

Northern Mariana Islands. I appreciate their comments and their leadership on this, along with Mr. BISHOP and Mr. GRIJALVA.

The Quileutes are one of eight tribes living in the Washington State district that I represent here in Congress. Although the tribe's reservation at La Push is spectacularly beautiful, it also is a dangerous place to live. The threat of tsunamis is a harsh reality that the Quileute Tribe faces every day. The tribe lives on a one-square mile reservation along the Pacific coast of the Olympic Peninsula. Again, I cannot emphasize enough the breathtaking nature of their home.

The tribe has received much notice over the last few years due to the "Twilight" series of movies and novels. If you're not familiar with the "Twilight" phenomenon yourself, then I am sure that at least your children or grandchildren know about the Quileutes and their role in the "Twilight" world.

H.R. 1162 will provide land currently in Olympic National Park to the Quileute Tribe to enable the relocation of many facilities outside the tsunami zone. We need only look to the tragedy last year in Japan to see the loss of human life and horrific damage that tsunamis can cause.

Much of the Quileutes' infrastructure, including a day care center, the elder center, government offices, and Quileute tribal members' homes, are right in the path of a potential tsunami. This existential threat is compounded by damaging floods from the Quillayute River nearly every year.

The purpose of H.R. 1162 is to help the Quileutes move their buildings and people to safer land. The Olympic National Park would transfer land that is out of the tsunami zone to the tribe for the development of new infrastructure.

□ 1700

Of the 275 acres the Park Service would provide the tribe for this safety purpose, 222 are currently designated as wilderness. The legislation would designate those 222 acres.

The legislation also settles a long-standing dispute between the Olympic National Park and the tribe over the northern boundary of the reservation. The resolution of this dispute benefits the tribe, the Park Service, and the general public. The park would provide 510 acres to the tribe to settle the dispute.

The bill would place into trust these two parcels as well as another piece of non-Federal land the tribe had acquired earlier. The bill also guarantees access for the public to some of the most beautiful Washington State beaches.

I must note, however, that I am disappointed that a provision of H.R. 1162 was taken from the bill when the Natural Resources Committee passed it last October. The legislation as introduced mitigated the loss of wilderness designation for the 222 acres to be

given to the tribe by designating other parcels already within Olympic National Park as wilderness. It was this provision designating new wilderness within the park that was removed. In response, I have introduced H.R. 3222 that would designate as wilderness those acres stripped from the underlying bill. The National Parks, Forest and Public Lands Subcommittee held a hearing on H.R. 3222 and other bills back in December, and I urge the committee to keep making progress on H.R. 3222.

In closing, I want to recognize the Quileute Tribe, its council and tribals chairs past and present, along with National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis and Olympic National Park Superintendent Karen Gustin for their hard work over many years to resolve this dispute and provide safer land for the tribe.

Again, I want to thank Congressman HASTINGS, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee; and Todd Young and Todd Ungerecht of his staff. I want to thank National Parks, Forest and Public Lands Subcommittee Chairman ROB BISHOP and Jim Streeter of his staff. On the Democratic side, I want to thank ED MARKEY and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands and their staff, Jeff Duncan and David Watkins, and Pete Modaff on my staff.

In closing, I urge the House to pass H.R. 1162 to provide the Quileute Tribe a safer home along the Pacific Coast in Washington State.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend I have no more requests for speakers if he is prepared to yield back.

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

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

I'm pleased that this legislation is moving forward. I know this has been something that has been worked on by my friend and colleague from Washington for some time, and I'm glad we have finally gotten this far. And hopefully now that it's a clean bill that really deals with the safety of the Quileute Tribe, which is the important part and that's the reason for the bill, I hope it can move very fast through this House and obviously through the Senate.

With that, I urge adoption of H.R. 1162, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1162, which authorizes the transfer of lands within and around the Olympic National Park in the state of Washington. H.R. 1162 would incorporate specified federal lands within the Olympic National Park and specified land owned by the Quileute Tribe into the Quileute Indian Reservation, held in trust by the federal government.

