B)(i)—

(i) by striking “and subparagraph (A)(iii)(II).”; and

(ii) by striking “or radio”;

(B) in the 3rd sentence of paragraph (6)(B), by striking “paragraph (3)(A)(iii)(I)” and inserting “paragraph (3)(A)(iii).”; and

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking “(iii)(I)” and inserting “(iii).”; and

(ii) by inserting “(except for the acquisition of radio programming)” before the period at the end; and

(3) in subsection (l)(4)—

(A) in the matter before clause (i) of subparagraph (B), by striking “(iii)(II)” and inserting “(iii).”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “subsection (k)(3)(A)(iii)(II)” and inserting “subsection (k)(3)(A)(iii).”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “subsection (k)(3)(A) (ii)(III) or (iii)(II)” and inserting “subsection (k)(3)(A)(ii)(II) or subsection (k)(3)(A)(iii).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1076, a bill to get the Federal Government—and Federal taxpayers—out of the business of buying radio programming they do not agree with. This is a bill that is long overdue. Regardless of what you think of NPR, its programming or statements by its management, the time has come to cut the umbilical cord from the taxpayer support that has become as predictable as an entitlement program.

Much has changed, Mr. Speaker, in the media landscape since the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was created in 1967, followed by its creation of National Public Radio in 1970. Today, we have multiple listening choices. There is analog radio, digital radio, satellite radio, streaming radio over the Internet, and podcasts—both commercial and the self-published variety. Choice and available content are not the problem. If you want to find some content, the only question is where you will find it.

In these challenging economic times, committing the taxpayer to fund and support particular content, including content he or she may never listen to, highlights this absurd anachronism of the past. It is time to move forward and to let National Public Radio spread its wings and support itself.

This legislation does several important things. It prohibits the direct Federal funding of National Public Radio; and more importantly, it ensures that American taxpayers will not be funding through their tax dollars radio programming from NPR or other outlets with which they may not agree.

It is also important to recognize that this bill does not do a few things. It does not defund public radio stations. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is such an important point. It does not defund public radio stations. They still may use Federal funding to operate their stations or to produce their own programming. Public radio stations may also continue to purchase programming from NPR or other sources, just not with Federal taxpayer dollars. Also, this bill has no impact—I want to repeat that—no impact on public television.

The added benefit of this legislation is that it ensures that, if taxpayer dollars are necessary and given to local stations, the money will not be used to purchase generic national programming but, instead, can be used to produce local content that actually will meet the needs of the communities in which these are located.

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

□ 1330

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076. This bill will cripple National Public Radio, public radio stations, and programming that is vital to over 27 million Americans. We are now voting to deny the public access to one of our Nation's most credible sources of news coverage. CBO has scored this bill. It does not save a penny. This means that this legislation does not serve any fiscal purpose, but it does serve an ugly ideological one.

This legislation is not about reforming NPR. It is about punishing NPR. We've held no hearings on this bill. It didn't get referred to the committee for consideration. It's being handled as if it were an emergency. We don't even know all the facts, but that's apparently no impediment.

For decades, decisions on Federal support for public broadcasting have been made 2 years in advance to insulate public broadcasting from politically motivated interference. This bill removes that buffer. NPR is now exposed to the full force of the political winds that blow through the House of Representatives. That means the independence and objectivity that public broadcasting has tried so hard to uphold is now subject, clearly, to political interference.

For those who complain that they don't want content to be one way or the other on the political spectrum, to be honest and fair, the right-wing Republicans are trying to impose their view of what NPR should be saying in the content of their programming. They will say that's not the case; but, Mr. Speaker, that is the case.

There is no reason for this bill. It is vindictive, it is mean-spirited, it is going to hit the smallest stations in rural areas particularly hard. Public radio is indispensable for access to news that's hard to get, especially where broadband service is limited.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from the State of California (Ms. ESHOO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, be allowed to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the author of the legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Madam BLACKBURN, for your great work that you do on the committee.

I introduced H.R. 1076 because the Federal Government can no longer afford to fund programs that are fully capable of standing on their own. This is

not about the ideology of NPR executives or the content that NPR produces; but whether, in this age of trillion-dollar annual deficits, taxpayers should subsidize a nonessential entity.

Plain and simple, this bill accomplishes three things. First, it prohibits public radio stations from using Federal funds to purchase programming. Current Federal law requires that about 26 percent of Federal grants to public radio stations be used for the production or acquisition of programming. Many stations use these restricted grants to purchase programming from NPR. These programming fees are the largest single source of NPR revenue at \$56 million in fiscal year '10.

Second, H.R. 1076 prohibits stations from using Federal funds to pay NPR dues: in fiscal year '10, over 400 member stations paid a total of \$2.8 million in dues to NPR.

Third, my bill prohibits direct Federal fundings of National Public Radio. For fiscal year '10, NPR received over \$5 million in direct funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Departments of Education and Commerce, and the National Endowment for the Arts. These three sources of revenues I just described totaled about \$64 million in fiscal year '10.

Local public radio stations would not be able to use Federal tax dollars under this bill to purchase content, whether it's from NPR or any other vendor. However, under this bill, a station could use other dollars for the payment of NPR dues or the acquisition of programming. Should this bill become law, the prohibition of funds would take effect immediately.

But the real issue today is the proper role of the Federal Government with National Public Radio and whether government programs and services that can be funded privately should receive taxpayer dollars. We live in an age of digital radio, computerized digital streaming, commercial all-news radio, and radio talk shows, many of which are also streamed on the Internet or over satellite radio; and these provide sources of news and opinion without Federal taxpayer dollars. NPR should do the same.

With the national debt over \$13 trillion, the government should simply not continue to fund nonessential services, and this bill is just one step.

Long before any firings, videos, and executive comments at NPR, I sponsored legislation in Congress to pull the plug on taxpayer funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, NPR's parent company, as well as NPR. Last year, many of you will remember this issue came up as a YouCut item, and we voted in support of de-funding.

Last month, this House passed H.R. 1. Within that bill, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's unobligated funds for fiscal year '11 would be rescinded. When you couple H.R. 1 with this bill, H.R. 1076, we end up with taxpayers having to subsidize National Public Radio.

I'm a strong believer in the free market. I'd like to see NPR rework its business model and begin to compete for all of its income. NPR already receives a huge amount of funding from private individuals and organizations through donations and sponsorships. NPR can and should be entirely supported with private sources.

In my own State of Colorado, Colorado Public Radio received in fiscal year '10 only 6 percent of its funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Now, according to this bill, Colorado Public Radio is still permitted to apply for and receive Federal grants through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, but they cannot use Federal money for the NPR dues or purchasing of content. They could use the other 94 percent of their money to purchase program content. Will this potentially require them to review and reprioritize where money is spent? I'm sure it will. But will it kill its programming? No way.

According to NPR, Federal funding to supplement operations amounts to less than 2 percent of its annual budget. Some have said this Congress should not bother with such a small amount of money. Only in Washington would anyone say \$64 million is not worth saving. You have to start somewhere if you're truly serious about getting our fiscal house in order. If Congress cannot make difficult decisions in the small areas, how can we even begin to tackle entitlements or other major programs?

If we look at the sting video that has received so much attention, Ron Shuler admits that NPR would be better off without Federal funding. There is no need for further debate. NPR does not need taxpayer dollars. We can save a program, or we can save our country. Americans want Washington to get serious about ending our overspending. If we can do that, the economy will get better, and we will have less unemployment and more jobs.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LAMBORN. To wrap up, like many Americans, I enjoy much of NPR's programming; but let it live on its own. It can do that simply by changing its business model. Just take the taxpayer out of the equation.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in fierce opposition to this bill which is going to adversely affect more than 34 million National Public Radio listeners through 900 local stations across our entire country.

My Republican colleagues have declared an emergency to rush this bill to the floor without any hearings whatsoever to examine the proposal. I think that's a bad way to do business.

□ 1340

We have many emergencies to deal with in our country, but attacking and

crippling NPR is hardly an emergency. And it does it in a very sneaky backdoor way. What the bill does is it cuts off the use of all Federal funding to NPR by preventing any grants to it. It prevents any support to NPR by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and it prevents support to NPR programming from public radio stations across the country. In other words, it cripples it, it hobbles it, which is really what the majority is seeking to do.

This proposal is not going to do anything about reducing the deficit. The CBO has weighed in. It doesn't cut any Federal spending. In fact, the bill doesn't produce one penny in savings. What's very clear is what it does do, and it's really purposeful. And that is to hobble NPR, threatening 9,000 jobs at stations across the country. Why? I think the motivations behind this effort are quite clear: They are rooted in an ideological view about what NPR broadcasts, and it capitalizes on recent headlines involving Ron Schiller and Juan Williams. This attack on NPR strikes at the core of a wide array of NPR programming that Americans enjoy every single day, all week long across the country, from "The Diane Rehm Show" to "Morning Edition" and two of my favorites, "Car Talk" and "World of Opera." I acknowledge that our Nation faces threats, but "Car Talk" is hardly one of them, and neither is "Diane Rehm." Silencing what some disagree with—make no mistake about it—is a threat to our democracy. A great democracy does not silence voices. We want many voices to the many.

NPR programming reaches more than 900 independently owned and operated stations across the country, from San Francisco's KQED, the most listened to public radio station in the country with more than 740,000 listeners each week, to small rural stations like that of the chairman of the subcommittee, KCUW in Pendleton, Oregon. These stations provide an important public service to the local community, and people trust it, and they enjoy it. They want it. They like it. This is national programming with local listenership.

And NPR's listenership has increased, unlike other stations, by 72 percent over the last 10 years. A recent national survey found—and that's why I think this is an ill-begotten proposal by the majority. You say you listen to the American people. I think you have to take the plugs out of your ears. A recent national survey found that almost 70 percent of all voters across the entire political spectrum oppose terminating the funding for public broadcasting, including 56 percent of Republicans in the country.

