



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2011

No. 143

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
September 23, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT J. DOLD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Charley Hames, Jr., BeeBee Memorial Cathedral, Oakland, California, offered the following prayer:

Eternal and gracious God, we call on Your Name by Your mercy as one nation under Your divine counsel. Dear Lord, I lift up to You today these men and women who have been weighted with the vicissitudes of life by the virtue of the office that they have been called to serve for such a time as this.

We ask You, Lord, to equip and empower these, Your leaders, by Your Spirit to faithfully carry out the duty to the office in which affects our daily lives. Remind them of their divine purpose to bring hope where there has been disappointment, to give peace where there is chaos, and leadership that promotes unity.

Guide their minds to make decisions that embody the good of all of our citizens and pilot their hands to give voice to the voiceless. This is our prayer in Your awesome Name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LEE of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### WELCOMING REVEREND DR. CHARLEY HAMES, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to welcome Reverend Dr. Charley Hames to the House floor after delivering today's very powerful opening prayer.

Dr. Hames is an absolutely brilliant pastor at the historic BeeBee Memorial Cathedral in Oakland, California. Under his leadership, BeeBee Memorial Cathedral has grown from approximately 80 members to over 1,400 members, making it one of the Bay Area's fastest growing churches. His ministries touch the lives of many throughout the community.

In addition to his 19 years in the ministry, Dr. Hames served as the chair of the board of the Empowerment Community Development Corporation, a nonprofit organization that fosters community involvement with local government.

Reverend Dr. Hames is the proud recipient of the 2011 CME-Ninth Episcopal District Pastor of the Year, is an

active member and chaplain of the 100 Black Men of the Bay Area, Inc., and a director for the Oakland African American Chamber of Commerce Board. He is married to his wife, Felicia S. Brooks-Hames, and is the proud father of three children.

I thank Pastor Hames for his wise counsel, for his spiritual leadership and for his commitment to making this a better world for all God's children.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### HONORING ROGER SCHLICKEISEN, DEFENDER OF WILDLIFE

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last night Roger Schlickeisen was honored for his 20 years' leadership as president of Defenders of Wildlife, where he became a key pillar of the American environmental movement.

The successful reintroduction of the gray wolf into the American West was an example of his tenacity, skill and his vision. Whether Roger was fighting to protect our environmental laws from assault or using them for their intended purposes, he showed how even in difficult times, people would respond to protect what they cherish. That is how he built Defenders of Wildlife into such a formidable political and policy force, increasing its membership 1,500 percent to almost 1 million people.

Whether taking his phone call, an office visit, or exploring the Arctic wildlife refuge with Roger, his passion was clear to me. Roger provided leadership that matters, which speaks volumes today and will far into the future. Thank you, Roger.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H6417

**PRESIDENT OBAMA MUST STAND UP FOR ISRAEL**

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, this week, President Obama went to New York to address the United Nations General Assembly. He did so, remarkably for an American leader, from a position of weakness.

As the Palestinian Authority began to campaign to upgrade its status at the U.N., this administration wavered and vacillated and did nothing for too long. This was a failure of leadership and leaves us, our Israeli allies, and the ever tense Middle East at an uncertain crossroads.

The President might have been able to rescue the situation with a forceful speech laying down a clear marker of America's support for Israel. Instead, he falsely blamed Israel for the stalemated peace process.

I have always believed that our relationship with Israel is unique in world history and critical to both countries. Those beliefs were reinforced when I had the opportunity to visit Israel and meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu in May.

President Obama must stand up, not only for Israel and the Israeli people, but also for a commitment to the peace process and the rule of law.

**AMERICAN JOBS ACT**

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting. They need our help now. It's time for Congress to step up to the plate and live up to our responsibilities. Let's do what is right for the American people.

The American Jobs Act contains bipartisan policies that both Republicans and Democrats have supported in the past. Economists across the Nation agree it will create jobs and give our economy an immediate boost. If we do pass the American Jobs Act, in my home State of California, over 700,000 businesses will receive a payroll tax cut, \$3.9 billion in the infrastructure investment will create over 50,000 new jobs, and over 37,000 teachers and first responders will be saved from layoffs.

This debate is not about political winners and losers. It's about the struggle of everyday Americans. The next election is 14 months away. Let's come together and pass this bipartisan agenda.

□ 0910

**TRIBUTE TO DR. R.C. GOODMAN, SR.**

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to send birthday greetings

to a member of America's Greatest Generation, Dr. R.C. Goodman, Sr., of Fort Smith, Arkansas.