The Quileute people and their reservation are in danger. Most of the reservation is located within the flood zone and most of the tribal infrastructure, including their school,

elder centers, and housing, is within the tsunami zone. This legislation will provide protection to the 375 residents of the Quileute Indian Reservation by transferring a few hundred acres from the vast Olympic National Park to the Tribe.

As a member of the Native American Caucus, I have worked with my colleagues in Congress to address the needs of Native Americans. This legislation will provide the Quileute Indian Tribe with approximately 275 acres of land currently located within the Olympic National Park and approximately 510 acres of land along the Quillayute River.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed land transfer will allow the people of Quileute Indian Tribe to relocate their schools and other structures to safer lands. Based on information from the Department of Interior, CBO estimates that H.R. 1162 would have no significant impact on the federal budget.

California is home to over one hundred federally recognized tribes. Tribes from my state and from other states such as the Quileute Indian Tribe from the state of Washington need protection from natural disasters such as tsunamis and floods.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1162 and allow the Quileute Indian Tribe to relocate their people and reservation to safer land away from the frequent tsunami risk that threaten the Tribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1162, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1716

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1734, CIVILIAN PROPERTY REALIGNMENT ACT

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 537 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 537

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1734) to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, selling, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 112-11 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WEBSTER. For the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1720

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill.

House Resolution 537 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1734, the Civilian Property Realignment Act.

The rule makes six amendments in order. Of these, five are Democrat-sponsored amendments and one is a Republican-sponsored amendment. The only amendments not made in order were either because of a lack of germaneness and/or they were duplicative in nature or the subject of other amendments.

H.R. 1734 has come to the floor under regular order. The applicable subcommittee held two hearings specifically on this bill and held an additional six hearings on the subject of Federal property consolidation. The subcommittee held a markup and subsequently passed the bill out by voice vote. The full committee also held a markup during which several amendments were considered before the bill was reported out of committee. Further, H.R. 1734 enjoys a bipartisan list of cosponsors.

The Civilian Property Realignment Act enjoys bipartisan support because it tackles an inherently bipartisan issue: making government work more efficiently in order to better safeguard taxpayer dollars.

The Federal executive branch agencies hold an extensive real property portfolio that includes 429,000 buildings and over 1 million total properties. In fact, the Federal Government is the largest owner and manager of real estate in our country.

The Office of Management and Budget in 2007 estimated that the Federal Government is holding \$18 billion in real property that it does not need. If we sold all excess Federal properties, the resulting proceeds could approach \$15 billion, on top of the annual savings reaped from reduced maintenance and operating costs.

These properties have been accumulated by the agencies over time and in many cases these agencies' missions have evolved over that period. As missions change, so agencies' needs also change. As a result, many properties that were once crucial have become less useful, or in some cases unneeded altogether.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in fiscal year 2009—the most recent data available—the government held 10,327 unneeded buildings and spent \$134 million annually to maintain them. According to Office of Management and Budget testimony delivered before Congress, the Federal Government has approximately 55,000 properties classified as “underutilized.” It costs taxpayers nearly \$1.7 billion annually to operate underutilized Federal buildings, according to the Government Accountability Office.

H.R. 1734 would establish an independent commission to make rec-

ommendations to Congress to better manage the inventory of Federal civilian real property. The commission, consisting of eight members appointed by the President, would report annually on its findings. Under the bill, within 6 months of enactment the commission would identify and recommend to the President and Congress the sale of at least five high-value Federal properties with an estimated fair market value of at least \$500 million. Both the President and Congress would have the opportunity to approve or disapprove of these recommendations. The President could transmit recommendations from the commission, with or without his approval, to Congress, where an up-or-down vote would take place under an expedited procedure.