So I think it's time to stand up for NPR. I think that this is a phony emergency measure, and I don't think NPR deserves to be treated this way. I urge my colleagues to vote to preserve really what I think is a national treasure. It provides in very tough times very

clear and important news and information to instruct our country and listeners in local communities around our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady. Mr. Speaker, let's really be honest and talk about what this bill is about. This bill is about making sure that we are spending taxpayer dollars the way that the people that earned them would spend them. And we saw, as the gentlelady from California indicated, on video executives at NPR saying that they don't need taxpayer dollars. So that's number one. That's out there. That was demonstrated for all of America to see. We are also in the process of making sure that Washington begins to do what every American family and small businessperson is having to do right now. It's called tightening the belt. It's called trying to learn how to do more with less. And inherently, what that means is, we have got to start prioritizing the things that are important to the American people.

The problem is, we have seen NPR programming and its programming often veer far from what most Americans would like to see as far as the expenditure of their taxpayer dollars. That's the bottom line. Nobody is on a rampage. Nobody is trying to say that we don't like NPR for NPR's sake. We have seen how they spend their money. So that's why we are saying, it's time to prioritize. It's time to reflect the common sense of the American people. And that's why the bill takes the form that it does. It says that we have got to, number one, listen to the executives at NPR who say that they don't need taxpayer funding.

Well, listen, we are all about looking for ways to cut right now and save on both sides of the aisle. We ought to take that advice for what it is. But we also know that NPR takes its funding and benefits from taxpayer dollars through the payments of local stations across the country. So what we are saying by this bill, those stations are not going to be starved from Corporation for Public Broadcasting grants, unlike the lady indicated. What they are going to be told is, You are not going to be using those taxpayer dollars for programming because we have seen how NPR has used that funding and the kind of programming that has been involved.

We are trying to find commonality. Our country is made up of much diversity with people of a lot of differing opinions. Why should we allow taxpayer dollars to be used to advocate one ideology? Why should we? We shouldn't. We should insist that our taxpayer dollars are prioritized, and the people's interests of this country are honored. That's why I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to our dis-

tinguished colleague from our beautiful State of California, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1076. I can't believe what I am hearing from the other side of the aisle. It's not a lefty-type organization. This bill would prohibit public radio stations from using Federal funds to buy popular programs like "Morning Edition," "All Things Considered," and "This American Life." Mr. Speaker, this would be a huge disruption to our Nation's public radio system, economy, and most importantly, the intellectual content and news that so many Americans rely upon.

According to a recent study, NPR's overall audience grew last year to over 27 million weekly listeners, up 60 percent overall since 2000. And this is when most other media outlets are struggling.

And as a former board chair of Sacramento's local PBS TV station, I can attest to the value that national public broadcasting programming offers to my constituents. Mr. Speaker, thousands of my constituents rely on local NPR stations to get their news, and this is a very diverse group. In fact, since this bill was introduced, I have received a significant number of calls from them voicing very strong support for NPR and very, very strong opposition to this legislation. One of my constituents told me that listening to NPR makes him a more informed, more engaged citizen.

Moreover, this bill will not produce any savings for the taxpayer and will not reduce the deficit. For my constituents, it's a simple equation of value for money.

□ 1350

And also, this is about jobs. We need to talk about jobs. Public radio stations employ over 9,000 workers across the country, including 40 in Sacramento. Mr. Speaker, these are jobs we cannot lose.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this harmful legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 2 minutes to one of our new freshman Members, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), who is a broadcaster and brings that expertise to this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1076.

As a broadcaster, I understand the importance of the free marketplace, the freedom to express yourself, but to do it on your own merit.

I brought an idea to the marketplace to develop a radio news network, started with four stations, and within 4 years was able to grow that to 50 stations serving five States. I did not ask for one thin dime from the Federal Government.

I think freedom to succeed in this country has to exist also with the free-

dom to fail. We have an open marketplace. We have an opportunity to sell advertising around the ideas that we express on the radio.

I'm a success story in using the open marketplace, the freedom to succeed. But it also comes with the freedom to fail. And earlier in the year, or last year, rather, I started a radio station, a small venture. I populated that staff with folks that were on unemployment; so I know what it means to create jobs.

And certainly this is not about further burdening our taxpayer with support of an industry that is perfectly capable of supporting itself.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Crisis averted, ladies and gentlemen. What a relief. What a relief. I'm glad we got the economy back going. I'm glad we've secured our nuclear power plants. I'm so glad that Americans are back to work.

We finally found out our problem. We discovered a target that we can all agree upon. It's these guys. This is the problem. It's Click and Clack, the Tappet brothers. We're finally getting rid of them. Thank God we solved this problem for the country.

Now, let's look at the record here. For one, they talk in that Boston accent. "Cah" talk. It's a "car." I need to call Congressman CAPUANO whenever they're on the air.

Secondly, they talk about master cylinders and slave cylinders. It's kinky. I am glad my Republican friends are finally getting to the bottom of this.

And then with all the giggling and snorting that they do every weekend on their show, it's got to be some kind of a code. They're clearly talking to the Russians or the Chinese or something with all that giggling and snorting.

It is fine. I'm so relieved that we had this emergency session, that we waived the rules of the House that require 72 hours so we finally get these guys off my radio. Click and Clack, the Tappet brothers on "Car Talk." I know it. Because these guys, clearly they're political. Well, I don't know if they're political. They make no sense about most of what they say.

But you know what? I'm glad we're finally not going to have to listen to them. I'm glad the Republican Party finally said enough of Click and Clack, the Tappet brothers. That clearly was what the American people said in campaign 2010. Clearly it's in their contract with America or something; right? Get rid of Click and Clack?

It's about time, I have to say, because the last thing we want is informative solutions to how we fix our cars and the Car Talk Puzzler. And think about all the people we're finally going to put out of work, you know, their Customer Care Rep, Heywood Yabuzzoff—I'll tell you how to spell this later, I say to the stenographer—and the Director of Ethics, Youlyin

Sack, all of these guys that finally are going to be taken off the public payroll.

The Republican Party, no one can say they're not in touch. They get it. They understand where the American people are. The American people are not concerned about jobs or the economy or what's going on around the world. They're staring at their radio saying, Get rid of Click and Clack. Finally my Republican friends are doing it.

Kudos to you.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 2 minutes to a highly respected member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Telecommunications and Internet Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MIKE DOYLE.

And Happy St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today the House Republicans want to eliminate funding for NPR, some because they think the government shouldn't operate a news service and some because they think the reporting is biased. I believe they're wrong on both counts.

Public radio plays an important role in our communities as a source of news and entertainment. My colleagues should consider the studies that show that NPR listeners are more aware of indisputable facts than viewers and listeners of most other news sources.

Opponents of NPR hold up a video hit piece to show that NPR is biased. Even Glenn Beck's Web site, The Blaze, explains that the video is neither fair nor balanced, how it's basically a lie.

And my colleagues should consider the fact that many NPR programs have nothing to do with news or politics. Where's the bias in "Car Talk"? There might be a bias against Pintos or Pacers, but not a political bias. Where's the political bias in music broadcasts? There might be a bias against Prokofiev, but not a political bias.

Even so, if this bill were simply to defund NPR's direct public contribution, then at least it would only impact the organization with the alleged political bias, which is, again, based on a lie. But this bill goes further. It hurts local public radio stations and tens of millions of listeners from across the country.

If this bill is enacted, communities across the country will be denied programming that their residents want. Whatever happened to the philosophy that more choice is better?

My colleagues, this is bad public policy. This is a terrible bill. This is a terrible waste of our time, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up what I think are probably a couple of misunderstandings that my colleagues have across the aisle.

One of the things I think it's important for everyone in this Chamber to realize, and I know some want to make fun of the fact that we're here talking about \$100 million, \$92 million, \$67 million, different funding that goes in and through NPR. Mr. Speaker, every single penny that comes from the taxpayer is important. And every single penny that we appropriate comes from those taxpayers, and we are charged with being good stewards of that money. Changing the structure in which NPR does their business, as Mr. LAMBORN said, looking at that business model, this is a step that we can take to save those taxpayer dollars. This is a step that is going to change that business model and free NPR.

Now, contrary to what some across the aisle are saying, this doesn't take NPR off the air. What this does is to say, NPR, you've got to get out of the taxpayers' pocket, because the taxpayer is not going to allow those taxpayer dollars to be spent to pay those NPR dues and to buy that NPR programming.

Now, another misconception that seems to be out there is about jobs and saying that programming is going to be denied because these stations won't be able to use taxpayer money to acquire some of this government NPR programming. Let me tell you, what we're doing is empowering these local radio stations, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues understand this.

□ 1400

We are turning to these local affiliates and saying, look, there are still going to be grants out there. You can create your own programming.

This is a great jobs program for these local radio stations. This is telling them you don't have to buy programming you don't want and that your listeners really don't want to listen to.

We are saying, get creative. Get that American spirit to work just as Mr. CRAWFORD was talking about. Find a niche in your marketplace and create a program.

Do you want to talk about the jobs that are created? Every time that you create a new radio show, you have got a writer, an editor, a producer, a director, a sound engineer, a sound tech, a systems engineer. You have got post-production work to take place. You have got a host. You have got a call screener, you have got a board operator, you have got a research assistant working with that writer and working with that editor. You have got a sales and marketing team working. You have got advertisers that are looking; now, of course NPR calls them sponsors. You have affiliate relations teams that are working. And you also have attorneys that are working on the intellectual property to make certain that they protect that content.

So I would just encourage my colleagues across the aisle here to remember, this is about freeing up those local radio stations. It is about getting NPR out of the taxpayer pocket. It is making certain that we are good stewards of the taxpayer money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. I would just like to add something here, and that is that one of the mantras of our friends on the other side of the aisle was "read the bill."