H.R. 1734 is modeled after the base realignment and closure—BRAC—process and would require an examination of Federal civilian real properties across government, used and unused, and make decisions based on the best return to the taxpayer. Military installations, properties deemed essential for reasons of national security, and national parks are not subject to the commission's jurisdiction.

The cost-saving initiative would achieve a reduction in the size of the Federal Government real property inventory by selling or redeveloping underutilized properties, increasing the utilization rates of existing properties, and expediting the disposal of surplus properties.

Given the vast real estate holdings of the Federal Government, poor asset management and missed market opportunities cost the taxpayers significant sums of money. The Government Accountability Office has placed real property management on its list of “high risk” governmental activities, citing excess and underutilization of real property, deteriorating and aging facilities, unreliable data, and overreliance on costly leasing.

H.R. 1734, the Civilian Property Realignment Act, seeks to reduce the Federal Government's footprint, increase efficiency, and ultimately enhance stewardship of hard-earned taxpayer dollars. It isn't just about closing buildings. It's about looking at the taxpayers' assets and deciding whether or not they are being efficiently utilized. Given the realities of the current economy, this is the same type of belt-tightening taking place all over our Nation right now. It's time for our government to start leading by example.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on both the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the structured rule. While the unemployment numbers are now at their lowest point in 3

years, the American people know that our economy is still teetering. That's why it's important for Democrats and Republicans to come together around commonsense proposals.

This underlying bill, the Civilian Property Realignment Act, stemmed from President Obama's proposal in his FY 2012 budget, and I'm glad that Congress is beginning its deliberative process on this important issue.

Currently, the Federal Government owns and manages over 1 million Federal buildings and structures—including many in my home State of Colorado—which costs over \$20 billion a year annually to operate and maintain. This bill seeks to ensure our government is a better steward of taxpayer dollars by improved utilization and management of surplus properties and the elimination and monetization of unnecessary assets to reduce our deficit.

Building on President Obama's proposal contained in his FY 2012 budget, this bill sets up a process to consolidate, sell, or exchange Federal Government assets it no longer needs. Sounds like common sense, but it hasn't been done yet. As the President identified, an estimated 14,000 buildings and structures are currently designated as excess properties. In essence, this legislation attempts to do with Federal Government property what the Department of Defense has successfully already done with its base closure and realignment program—BRAC—for military installations, an attempt to remove politics from the process so that effectively our Federal holdings can be streamlined and that money can be raised from properties that are no longer necessary for the operations of the Federal Government.

To accomplish this goal, this legislation sets up an independent Civilian Property Realignment Commission, which would recommend which Federal properties should be consolidated, sold, exchanged or redeveloped. The commission's downsizing recommendations would be subject to approval by the President and then by Congress before they could be implemented en masse.

The underlying legislation should be a strong bipartisan bill. Unfortunately, there are a number of last-minute considerations which are causing some contention between the two parties. And I understand that some language has been added, including contentious riders that were added without a hearing or a meeting of the Democratic side.

The current language, therefore, includes some offensive provisions that will jeopardize support on my side of the aisle, including a measure that would change Federal law to eliminate the preference homeless shelters receive, as well as a provision that waives compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, part of the ongoing Republican agenda to gut environmental protections, but in this case, a policy waiver that has

nothing to do with trying to manage our Federal property.

The Federal public comment process needs to be in place when assets are transferred because they have important roles in communities. Whether it's urban, suburban, or rural, our comment process is a critical piece of ensuring that all stakeholders are taken into account. If there's a flaw with the NEPA comment process, or NEPA, fix it elsewhere, but not in the context of a bill that's supposed to streamline Federal Government holdings and allow us to sell off excess property.

Another problem with this bill is that the new programs funded under this bill are not funded. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill would cost \$68 million over the next 5 years. Now, some on the other side might argue that \$68 million isn't much money, but as a matter of principle it should have an offset. This violates the CutGo protocols and is an example of the majority spending money without saying where it's going to come from. So to be clear, this bill in its current form would increase our deficit by \$68 million. I think it would be relatively easy, in a bipartisan manner, to figure out where we can find \$68 million elsewhere in the budget to offset this so it doesn't go directly to the deficit.