If the gentlewoman from Tennessee would read the bill, she would know that there is not one dime, not one cent that is saved in this bill. And what this bill does is you can talk all you want about NPR and how much you love it, but what you are doing is killing off the local stations from being able to have the money to buy NPR's programming. So you are hurting local broadcasting.

I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished woman from the Santa Barbara, California area, a valued member of the committee, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPs.

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this effort to defund public radio.

Right now, millions of Americans tune in to NPR stations across the country for one reason, the consistency of the high quality of its programming. In a world awash by often ill-informed and sensationalist cable news and ever louder voices, public broadcasting provides thoughtful, even-handed analysis of the issues of the day. And they do it every day. The bill before us seeks to end that. It is nothing more than an effort to cripple NPR by crippling our local public radio stations.

The bill would decimate local NPR stations by restricting their ability to choose programming best suited to their community.

In my district, NPR stations like KCLU, KCRW, and KCBX provide valuable international and domestic news. They bring "All Things Considered," "Morning Edition," and "Car Talk" into our cars and our living rooms. But these stations also cover local news, concerts, local and school events. They produce shows like "Ears on the Arts," "Community Calendar," and "From Ballet to Broadway." The bill throws all that out the window.

NPR reports and media coverage are consistently even-handed, driven by a high standard of journalistic ethics. They are not politically biased. NPR lets the stories do the talking, not the commentators. And apparently the public, the tax-paying public, likes that.

According to the Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism, in the last year the television networks' audience slipped 3.5 percent, newspapers were down 5 percent, radio fell 6 percent, magazines were down almost 9 percent. NPR, up 3 percent. Since 2000, NPR's audience is up 58 percent. In the last

year, it's Web site, npr.org, drew an average of 15.7 million unique monthly visitors, up more than 5 million visitors.

This is a reflection of the quality of its programs and its dedication to its mission. Public broadcasting helps educate our society, celebrates the arts, education, respectful debate, and civil discourse. NPR and the 900-plus local stations are valuable resources for our country.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for public broadcasting and oppose this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, since the previous speaker talked a little bit about NPR and its listening audience, I would like to make certain that the record reflects a little bit about that listening audience.

We know that more men than women listen to NPR, except for the classical music, which is 48 percent female. Baby boomers are a big part of their audience.

We also know that NPR, according to their Web site, says that their audience is extraordinarily well educated. Nearly 65 percent of all listeners have a bachelor's degree, compared to only a quarter of the U.S. population.

We also know that they are wealthy listeners, Mr. Speaker. NPR households tend to be more affluent than other households as a result of their educational attainment. The median household income of an NPR news listener is about \$86,000, compared to the national average of about \$55,000.

We also know that when it comes to geography, more than 99 percent of the U.S. population has access to at least one NPR station. And then, when it comes to employment, the majority of NPR listeners, 63 percent, are employed full time.

Mr. Speaker, again, I repeat the point. The object of this today is to get NPR out of the taxpayers' pockets. It is time for us to do this. It is time for this structure to be changed. It is time for us to be good stewards and save the money of the American taxpayer. This is another step toward that goal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to Congresswoman TAMMY BALDWIN from Wisconsin, a highly valued member of the committee.

Ms. BALDWIN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this bill which prohibits Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content.

I am incredibly disappointed in my Republican colleagues for this needless attempt to cripple NPR and threaten thousands of jobs in the public broadcasting community. Without so much as a single hearing on this subject, this bill dissolves a vital public radio system depended upon by millions of Americans across the country.

Twenty-seven million Americans listen to NPR each week, and back home

in Wisconsin nearly 450,000 people listen to Wisconsin Public Radio weekly over three statewide networks. In addition, 2.3 million visitors visited the Wisconsin Public Radio Web site in 2010.

Those who listen to Wisconsin Public Radio know how much there is to love. Wisconsin Public Radio provides over 9 hours each weekday of interactive radio programming, engaging Wisconsin residents and experts from around the world in public policy, culture, arts, and educational discussions. And because Wisconsin is largely a rural State, our citizens rely on over-the-air broadcasting more than almost any other State. This means that Wisconsin audiences significantly rely on public radio.

Not only would this horrible bill, rushed before us today, cripple local radio stations and programming that we enjoy in Wisconsin; it severely harms listeners' access to national shows, like "Morning Edition," "All Things Considered," "This American Life," "A Prairie Home Companion," and one of my personal favorites, "Whad'ya Know," among many others.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is clearly not interested in creating jobs or dealing seriously with this deficit. Despite all of the talk, we are here today considering legislation that attacks public radio. I strongly oppose this bill, and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to do so, too.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

□ 1410

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to rise in support of this bill. The Federal Government has a few constitutional duties, and we seem to have taken on a lot of Federal responsibilities. As time goes on, every time we see a need, we think we have to tap into the taxpayers and create another government function. But this is not one of those functions that is an enumerated power of the United States Congress. It is not something that we are compelled to do. It is something that is discretionary. We are into operations at a time of austerity, a time when we see what's happened as a prelude to the American economy, if we just look over to Europe, in places like, oh, Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Spain, for example. That's the direction we're heading with our economy. And as we see this discretionary spending grow along with our entitlements grow and our economy contract, we also need to take a look at these items that are at our discretion as to whether or not to fund.

I think that the image that we have seen on the videos tells us something about the internal culture of NPR. If you haven't seen the videos, or if you've just seen the little text in there, that doesn't give you the real sense of

what was going on in that conversation with Mr. Schiller at that table for 2 hours that day. If you look at the whole video, you'll see, the cast of the character and the content reflected, the culture of NPR; in the same way, in my view, that the videos of ACORN reflected accurately the actual internal culture of ACORN. We shut off the funding to ACORN for that reason. Of all the data that we've put out on ACORN, you couldn't be convinced to shut off the funding until you saw the reality of the video.

Then we looked into Planned Parenthood, and of all the data that was brought out here to the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker—and I compliment MIKE PENCE for doing so and all of those who stood with him and for life—still, the American people didn't understand the real culture of Planned Parenthood until they saw the video.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady.

Of all the data that we've seen, we still had not absorbed the real culture of NPR, until we saw the video of that dinner, those 2 hours that day.

So I stand in support of this act and this resolution, and I believe it's time for us to draw a bright line in our budget and cut this funding. I will be voting to adopt the cutting of the funding, as will my colleagues.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 13 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 11 minutes remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. Thank you.

I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman ED MARKEY, whom I think possesses the broadest and the deepest knowledge about telecommunications in the Congress.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, in an era when Edvardian drama is the only way to characterize the way in which cable news deals with the public affairs of our country, there is an oasis of real news that begins with Morning Edition, goes right through the day to All Things Considered, which focuses on that most unusual of all subjects, hard news, that the American people can use to make judgments about the affairs of our country and the affairs of the world. It is an oasis of information that is supplemented, yes, by Lake Woe Begone, On Point, other programs that raise the cultural level but serve as a place where people, 170 million Americans, can go to get real information.

Now what is this debate all about? Well, it's really about an ancient animosity which the Republican Party has had to the very creation of NPR, through Newt Gingrich, through the



early years of the 21st century, right up to today where it's on a list of grievances which they have about this ability of NPR to provide this news and information. That's what the debate's about. You don't have to be Dick Tracy to figure out what this debate is all about. They have right from the very beginning of the creation of this network wanted to destroy it.

I think that they are going to run into a razor blade sharp edge reaction from the American public as they find that, in place of Morning Edition and Car Talk and All Things Considered, they want to move to radio silence, and when the American people find out about that, they are going to be outraged.

I would vote "no" and urge strongly a "no" vote for all Members of this body.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address one thing. This is not an ancient animosity. I don't think I'm quite that old. And I don't think you have to be Dick Tracy to figure out what this debate is about. This debate is about saving taxpayer money. We do not have a revenue problem in this town. We have a spending problem in this town. The Federal Government does not have the money to fund these programs. We are borrowing 42 cents of every single dollar that we spend. We have to get the spending under control. We have to get an environment where the American people can get back to work. And we're talking about funding for NPR.

I just gave the demographics. It is a wealthy, educated listening audience. If people want this programming, Mr. Speaker, they're going to be willing to pay for it. But the American taxpayer has said, get NPR out of our pocket.

I pulled the sponsors for NPR, and I think my colleagues would be interested in this. When you go to the NPR Web site and you start pulling the sponsors, they don't sell advertising, but they do have many sponsors. They have some sponsors that land in the \$1 million plus category. And then they list sponsors all the way down to \$5,999. This is how wealthy the sponsorship base and the subscribership base is for them. It is time for us to remove the Federal support system that they have relied on. They have told us they do not need the money. We need to cut the umbilical cord. We need to see what NPR can do on their own.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the dean of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California for her yielding me this time, and I commend her for her opposition to this outrageous piece of legislation.

I rise in strenuous opposition to H.R. 1076, visited upon us without any attention to regular order, hastened to the floor in defiance of the commitments of the Speaker, and without any hearings or consideration by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. No opportunity for the public to speak or to be heard on what we're doing.

The majority continues to force Members of this body to waste time and energy of the House, a critical asset of this Nation, on political witch-hunts with respect to health care and the environment. Now we find that we're adding public broadcasting to this list.

Public broadcasting is a national treasure. It provides us impartial, honest coverage of facts and news. It provides information not available elsewhere. And, yes, it sheds a little bit of culture on our people, something which probably my Republican colleagues find offensive. It has done so at very low cost to the public, with huge contributions from the people for the support of this.

This legislation is going to prohibit local stations like Michigan Radio in Ann Arbor, and in your own districts and in your States, from using money from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to acquire or produce any public radio programs. As regards process, we are completely evading the processes and the commitments that are to be found in the rules and the pronouncements of the leadership on the other side. And we are finding that the history of this, which goes back to the 1934 Communications Act in the Commerce Committee, has been grossly disregarded.

So much for regular order. And so much for transparency that the majority made such a big fuss about at the beginning of this year. What's next? Are we going to amend the Endangered Species Act on the floor to declare an open season on Big Bird? Or upon programs which educate our kids or which contribute to the advancement of our society?

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1076. It's a bad bill.

□ 1420

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who is the chairman of the House Caucus on Public Broadcasting.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentlelady.

I want to make five basic points.

Number one, there are no savings to the taxpayer in this bill. It simply passes on higher costs and fewer choices to local stations.

Second, it is not going to stop NPR, which will go on in New York and Los Angeles and even Portland, Oregon. What it will cripple is what happens in smaller local stations around the country who rely on NPR and other public broadcasting entities for their content.

My good friend from Tennessee just went through all the steps that are necessary to produce local content. That is complex and it is expensive. That is why they voluntarily buy "Morning Edition" or "Prairie Home Companion" or "Car Talk."

NPR never said it didn't need the money. They are relying on a discredited video that was exposed by Glenn Beck's Web site, of all places. Our friends should talk to the thousands of volunteers at home who rely upon public broadcasting resources to provide the content that Americans love.

Reject this travesty.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in response to this statement that there are no savings, may I point my colleagues to a CRS report on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Federal funding and issues, and I will be happy to submit this for the RECORD.

Reading from it: "NPR, Incorporated, which oversees the NPR system, states that annually NPR receives direct funding in the range of \$1.5 million to \$3 million from three Federal agencies and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Those are the National Endowment for the Arts, the CPB, the Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and the Department of Education."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is you can't do that anymore. This is one of the steps that we have to take in order to straighten out this budgeting process. Our country does not have the money to spend on this. NPR does not need the money. They will not be able to get these grants. We will save those dollars.

The American taxpayer has said, Get your fiscal house in order. This is a step in that process. I know they don't like it, but, you know what? This is something we can do. This is something we will do. This is something the American people want to make certain that we do so that we get this Nation back on a firm fiscal and sound fiscal policy.

The day has come that the out-of-control Federal spending has to stop. A good place to start is by taking NPR out of the taxpayer's pocket.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlelady from California.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076 to defund National Public Radio. Overwhelmingly, my Rhode Island constituents agree, this legislation is no more than an ideological attack on public broadcasting masquerading as a fiscal issue. That is because Federal funding accounts for less than three-thousandths of one percent of the annual Federal budget. In addition to that, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says this legislation will not reduce the deficit by a single penny.

Without as much as a hearing, this legislation undermines public broadcasting, a system that 34 million Americans turn to weekly and in which Americans across the political spectrum place high trust.

These funding restrictions will devastate the economy of public radio. It will harm local stations. It will inhibit their ability to attract audiences, develop stable local revenue bases, and, most importantly, their ability to continue to produce local programming. Public broadcasting gives voice to the smallest and most diverse communities in our country. I know firsthand the high quality broadcasting the NPR provides in Rhode Island and all across this country.

It would also endanger 9,000 jobs at local public radio stations and communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this assault on the free exchange of ideas and instead support a democracy that continues to listen carefully to its people.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is one of the great advocates of public broadcasting in the Congress.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition. 170 million Americans use public media for vital news. Sixty-one percent of voters who support deficit reduction also support funding for public broadcasting. Yet the assault on public broadcasting continues, when jobs and the economy should be our top priority.

This outrageous bill would prohibit public radio stations from using Federal funds to acquire any radio programming from any outside source. That means that your local stations may not be able to air quality programming.

We were not sent here to silence "Prairie Home Companion," "Car Talk" and "Morning Edition." Let's stop trying to put Diane Rehm out of work and focus on putting more Americans back to work.

Reject this bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), the chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady. I wish her a happy St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, there is a pattern here. Americans are seeing through what amounts to an ideological purge.

In Wisconsin, under the guise of dealing with the deficit, they are taking away collective bargaining rights.

In Washington, under the guise of dealing with the deficit, they are cutting Planned Parenthood and taking away women's rights.

Under the guise of dealing with the deficit, they are planning to privatize Social Security and voucher Medicare, as if they had anything to do with causing the deficit and the problem we are in.

And under the guise of saving taxpayers' dollars, what they are doing is silencing NPR, not because it saves money, but because it is not on the same ideological frequency of the extreme right.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when is the majority going to try to solve a real problem? The reaction to unemployment is "so be it." The reaction to an immoral Afghanistan policy is a big shrug. But a modest investment in educational, commercial-free programming, now, that is a national crisis. I guess they figure if they can't catch bin Laden, they might as well go after "A Prairie Home Companion."

Public broadcasting, Mr. Speaker, performs a vital function in a democracy. It is also twice as popular as the Afghanistan war, and it supports 21,000 jobs. That is 21,000 jobs more than the Republican agenda would create.

Vote against H.R. 1076.

□ 1430

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. While Republicans insist today that NPR is a four-letter word, the real attack is on KUT and similar public radio across America. Two hundred fifty thousand Texans rely upon KUT's in-depth radio news scrutiny of the Texas legislature and local government. The only "bias" of those who begin with Morning Edition is a bias for truth. My constituents tune in to KUT because they want fact-based, not faux-based, not FOX-based coverage.

Like their continued assault on PBS, these Republicans just can't tell the difference between Big Government and Big Bird. While they pander to Wall Street, they continue to want to terminate support of Sesame Street. "All Things Considered," their attack really has nothing to do with balancing the budget. It is an ideological crusade against balanced news and educational programming. Cutting access to the power of knowledge decreases our ability to hold our government accountable. Don't weaken our democracy by weakening this vital source of reality-based journalism.

Don't cut KUT. Public radio serves the public interest.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to one of our freshman Members, the gentleman from the Florida Panhandle (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. We talk about Big Bird and that sounds wonderful. We had a couple of Big Birds in my family. We have four small children, and they love Big Bird.

But I will tell you this: When the CEO of Sesame Street is compensated \$956,000 in 2008 compensation, that's over double what the leader of the free world makes. Think about that: \$956,000, when, in the same year, Sesame Street received \$211 million in toy and consumer product sales.

So to stand here and say that we have the luxury at this incredibly critical crisis moment in our deficit struggles that we have the luxury of making sure that PBS can pay Mrs. Kerger \$632,000 in salary, and that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting can pay its President and CEO \$300,000 apiece, I mean, really. Are we serious? Are we serious?

We can do better. We must do better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 3 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. At this time I would yield 1 minute to the gentleman, the great Irishman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, National Public Radio has the strongest intellectual, artistic, and informational in-depth content of any radio network in this country because its content is not compromised by corporate ownership. I love it. But I won't lose it.

It's the rural stations that depend on NPR for half their budget. They can't afford to lose this national asset, nor can the 36 million people who rely on emergency alerts from NPR in times of crisis. The commercial market won't do that because there's no profit in it. Nor can the visually and hearing-impaired afford to lose the technology NPR developed.

This has nothing to do with the deficit. It's an infinitesimal fraction of our national debt. It jeopardizes 9,000 jobs, and it distracts us from solving the real problems that this Nation faces while trying to destroy one of the primary sources of an enlightened electorate.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is one of those things that's kind of what's wrong around here. Everybody says, Don't do this, don't do this; that's not much money, that's not much money. Mr. Speaker, it all adds up. And the American people have had it with the Federal Government spending money they do not have.

With that I yield 1 minute to a wonderful new Member who has joined us, the gentlewoman from Dunn, North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation.

Let us be clear: This legislation would simply prohibit direct Federal



funds—taxpayer money—from being made available to National Public Radio, or as we know it, NPR, and would prohibit public radio stations from using Federal funds to pay for their NPR dues. The bill would prohibit public radio stations from using Federal funds for the production or acquisition of programming.

I want to be very clear: I am in support of the arts. However, I do not believe that NPR has the right to public funds from our hard-earned taxpayer dollars when they receive plenty of funding from private sources. These prohibitions would not affect a local radio station's ability to use Federal funding for their operations or for the reduction of their own programming. NPR already receives direct Federal funding through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Department of Education, Department of Commerce, and the National Endowment for the Arts. They also get a considerable amount of money from local radio stations. Why do they need more?

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield 1 minute to the brilliant, brilliant gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, NPR provides news and cultural enrichment—yes, enrichment—that adds value to the lives of millions of Americans. It reaches into all parts of our country, even into that fact-free universe where the other side seems to be living, saying that factual information is somehow a liberal bias.

We talk about the need for a well-informed public. Just this morning, we had a reminder of the benefits that NPR brings to America. Today, there was a news report on the slow progress the U.S. Army is making towards seeing that wounded soldiers get the Purple Hearts they deserve. General Chiarelli, the Army's second in command, remarked in this story that it was previous reporting by NPR that was removing the confusion and the misunderstanding that had prevented the serving soldiers from getting the Purple Heart recognition. This is good reporting. The other side seems to think that this is, that this is, this is—wait, wait, don't tell me—biased reporting.

We need NPR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield my remaining 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, a study conducted by the Center for International and Security Studies found that those who said they received most of their news from NPR

were only about one-fourth as likely to hold a demonstrably false belief about important issues relating to the Iraq war as those who primarily consumed news from our colleagues' favorite news channel. A similar study conducted last year on mainly economic issues produced similar results. Those who primarily listened to NPR were considerably less likely to hold demonstrably false beliefs.

So now our colleagues across the aisle want to pull the plug on NPR, one of the most accurate sources of demonstrably true news and information. Our colleagues want to fire the messenger. This is not a move to create jobs or save money. This is a move to save face at the expense of truth. And I believe that such a move comes at a price that we simply cannot afford to pay.