In addition, the rule before us restricts the number of amendments to be considered and limits debate. During the Rules Committee last week, Democrats asked for an open rule so that all Members could offer amendments. A majority on that committee rejected an open process in favor of this restrictive rule.

□ 1730

The ranking member of the House Oversight Committee, Representative CUMMINGS, offered an amendment to ensure provisions of the Homeless Assistance Act would continue to apply. This was a germane amendment that would be allowed on the floor if this were an open rule, and yet it is blocked by this restrictive process.

That's one example of an amendment that was actually brought to the Rules Committee and dismissed by the majority. But what if this debate inspires a Member to offer other practical, commonsense amendments, including offset ideas to ensure that this doesn't increase our deficit?

Under this process before us, that Member's amendment will not be allowed, no matter how good or how bipartisan or how universal the support is for that amendment. Therefore, I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1734. This has been a bipartisan bill all the way through. It's something we've worked on for well over a year now, including having the

President, OMB and the administration working directly with us on this bill. It is something that is important for the American taxpayer.

We have enough partisan divide here. To be able to find something that cuts waste, something that brings in revenue without raising taxes, and just a more efficient way of doing business is something that both Republicans and Democrats should agree on.

But certainly politics enters into many different situations. As of Friday, we had a bipartisan agreement. I was willing to accept all of the various amendments, including the amendment to NEPA, including the homeless amendment.

We've accepted the amendments on several different occasions. First, it was a \$2 million exemption for homeless to be able to grab a \$2 million piece of property. Then it was renegotiated to \$3 million, and then five million. Why the homeless would need a \$5 million piece of property is beyond me. But in the sense of bipartisanship, we were willing to agree to that.

So that amendment is still on the floor today. We still accept that amendment. We stand by our word. But the other side has decided to interject politics into this, and we will see how that works out in the future.

But the last issue I wanted to just touch on was clarifying an important point about the savings of this bill. This will generate significant savings, but I just wanted to touch on how CBO scores those savings.

First, the bill authorizes \$20 million for the commission itself, just to set up a commission, and \$62 million to fund relocation or cleanup costs that may be needed if one of these properties actually has some occupants in them. This \$82 million is subject to appropriations and requires Congress to approve a future appropriation.

Second, within the first 180 days the bill requires the commission to recommend at least five properties worth a minimum of \$500 million for sale.

When CBO scored this provision in the reported version of the bill, CBO said it would save at least \$160 million in the first 5 years. This requirement to sell at least \$500 million in property is still in the bill.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. However, since the bill was modified to require the approval of Congress before it can be implemented, CBO now says the savings will be scored on the future approval resolution, and not in this bill before us today. The savings that will be generated by this commission still exist. This will be scored at a later date.

Only in Washington, DC can you get rid of properties, get rid of the cost of maintaining these properties, have billions of dollars in revenue, actually create jobs in the redevelopment and

sale of the properties and still be able to argue against the savings.

Mr. POLIS. I would inquire if the gentleman from Florida has any remaining speakers.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, we have no other presenters. We are ready to close.

Mr. POLIS. I will yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I know that significant issues still remain with the Civilian Property Realignment Act in its current form. The gentleman discussed the potential savings from this bill.

To be clear, this is a transfer of items that are already in the asset column of the Federal Government. It's not the creation of new value or new money out of nothing. It simply turns assets into cash.

We need cash. We have a large deficit to cover. It makes sense to sell excess properties, but this money doesn't come from nowhere. Once those properties are sold, those will no longer be on the ledgers of the Federal Government.