This country needs NPR. Vote against the Republican bill.

□ 1440

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I do think our colleagues across the aisle are missing the point on this. We are responsible for making certain that this fiscal house gets in order. This is just another of those steps. This bill is not about taking NPR off the air. There is nothing here that says you will take NPR off the air.

What it simply says is, if you are an affiliate station and if you want to pay NPR dues, you can't use taxpayer dollars. If you want to buy NPR programming, you cannot use taxpayer dollars for that. The taxpayers want NPR out of their pockets. Now, there is plenty of popular programming out there, and if listeners want to hear that, we are not trying to disenfranchise those listeners. Indeed, if listeners like the NPR they have, they can keep it. What we're saying is that they need to raise the money for this.

We went through the demographics for NPR: college-educated; 63 percent have full-time jobs; the average household income is upwards of \$86,000 a year. They have a list of sponsors who give over \$1 million a year to NPR. NPR, itself, has said it does not need our taxpayer funding. So this is a place that we can save some money.

Now, to those who say it is a job-killing program, may I remind you, indeed, to develop local programming, I articulated 17 different positions that are attached to creating even one radio show. Unlike some of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I fully believe there are talented people—talented writers and editors and programmers—all across this great Nation who would love to have a platform for the great ideas and the content they would like to create.

I want to encourage all of my colleagues to take a step in the right direction in getting our fiscal house in order. The time has come for us to claw back this money. The time has come for us to send a message. We need to get NPR out of the taxpayers' pockets. I encourage a "yes" vote on H.R. 1076.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to not only support National Public Radio, but to speak against a bill that is a top example of thoughtless political pandering.

The consequences of this legislation are much broader than simply defunding NPR, which provides thoughtful news broadcasts and well-known programs that are listened to by my constituents and over 27 million people nationwide. This bill will cause all locally owned public broadcasting stations across our country to lose key funding. Yes, this is a job killing bill brought forth by my Republican colleagues.

The Republican leadership wants the public to think that they're working hard to cut spending and that this legislation will help taxpayers. Let's call them out on what they're really doing: putting jobs at risk so that they can appeal to right-wing voters. This is not just pettiness—it's pure hypocrisy and goes against everything that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle supposedly stand for. Does this bill save a great deal of money? No—it doesn't do a thing to reduce the deficit. Does this bill create jobs? Absolutely not—in fact, it does the opposite. And what happened to the Republican commitment to transparency? This bill has not been available for 72 hours, breaking the Republican leadership's pledge to allow three days for the public to read legislation, and several germane amendments have been rejected.

This bill sacrifices jobs and well-loved programs to score political points. It is a waste of this Congress's time and the legislators behind it should be ashamed of themselves. I am happy to work with my colleagues toward real deficit reduction and job creation strategies. Until that happens, I urge Members to vote no against this harmful and tactless legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076, a Republican bill to prohibit federal funding for National Public Radio.

Congress has been in session this year for nearly three months, and what have the American people gotten?

The House voted to repeal new patients' rights and benefits and to strengthen the rights of insurance companies.

The House voted to cut funds for education and Pell Grants at a time when we need to build up, not tear down, our educational and economic competitiveness.

The House voted to eliminate funds for Planned Parenthood, a highly regarded source for medical and health information and services for women.

The House voted to take away the rights of workers to contest workplace abuses by their employers, weaken the reporting system for workplace safety violations, and lower the wages of construction workers on federal contracts.

And now, today, the House is voting to kill the small amount of federal funding for National Public Radio, an important and unbiased source of news for tens of millions of Americans across the country.

Not one bill so far to create jobs. Not one bill so far to invest in America. Not one bill that makes it clear America will be ready to compete in the global economy and win the race to produce the best college graduates in the world.

Instead, the American people are being fed a steady diet of right-wing ideological attacks

on our rights, on our values, and on middle class economic opportunities. American families are desperate for work, but they are getting nothing but a cold shoulder from the House of Representatives under this new leadership.

The attack on NPR, just like the attack on Planned Parenthood, or on Head Start, and on workers' rights and safety, has nothing to do with reducing the deficit and the debt. It is nothing more than a partisan political agenda that is out of step with, and very dangerous to, the American people.

The attack on NPR is outrageous and it should be rejected. The American people benefit greatly having this source of news that is free from the influence and demands of corporations and that consistently delivers top quality, in-depth, and breaking news on foreign affairs, science and technology, politics, the arts, and business.

If this leadership is so concerned with the deficit, why hasn't it called up legislation to reduce tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies to major oil companies, companies with record profits quarter after quarter and no need for subsidies to carry out their work?

Why hasn't this leadership called up legislation to reduce some of the billions of dollars in Pentagon waste documented year after year?

And why was this leadership's first major action in the House a bill that would increase the deficit over the next ten years by more than \$210 billion by repealing our historic health care law?

Why? Because their rhetoric about deficit reduction is just a cover for a divisive political agenda that they hope will help them in the next election.

I strongly support eliminating wasteful government spending, and I have a long and documented track record of deficit reduction. Whether it was my successful effort to increase student loan aid by reducing taxpayer support to private lenders, or passing the health care reform law, or through my early support for Pay-As-You-Go budgeting, I have always made this a priority.

I know how hard it is to make tough choices about saving taxpayer money and being fiscally responsible.

I know it is not hard for politicians to cut Head Start, but it's really hard on low-income mothers trying to educate their children. And I know it is not hard to cut the small amount of federal funding for NPR, but it is really hard on the millions of Americans who hunger for information from a wide variety of sources.

I'll tell you what's hard to cut. It is really hard to cut land subsidies to multi-national mining companies, or royalty subsidies to oil companies, or water and price subsidies to major agricultural corporations. I know, because I have fought to make those cuts. And corporations fight back, hard.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I rise in opposition to this bill that will not reduce our deficit but will reduce the level of information Americans have about really complex and important issues facing our country. And I rise in opposition to the past three months of partisan, ideological and political attacks on the basic rights, values and services that are so important to our country.

And I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076, which would prohibit federal funding of National Public Radio, and

I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided bill. National Public Radio (NPR) provides an essential public service to our nation at a minimal cost to taxpayers. In Rhode Island, WRNI utilizes federal funds to provide local coverage of news events with local reporters. Without these funds, which account for nearly 8 percent of their annual budget, WRNI would lose its ability to bring local information to local communities, from the breaking news of the day to upcoming arts and cultural events.

This bill will not reduce our deficit by one penny and it will not save or create any jobs. In fact, some have estimated that 9,000 jobs will be lost due to the elimination of federal funding for NPR. In a time of unprecedented global events, from natural disasters to citizen uprisings to dramatic economic upheaval, we must ensure that people have access to accurate information, not limit it even more. Once again, I urge my colleagues to put politics aside and oppose this bill to eliminate federal funding for NPR.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1076, a bill to Prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content.

NPR is a congressionally chartered non-profit organization that provides independent and non-partisan news and education to approximately 27 million Americans each week.

This is a politically motivated bill that would hurt over 900 local radio stations across America that rely on NPR for fact based news content and the millions of Americans who listen to NPR for their daily news.

NPR enjoys very strong support from the American public as nearly 70 percent voiced their opposition to eliminating funding for public broadcasting according to recent polling.

Constituents in my home of Dallas, Texas have contacted my office by the hundreds; making phone calls, sending emails and faxes to express how important NPR is to them.

This bill will do nothing to create jobs or improve our economy. In fact, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has stated that this bill would produce zero savings to the taxpayer, and do nothing to reduce the deficit.

Families with low incomes, families living in rural areas, and minorities would be especially hurt by this legislation.

Smaller radio stations in rural America rely on NPR more than large cities for radio content so they would be more greatly impaired by the bill's prohibition against using federal funding to local radio stations to pay for any content from any source, depriving them of hours of programming every day.

At a time when our national news is driven more and more by commercial interests and obsession with viewing ratings, it's more important than ever for Americans to have an objective and unbiased source of news and national commentary that is based on facts and reporting.

I also object to the process that the Republican Leadership has brought this bill under consideration today. The Republican Leadership have reversed themselves on their own promise to for every bill to undergo 72 hours of review.

The American people have not heard a single hearing on this bill nor have they heard a single minute of testimony from any expert witness on the merits of this bill.

Not only was this bill rushed to floor of the House without sufficient review and scrutiny by the public, but the Republican Leadership has brought this bill to the floor that prohibits any opportunity for any other Representative in this House to offer a single amendment to improve it.

This is not the way to run the people's House. This legislation is pure political posturing and is distraction from what we should be doing today, which is working to create jobs and improve our economy.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand with me today in voting "no" on this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong disapproval of H.R. 1076, which would prohibit federal funds to National Public Radio. The proposal today is a draconian attempt to kill public radio to millions of listeners across our nation who depend and cherish this essential service.

The bill would significantly impede NPR's local station in Detroit, WDET 101.9 to continue its public service. Over 150,000 listeners in southeast Michigan, northwest Ohio and our neighbors in Canada would be deprived of such great shows such as The Diane Rehm Show, Jazz Profiles hosted by my friend Nancy Wilson and many other news and cultural programs. Furthermore, WDET and other NPR stations are one of the few radio providers of local news. The station carries many diverse perspectives that strengthen the social fabric for Detroiters.

Media consolidation, for a variety of reasons, has resulted in a less progressive, less diverse, and a narrower set of viewpoints. For years, public radio has successfully been able to provide Americans with cutting edge, sophisticated, and culturally relevant news that otherwise would not be able to enjoy this much needed public service.

Today's bill jeopardizes public radio's ability to operate at an optimal level, and could result in a dramatic decrease in Americans' access to this vital medium. It is a shame that our nation's children and young people may not have the ability to listen to classical music, opera, and other intellectually stimulating broadcast that are vitally important to the intellectual and cultural of our future Americans. In short, today's vote is a needless attack on one of America's cherished institutions—public radio. I urge my colleagues to look at other ways to balance our Nation's budget that do not include cuts to education and culture.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, here the Republicans go again. I guess no one in this country, as they envision, it should ever have a different point of view than theirs. Liberty cannot be just an empty word. It certainly is not to us Democrats. We opposed the elimination of National Public Radio last year and I oppose it today.

Thinking and discerning people like to get their information from different sources and different points of view and then make their own decisions. That is what NPR provides.

The American people are smart and do not want to be spoon fed propaganda and brainwashed by any one ideology or political party.

And they support Public Broadcasting—Republicans, Democrats and Independents alike. When asked, more than two-thirds oppose the elimination of federal funding for public broadcasting as this bill would do.

This bill has nothing to do with reducing the deficit. It is an ideological battle—all about

never supporting and always wanting to get rid of public radio and public TV. Republicans are showing again that they are out of touch with the American people.

This attempt to shut down free radio is misguided and based on deliberately distorted information.

Taking funding away from national Public Radio would hurt local stations, small stations—many even in Republican districts—which depend on NPR programming to survive so that they can carry local news, events and programming and even provide the opportunity for any of us to speak to the public.

Colleagues, let's vote for Democracy. Vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, had I been able to vote on H.R. 1076, legislation that would decimate public radio in America, I would have voted "no."

National Public Radio (NPR) is one of America's most vital and trusted news sources, utilized by 27 million Americans each week. Taking away federal assistance for public radio would hurt 900 public radio stations, especially smaller stations in rural America that lack a sizable donor base.

Access to popular and informative news programming, including *All Things Considered*, *Morning Edition*, *Forum*, *On Point*, and *This American Life*, would be jeopardized in smaller markets. Broadly available access to informative and objective news in America would be compromised.

My office has received many calls and letters from residents throughout the 10th Congressional District, urging Congress to preserve NPR's budget. My constituents understand that public broadcasting is a critical and cost-effective American investment, and I stand with them.

H.R. 1076 harms our economy and American competitiveness. The Congressional Budget Office has determined that this legislation will have zero impact on the budget and the deficit, but it will likely destroy 9,000 jobs. Our support of public broadcasting is a tremendous bargain for the American people. At a time of increasing competition in the global economy, America's future prosperity depends on a knowledgeable workforce, and our robust democracy depends on a well-informed citizenry.

H.R. 1076 takes away vital information from the American people, and that is why I am deeply opposed to this pointless and destructive bill.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1076, which prohibits federal funding for National Public Radio (NPR) and radio content acquisition.

According to a preliminary estimate from Congressional Budget Office, this bill will produce no savings for the taxpayers and will not reduce the deficit. This is an ideologically driven piece of legislation that does nothing to reduce our deficit.

Each week, 27.2 million Americans nationwide turn to NPR to find the kind of news, music programs, and interesting entertainment they can't get elsewhere. NPR offers quality in-depth reporting, insightful commentary, and an on-air forum that allows a wide range of voices to be heard. With political rhetoric and ideological name-calling filling cable news programs, NPR's news coverage has become an essential source for people looking for the facts. This is why 8 out of 10 voters oppose cutting federal funding for public broadcasting.

In my district, Hawaii Public Radio (HPR) engages its island listeners through countless events statewide. These include the Hawaii Book and Musical Festival as well as a series of pre-performance lectures at the Hawaii Opera Theatre. HPR also embraces Native Hawaiian culture with its daily Hawaiian language newscast and the "Hawaiian Word of the Day" feature.

With the program *Aloha Shorts*, HPR promotes local poets and actors. HPR has even given our children an opportunity to be heard by a national audience having young musicians featured in the sold out *From the Top* performances, which received national broadcast. With over 400 volunteers and audiences on all islands, HPR shares the diversity of Hawaii with communities across the country.

Hawaii Public Radio is not just a radio station—it's an essential part of our island community and deserves federal support.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of NPR in people's daily lives and vote against this bill.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. The legislation on the floor today, a bill to defund National Public Radio, is another example of a Republican-Tea Party agenda which kills jobs and imposes an extremist right-wing ideological agenda on the American people. This bill and debate is about titillating right wing passions and silencing public broadcasting—nothing more. It is time for listeners of public radio, viewers of public television, and all citizens who value non-commercial broadcasting to make their voices heard or some valuable radio stations and important programming will disappear.

In my state, Minnesota Public Radio is a treasured source of information and an important employer. The effects of this legislation would hurt National Public Radio, hurt Minnesota Public Radio, and Minnesotans who value this critical public media resource. Currently, public broadcasting in Minnesota receives over \$4.2 million in federal grants, and that funding is at risk as a result of this bill.

This ill-conceived and mean-spirited attack on an important non-profit employer would mean hundreds of lost jobs in Minnesota and the silencing of important public broadcasting content currently heard by tens of millions of Americans every week. Again, this is not surprising coming from a Republican-Tea Party majority that has already passed legislation that would eliminate nearly a million American jobs.

While Democrats are fighting to strengthen the economy and create jobs, the Republican-Tea Party is pursuing an agenda that kills jobs, busts unions, and rewards big corporations with taxpayer handouts. This extreme agenda is an affront to the American people and seriously diminishes the ability for bipartisan solutions to our nation's most serious challenges.

The bill is on the floor today in large part because of the exploits of a Republican operative who doubles as a muckraking dirty trickster. This faux-journalist lied to a National Public Radio executive to secure a meeting and then pieced together a deceptively-edited video of a secretly taped meeting. One media expert called the media sabotage of NPR by James O'Keefe, "... unethical. It's pretty scummy."

Mr. James O'Keefe, the Republican operative who deceived NPR, is most famous for

being arrested and convicted of attempting to infiltrate the office of a Democratic U.S. Senator while impersonating a telephone repairman in an attempt to eavesdrop on calls between constituents and congressional staff. Now Mr. O'Keefe's criminal and unethical behavior is being used by the Republican-Tea Party majority in the U.S. House to pass a law to defund NPR.

I guess today's legislation could be called an example of yellow policy-making based upon yellow journalism—except for the fact that any reference to journalism even in its most pejorative form in association with Mr. O'Keefe is a discredit to journalism.

Mr. O'Keefe is in better company with Republicans such as former President Richard Nixon and former House Majority Leader Tom DeLay in their efforts to embrace criminal behavior in the pursuit of political advantage.

The millions and millions of Americans who seek unbiased news, information, educational, and cultural programming should not be surprised that the Republican-Tea Party Congress and their corporate sponsors want to eliminate funding for National Public Radio. This legislation is not about deficit reduction because this bill fails to reduce the federal budget deficit by even \$1 according to the Congressional Budget Office, but it is about advancing a right-wing political agenda at NPR's expense.

This week, the Republican-Tea Party held an emergency meeting about so-called urgently needed legislation.

What was the emergency? Were we finally going to consider a jobs bill? No.

The "emergency" declared was to prohibit federal funding to go to NPR.

This bill will prevent all public radio stations from using federal funds to purchase any programming from any source. The Republican-Tea Party majority wants to take control away from our local stations, like Minnesota Public Radio. It means that local stations, across the country, will not be able to use these funds to get programming from two of the largest public radio organizations in the country—American Public Media and Public Radio International—both located in Minnesota. That means stations could not use the funds to purchase programs like the beloved "A Prairie Home Companion" and "This American Life".

Why have the Republicans brought this bill to the floor without as much as a single minute of consideration in a hearing or in committee?

This NPR "emergency" is not to help struggling families and debate a badly-needed jobs bill right before we leave on a week-long recess.

It is to consider legislation that will weaken our community. That will cost jobs in Minnesota. And all the Republican-Tea Parties will vote for it based on the antics of a Republican operative who makes a living from lying.

I would urge Members of the U.S. House and all Americans who value journalistic integrity and valuable public media outlets, like Minnesota Public Radio, to fight against a very bad bill and the harm it would cause to our communities.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 1076, the bill to stop federal funding for National Public Radio (NPR). The bill bars making federal funds available for: NPR; payments of dues to NPR; and the acquisition of any radio programming by or for the use of a public radio station.

Earlier this week the Republican led House passed a three week CR that contained \$50 million in cuts for NPR's parent organization, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The new House majority is looking to cut all federal funding of public radio and television stations.

Mr. Speaker, without federal funding, many public radio and TV stations, especially in rural and small communities would go off air. Prohibiting local stations from using federal funds to acquire or produce local/national programming will interfere with the operating independence fundamental to the American's public radio system.

Barring public radio stations from using federal funds to acquire public radio programming would be a huge disruption to the economic model used by public radio stations to serve audiences and to develop local programming, including local/regional news.

If this measure were to pass, New York Public Radio's own station WNYC's national morning news program, *The Takeaway*, with an audience of younger and more diverse listeners, will be in serious jeopardy. New York Public Radio produces more than 150 original hours of programming each week, including a broad range of daily news, talk and cultural and classical music programming. New York Public Radio has two million weekly listeners in NYC metropolitan region and 3 million listeners across the country.

After 11 weeks with no jobs legislation, the Republican Majority is bringing up this bill that does not create jobs or reduce the deficit. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, while the media may focus on NPR, the federal dollars being targeted by this awful bill now go directly to local public radio stations, not to NPR.

The federal dollars received make up a small percentage of the budget for larger stations, but these dollars represent a significant percentage of budgets for local public radio stations, like KAZU and KUSP in my district. It's important to note that stations are then able to leverage those federal grants into millions of dollars in donations from listeners, corporate supporters and foundations. That's the definition of a good federal investment.

Those federal grants enable our local public radio stations to do in-depth stories on local issues important to our region—our world famous tourism events like the AT&T Pebble Beach golf tournament, the Monterey Jazz and Pops festivals, our multi-billion dollar agriculture industry or the budget crisis in California.