Now, it does save significant operating capital and maintenance of these unnecessary properties; but, again, I think common sense would indicate that if the commission costs \$20 million to set up, with the various people involved with this process, we should specify where that money is coming from in the bill. And I think that there would be a way to do that on a bipartisan basis.

Given all the concerns that remain with this bill regarding how it's paid for, the homeless situation, and the NEPA, the environmental review protections, we should be engaging in an open process, not one that limits and shuts down debate.

The American people are frustrated that this Congress refuses to consider bipartisan-supported balanced bills that would stimulate job growth in our country and restore fiscal responsibility.

We can only reignite the American Dream and reinvigorate our economy by strengthening the middle class and encouraging innovation. President Obama has introduced a package to spur small business growth and startups, which includes many of the proposals previously offered by Members on both sides of the aisle with bipartisan support. And yet, to the dismay on many on my side of the aisle, this Congress has yet to consider these measures that will strengthen the middle class and help small business grow.

I do applaud the majority for beginning to take up the process that President Obama has put forth in his fiscal year 2012 budget of selling off excess Federal property. There just remain a few I's to dot and a few T's to cross to ensure that this important piece of legislation can garner the support of the bipartisan majority in this body.

There remains much work to be done on the large issues, including enacting a comprehensive jobs plan, extending

the payroll tax cuts and unemployment insurance, ensuring seniors have access to their doctors under Medicare, comprehensive tax reform, and putting our fiscal house in order by passing a bold and balanced plan to reduce the deficit.

Selling off excess Federal assets and making sure that the Federal Government doesn't own or have to maintain or operate more than we need to is a small, but critical, piece of the overall equation. This Congress has the opportunity to get it right through a deliberative process.

But because the majority has restricted debate on the underlying bill, I cannot support this rule, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The cost of real property to the Federal Government—costs are significant, and most agencies do not have the incentives to minimize those costs. Properties sit vacant and woefully underutilized, not only costing taxpayers billions of dollars, but often are eyesores in the local communities, and steal property away from the ad valorem revenues of local communities.

Even so, despite the current budget climate, many agencies continue to seek more space than is necessary, reducing efficiency and increasing cost. Better management of Federal property presents an opportunity to reduce expenditures and increase revenues.

H.R. 1734 is a bipartisan measure. It seeks to address a problem that has become a hallmark of our bloated, inefficient Federal bureaucracy. H.R. 1734 is intended to bring an independent process outside the bureaucratic red tape to the management of real property owned by the Federal Government. It will reduce waste, increase efficiency of the Federal Government, and produce significant savings for the taxpayer.

With deficits over \$1 trillion in the Federal Government, we simply can't afford to sit on money-losing properties and empty Federal buildings any longer. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of the rule and passage of the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. POLIS. 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.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 537, by the yeas and nays;  
Motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1162, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1734, CIVILIAN PROPERTY REALIGNMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 537) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1734) to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, selling, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 155, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—233

Adams	Bucshon	Duffy
Aderholt	Burgess	Duncan (SC)
Akin	Burton (IN)	Duncan (TN)
Alexander	Calvert	Ellmers
Amash	Camp	Emerson
Amodei	Canseco	Farenthold
Austria	Cantor	Fincher
Bachmann	Capito	Fitzpatrick
Bachus	Carter	Flake
Barletta	Cassidy	Fleischmann
Bartlett	Chabot	Fleming
Barton (TX)	Chaffetz	Flores
Bass (NH)	Coble	Forbes
Benishek	Coffman (CO)	Fortenberry
Berg	Cole	Fox
Biggert	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Billbray	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Billirakis	Cravaack	Galleghy
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Gardner
Black	Crenshaw	Garrett
Blackburn	Culberson	Gerlach
Bono Mack	Davis (KY)	Gibbs
Boren	Denham	Gibson
Boustany	Dent	Gingrey (GA)
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Gohmert
Brooks	Diaz-Balart	Goodlatte
Brown (GA)	Dold	Gosar
Buchanan	Dreier	Gowdy