Unlike commercial media, local public radio employees have only one concern—to serve their audience. Public broadcasting gives voices to the smallest and most diverse communities in our country that are overlooked by commercial broadcast radio. These are the voices that will be lost if H.R. 1076 is enacted.

H.R. 1076 is an ideological attack on public broadcasting masquerading as a fiscal issue.

Without so much as a single hearing on a subject that affects 34 million Americans weekly who depend on public broadcasting for their commercial-free news and more, this legislation dismantles fifty years of quality public broadcasting and thousands of jobs because of a political bias.

I hope my colleagues will consider the impact that any cuts or elimination of the ability to buy NPR programming would have on institutions in your district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote to against H.R. 1076 which would prohibit federal funding for NPR and the use of federal funds to acquire radio content.

Today's Republican attempts to defund NPR will affect stations all across the country. In my district alone, KTSU and KPFT will have to cope with the aftermath of the Republican proposal. These two stations serve predominately poor, minority populations in my district, and the House Republicans are attempting to eliminate their opportunity to provide National Public Radio to their listeners. If this bill were to become law, radio stations in my district would no longer qualify to receive over \$743,000 in Corporation for Public Broadcasting grants, and prohibiting the use of these funds to purchase popular NPR programming will make it difficult for stations to attract local listeners and raise funds for the production of local content and station operations. Hundreds of stations rely on public broadcasting funding as a major source of funding, especially rural and minority stations.

Some people in my district exclusively listen to these stations. These two stations in Houston and hundreds across the country do not have the money to compete with big corporate stations, and they cannot compete with conservative talk shows because they do not spew out biased, partisan, uncomplimentary, critical messages. They are just reporting the news and bringing it from all over the world.

Further, I think it is shameful that once again the Republicans have violated their so called promises of transparent government by refusing to allow this bill to go through normal committee processes. There have been no hearings or expert testimony for Members to review. There has only been politically charged rhetoric and lies about the impact of public radio.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot believe we are focusing on this right now. At a time when millions are out of work, people are looking for jobs, and trying to get back on their feet, why is this body focused on NPR, of all things? Is this really the best we can do?

For a minute, let's put aside the fact that national public radio is a part of our tradition as a country and provides quality programming to millions of listeners in urban, suburban and rural America. Let's put aside for a minute that funding for NPR is but a drop in the bucket compared to the giveaways and budget busting tax breaks Republicans support for Big Oil companies.

Here we are, eleven weeks into a new Congress—still putting politics over policy. Make no mistake about it, cuts to NPR will not solve our budget crisis and it will not create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better. This body should be focusing on jobs. Plain and simple. Instead we are focused on defunding NPR. I urge a no vote.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to HR 1076, a bill to eliminate federal funding for NPR and prohibit local public radio stations from using federal funds to acquire programming content.

Mr. Speaker, National Public Radio provides 27 million Americans with access to high-quality, non-commercial programming every week. In many cases, NPR's network of 900 local public radio stations is the only way Americans can access this kind of news and information. For that reason, public opinion polls

routinely show large majorities of American in support of federal funding for NPR—and that breadth of support is consistently strong across the political spectrum.

So what are we doing here today? Creating jobs? Exactly the opposite. Enactment of this bill would endanger 9000 jobs at local public radio stations in communities across the country. Reducing the deficit? Hardly. CBO says this bill produces no savings. Honoring the majority's commitment to 72 hours notice and transparent governance? Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on Tuesday and is now being rushed to the floor 48 hours later without a single hearing.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the people's business, and it is no way to run this House. It won't create a single job. It doesn't reduce the deficit. The American people haven't asked for it, and they don't want it.

I urge a "no" vote.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker I rise today to express the voices of the hundreds of people flooding my offices with calls and emails to plead for us to do the right thing and vote down this misguided legislation.

H.R. 1076 would cripple the public radio system in this country that currently provides vital news and information to over 27 million Americans each week.

I would first like to set the record straight—this bill will not save a single taxpayer dollar. Not one. And it will not reduce our federal deficit by one dime. Not one.

My colleague from Colorado and his leadership have tried to portray this bill as a savings to taxpayers—and with all due respect, that is simply untrue.

This bill is no more than a punitive measure reflecting an extreme agenda.

It would devastate 900 public radio stations across the country unfairly targeting smaller stations in rural and regional areas where there are fewer news outlets and where broadband is insufficient.

The bill threatens almost 9,000 jobs in the broadcasting community and, frankly is an unwarranted attack on the content of public radio.

And the ultimate agenda of my Republican colleagues is laid bare when one considers that the Leadership rushed this bill through, ignoring promises to take legislation through regular order, and in short, breaking all their own professed rules to get this legislation to the Floor.

Mr. Speaker, we've now been in session for 11 weeks, and the Republican leadership has not yet introduced a single bill to create jobs.

They've instead focused on advancing an extreme agenda that does nothing to get Americans back to work.

And today, rather than coming together to create jobs for the American people and address the fiscal situation squarely before us, we are spending our time debating and voting on a bill that is nothing more than social commentary in action to impugn one of our nation's most vital news sources.

When we began our session, we all proudly read from the Constitution, and in that process were reminded of our core values as a nation and a government.

One of those values is reflected in the First Amendment which supports the ability of Americans to access news and information through a free press.

Sadly Mr. Speaker, this bill would ultimately limit vital news coverage millions of Americans so desperately need.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this damaging and unwarranted bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today, on March 17, 2011, the House will consider H.R. 1076, to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content. Unfortunately, I have a prior commitment that will prevent me from taking this vote. However, I feel strongly about this issue and I wanted to make those feelings known.

According to people that I have met with at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), a public radio or broadcasting station is considered critically dependent on federal funding if thirty percent or more of its funding comes from federal funding. There are twenty-six National Public Radio (NPR) stations in Alaska and nearly half of them are critically dependent on federal funding. These stations serve cities, like KUAC in Fairbanks and KSKA in Anchorage. They serve salmon runs, like KDLL in Kenai and KDLG in Dillingham. The even serve places that are seemingly at the end of the world, like KHUB on St. Paul Island and KBRW in Barrow. In many cases, these radio stations are the ONLY broadcast signal that many Alaskans get. To deny them access to basic news, early childhood education programming, and even emergency alerts, merely to serve a political agenda, is irresponsible.

I must, first and foremost, consider what is best for Alaska. When 11 NPR stations in Alaska would have to close their doors to the public if this bill becomes law, I must stand up for all Alaskans. As Alaska's lone voice in the House of Representatives for the last four decades, I am proud to support NPR.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of swift U.S. troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. This decade-long war is costing our country tens of hundreds of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars. In 2010 alone, nearly 500 brave American men and women lost their lives, which is 63% more than the 2009 death toll. And as I speak, our government, which has vowed to reduce the deficit, has sent millions more overseas for a war with no foreseeable end. From 2008 to 2011, overall government spending has increased by 9%, while funding for the war in Afghanistan has increased by a startling 25%. As many of my colleagues demand \$100 billion budget cuts, they need look no further than our reckless war spending. For the good of our troops and the health of our economy, this war must end.

And this viewpoint is shared across the nation. According to a recent Washington Post poll, nearly two-thirds of the American people support an immediate withdrawal from Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, our job in this chamber is to represent our constituents, and they have spoken loud and clear. The American people are fed up with a war that has done little to improve our national security or bolster our international standing. Furthermore, after nearly ten years of fighting, it is crystal clear that the problem in Afghanistan cannot be solved by military means alone. Stabilization and reconstruction, governance, and peace-building activities can help to stabilize states, promote rule of law, and bring enduring peace at a sliver of the cost we pay for troops on the ground.

Make no mistake about it: I firmly support our men and women in uniform. For this reason, we must bring them home from a battlefield with no real hope of military victory. I

thank my colleague, Mr. KUCINICH from Ohio, for re-introducing this Resolution. I was proud to cosponsor it in the last Congress, and I will firmly offer my support today in hopes that we can finally end this war.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1076, a bill to prohibit federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of federal funds to acquire radio content. Our constituents sent us to Congress to address the economy and jobs, and to date we've only considered legislation to cut jobs and cut investment in our local communities. CBO projects this bill will have \$0 impact on the deficit, and this bill represents nothing more than an attack on news and programming that is valuable to 34 million Americans, and a further attack on American jobs.

National Public Radio programming provides a breath of “Fresh Air” in a toxic media environment, and this bill would threaten the ability of Iowa Public Radio in my home state to continue to provide access to that content. By prohibiting funding use on national programming, Iowa Public Radio expects to see a reduction in corporate underwriting and other fundraising, fundamentally impacting their ability to operate.

I'm proud to be a long time listener of Iowa Public Radio. This Iowa treasure provides access to valuable national content like Morning Edition, All Things Considered, Prairie Home Companion and Car Talk, and local programming like The Exchange covering current events and news from across the political spectrum, and programs that highlight the arts in Iowa communities like Orchestra Iowa in Cedar Falls. This bill would jeopardize this valuable source of non-partisan news and entertainment to fulfill a political vendetta.

“All Things considered,” Mr. Speaker, we need to address the deficit, but this bill does nothing to solve our problems. The CBO projects this bill will save the taxpayers nothing, and threatens 9000 jobs across the country. I know National Public Radio is a constant companion in my home, just as it is across the nation, and I have heard loud and clear from my constituents, do not cut funding for NPR.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 174, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SUTTON. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Sutton moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1076, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, after line 24, insert the following:

(3) AMBER ALERTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, nothing in this Act shall limit the eligibility of an organization described in subsection (a)(1) or an entity that makes a payment described in subsection (a)(2) to receive Federal funds to broadcast or otherwise disseminate alerts issued by the AMBER Alert communications network regarding abducted children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, there are many times when we come to this floor and engage in heated debate, and we have heard some heated debate on the bill before us; but in this moment, Mr. Speaker, my amendment offers us the opportunity to come together and to do something extraordinarily important, and that is to protect our children.

I happen to oppose the underlying bill, but regardless of how one feels about the underlying legislation, this amendment is something upon which we can all agree. Nothing is more precious, more valuable than our children, and when a child goes missing in a community, no one asks whether he or she is a Republican or a Democrat. We simply ask: How can we help find the child and return him safely home? When the unthinkable happens, we all seek in common purpose to do all that we can to ensure a successful outcome, and it is in pursuit of that successful outcome that this amendment is offered today.

This amendment will ensure that, when a child goes missing, every resource available to find that child and to return him or her to safety will be utilized, including NPR's satellite. We all know that, when a child is abducted, a rapid and coordinated response can make a life-and-death difference. This amendment will make sure that we do not undermine the AMBER Alert System that has been effectively used to recover missing children.

The AMBER Alert System was created after Amber Hagerman, a 9-year-old girl from Arlington, Texas, was abducted while riding her bicycle and then was brutally murdered in 1996. Her kidnapping and murder still remain unsolved. Amber's tragic story led to a partnership between broadcasters and police to develop an early warning system to help find abducted children. Named in Amber's memory, it stands for “America's Missing: Broadcasting Emergency Response.” The AMBER Alert program began as a local effort in Texas, and it has since grown into a successful national program, saving hundreds of lives of children.

Today, all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have AMBER Alert plans. The AMBER Alert program instantly galvanizes the entire community to assist in the search for and in the safe recovery of an abducted child. Since its inception, the AMBER Alert has helped to find and successfully recover 538 children nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, we go to great lengths to protect our children from sexual predators and abductors—and rightfully so. We talk to them about keeping themselves safe. We teach them how to recognize and how to avoid dangerous situations, and we talk to them about making smart decisions. Today, we have the chance to make a decision to ensure that, regardless of how we feel about the underlying bill, we will not undermine the effectiveness of our AMBER Alert network system.

NPR is designated as a disseminator of AMBER Alerts via arrangements with the Department of Justice and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The deployment of next-generation emergency alert systems is in progress, and NPR is positioned to play a vital, necessary role with its satellite-based capabilities.

Recklessly eliminating funding critical to the effective functioning of the AMBER Alert System would be a tragic mistake. Children of every age, gender and race are vulnerable to child abduction, and when it happens, time is the enemy. Communities must mobilize quickly.

The widespread use of the AMBER Alert network is the Nation's most powerful tool for bringing abducted children home. AMBER Alerts also serve as deterrents to those who would prey upon our children. AMBER Alert cases demonstrate that some perpetrators release the abducted children after hearing the AMBER Alerts on the radio or seeing them on television.

In my hometown of Copley, Ohio, a 1-year-old little girl was taken by her father after a domestic fight grew violent. The father, known to have a drug problem, took the young girl from her home and drove erratically off with her in a car. An AMBER Alert was issued, and because of the continued press coverage, the man made the decision to return his daughter. Thankfully, she was brought to safety.

Let's be clear. The passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If the amendment is adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will be immediately voted upon. So, though we may disagree on the bill, today we have the opportunity to speak with one voice to protect our children. It is up to us. I urge everyone to vote "yes" on this final amendment.

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

□ 1450

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that this Nation's children, our children and our grandchildren are an incredibly important part of our lives and protecting those children, protecting their future.

We all agree that it is important that we put this Nation on a firm fiscal footing. Now, while we all heartily support the AMBER Alert program, we also know there is nothing in the H.R. 1076 that would prohibit the AMBER Alert program. What we also know is that this is a procedural move by the minority to try to derail the funding to NPR.

As I said, as we talked about the bill, it is imperative that we be good stewards of the taxpayers' money, that we get this fiscal house in order. It is time to get NPR out of the taxpayers' pocket. The underlying bill does that.

I encourage a "no" vote on the motion to recommit. I encourage an "aye" vote on H.R. 1076.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 1076 will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 1076, if ordered; and adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 28.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 235, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—184

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
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  
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)  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)

Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loebuck  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarella

Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Ross (AR)  
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  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark

Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—235

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Amash  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishke  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
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  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach

Gibbs  
Gibson  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourrette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
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  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
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 Woodall Young (FL)  
Womack Yoder Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—13

Cohen Gohmert Nadler  
Fudge Hinojosa Wasserman  
Garamendi Jordan Schultz  
Giffords Labrador Young (AK)  
Gingrey (GA) Moore

□ 1515

Messrs. DESJARLAIS and JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 192, answered “present” 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

## AYES—228

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

Paul Paulsen  
Pearce Petri  
Pitts Platts  
Poe (TX) Pompeo  
Posey Price (GA)  
Quayle Reed  
Rehberg Renacci  
Ribble Rigell  
Rivera Roby  
Roe (TN) Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY) Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher Rokita  
Rooney Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam Sullivan  
Ross (FL) Terry  
Royce Thompson (PA)  
Runyan Thornberry  
Ryan (WI) Tipton  
Scalise Turner  
Schilling Upton  
Schmidt Walberg  
Schock Walden  
Schweikert Walsh (IL)  
Scott (SC) Webster  
Scott, Austin West  
Sensenbrenner Westmoreland  
Sessions Whitfield  
Shimkus Wilson (SC)  
Shuster Wittman  
Simpson Wolf  
Smith (NE) Womack  
Smith (NJ) Yoder  
Smith (TX) Young (FL)  
Southernland Young (IN)  
Stearns

## NOES—192

Ackerman Gonzalez  
Altmire Green, Al  
Andrews Green, Gene  
Baca Grijalva  
Baldwin Gutierrez  
Barrow Hanabusa  
Bass (CA) Hanna  
Becerra Hastings (FL)  
Berkley Heinrich  
Berman Higgins  
Bishop (GA) Himes  
Bishop (NY) Hinchey  
Blumenauer Hirono  
Boren Holden  
Boswell Holt  
Brady (PA) Honda  
Braley (IA) Hoyer  
Brown (FL) Inslee  
Butterfield Israel  
Capps Jackson (IL)  
Capuano Jackson Lee  
Cardoza (TX)  
Carnahan Johnson (GA)  
Carney Johnson, E. B.  
Carson (IN) Kaptur  
Castor (FL) Keating  
Chandler Kildee  
Chu Kind  
Cicilline Kissell  
Clarke (MI) Kucinich  
Clarke (NY) Langevin  
Clay Larsen (WA)  
Cleaver Larson (CT)  
Clyburn LaTourette  
Connolly (VA) Lee (CA)  
Conyers Levin  
Cooper Lewis (GA)  
Costa Lipinski  
Costello Loeb sack  
Courtney Lofgren, Zoe  
Critz Lowey  
Crowley Luján  
Cuellar Lynch  
Cummings Maloney  
Davis (CA) Markey  
Davis (IL) Matheson  
DeFazio Matsui  
DeGette McCarthy (NY)  
DeLauro McCollum  
Deutch McDermott  
Dicks McGovern  
Dingell McIntyre  
Doggett McNerney  
Donnelly (IN) Meeks  
Doyle Michaud  
Duffy Miller (NC)  
Edwards Miller, George  
Ellison Moore  
Engel Moran  
Eshoo Murphy (CT)  
Farr Napolitano  
Fattah Neal  
Filner Oliver  
Frank (MA) Owens  
Gibson Pallone

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

## NOT VOTING—11

Cohen Hinojosa Pence  
Fudge Jordan Wasserman  
Garamendi Labrador Schultz  
Giffords Nadler Young (AK)

□ 1524

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 93, nays 321, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

## YEAS—93

Baldwin Inslee Quigley  
Bass (CA) Jackson (IL) Rangel  
Campbell Jackson Lee  
Capuano (TX) Richardson  
Chaffetz Johnson (IL) Richmond  
Chu Johnson, E. B. Rohrabacher  
Cicilline Jones Rush  
Clarke (MI) Keating Sánchez, Linda  
Clarke (NY) Kucinich T.  
Clay Larson (CT) Sanchez, Loretta  
Cleaver Lee (CA) Schakowsky  
Coble Lewis (GA) Serrano  
Conyers Lofgren, Zoe Shuler  
Costello Maloney Slaughter  
Crowley Markey Speier  
Davis (IL) Matsui Stark  
DeFazio McDermott Thompson (CA)  
DeGette McGovern Thompson (MS)  
Doyle McNeerney Tierney  
Duncan (TN) Michaud Tonko  
Edwards Miller, George Towns  
Ellison Moore Velázquez  
Eshoo Moran Visclosky  
Farr Napolitano Waters  
Filner Neal Watt  
Frank (MA) Olver Waxman  
Grijalva Pallone Weiner  
Gutierrez Pastor (AZ) Welch  
Hastings (FL) Paul Wilson (FL)  
Hinchey Payne Woolsey  
Holt Pingree (ME) Yarmuth  
Honda Polis

## NAYS—321

Ackerman Berkley Braley (IA)  
Adams Berman Brooks  
Aderholt Biggart Broun (GA)  
Akin Bilbray Brown (FL)  
Alexander Bilirakis Buchanan  
Altmire Bishop (GA) Bucshon  
Andrews Bishop (NY) Buerkle  
Austria Bishop (UT) Burgess  
Bachmann Black Burton (IN)  
Bachus Blackburn Butterfield  
Barletta Blumenauer Calvert  
Barrow Bonner Camp  
Bartlett Bono Mack Canseco  
Barton (TX) Boren Cantor  
Bass (NH) Boswell Capito  
Becerra Boustany Capps  
Benishek Brady (PA) Cardoza  
Berg Brady (TX) Carnahan