This American patriot mobilized with the Arkansas National Guard at the beginning of World War II, earning two Purple Hearts and the Combat Infantryman's Badge. And his life was forever changed by the events of May 8, 1945. You see, Dr. Goodman was in charge of a train car full of Belgian POWs just rescued from a German camp. The train wrecked, and Dr. Goodman was one of the few survivors. He later shared with his children the terrific sense of helplessness watching so many die that day, and he made a commitment to becoming a physician so that he would always be able to help in the presence of human suffering.

Dr. Goodman, thank you for your service to your country and to your fellow man. And on the occasion of your 91st birthday, America sends its best wishes.

**NATIONAL CHILDHOOD OBESITY AWARENESS MONTH**

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September as National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month.

When I served as Delaware's Lieutenant Governor, I spent a lot of my time helping children in our State understand the importance of making healthy lifestyle choices. I started a program called the Lieutenant Governor's Challenge that helped thousands of Delaware students make regular physical activity part of their daily lives.

One of my partners in these initiatives was Nemours, a foundation that operates A.I. DuPont Hospital, a world-class facility for children in Wilmington, Delaware. Nemours works with schools, childcare centers, and community organizations to help children make healthy food and lifestyle choices and to stay physically active. If we can help children make healthy decisions at an early age, those habits will stay with them for a lifetime, and we will save money on the country's health care bill as a result.

Mr. Speaker, we should follow the lead of organizations like Nemours for the healthy messages they bring to our children in places where they live, learn, and play.

**WHERE ARE THE JOBS?**

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, where are the jobs? You spent nearly \$1 trillion on a stimulus bill that failed. Now you want to spend another \$450 billion on another stimulus bill. This is simply repeating the same action and expecting a different outcome.

Solyndra is an example of the waste and failure of your stimulus bill. This company in the solar industry is a crony of your administration. Solyndra's backers were friends of your Presidential campaign, and the company received friendly treatment from your administration. Solyndra was supposed to create green jobs, but now more than a thousand are laid off. They got a \$535 million taxpayer-subsidized loan, but they are now bankrupt and their officers are taking the Fifth Amendment.

We must help the American economy create jobs by freeing job creators from regulations that stifle growth, expand production of competitive and affordable energy, stop threatening job creators with higher taxes, and stop wasting taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, no more Solyndras.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

**PRESIDENT'S JOBS PLAN**

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. We have two problems in this economy: One is, we have a long-term deficit that requires long-term solutions. Second, we have an immediate crisis of high unemployment. We have 23 million Americans who are out of work full time or out of work part time, people looking for full-time work that don't have it—23 million Americans. Why can't we focus on policies that are going to put people back to work? The President's jobs plan will help us to do that.

What does it do? We start to invest in infrastructure. It is disgraceful that the roads and bridges of this country, that the water and sewer systems in your town and mine are ancient and antiquated. They need repair. They need rebuilding. That is not just money thrown out the door. That's investing in our future where generations are going to benefit from it.

Part of the solution is rebuilding our schools. Who among us has not been to a school in our neighborhood or our district that is in desperate need of repair? And we have folks in the construction industry who aren't building houses because of the housing crisis but can be rebuilding these schools and can be retrofitting our homes.

We have to focus on putting people back to work.

**TRAIN ACT**

(Mr. POMPEO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, this morning I rise in support of the TRAIN

Act, H.R. 2401. This bill provides a commonsense approach that addresses a series of EPA regulations that will cost jobs and cripple our Nation's economy.

TRAIN requires a commission simply to study the cumulative impact of EPA's regulations, but it would also delay two incredibly expensive regulations—the Utility MACT rule and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. The impact of these two EPA regulations on Kansas would be enormous.

The Sunflower Electric Cooperative has been trying to build an 895-megawatt coal plant in Holcomb, Kansas, for years. Holcomb 2 will increase our Nation's energy supply, utilizing environmental controls to reduce air emissions. It's a win-win that is good for jobs for Kansas, good for the economy, and good for the environment.

But now this project is in serious jeopardy because of these EPA rules. The Kansas Attorney General has now stepped in, filing a lawsuit in the D.C. Court of Appeals trying to slow down and stop this rule because it will be physically impossible for Kansas utilities to comply with these rules.

The problems in Kansas are the same problems all Americans face because of EPA's refusal to consider the real economic costs of these regulations. Passing the TRAIN Act saves jobs. Let's do it.

#### THE GREATEST CHALLENGE

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about things that we can agree on.

We can agree that the greatest challenge that faces all of us today is to stop the erosion of public confidence. We can also agree that public confidence is critical because that's what is really going to kick-start our economy. We can also agree that when you talk to the people in our various districts, what are they most concerned about? They're concerned about jobs. Because what do jobs represent? They represent the security that they need to provide for the most important part of their life, their families.

We can also agree that if there is a plan out there that can add to GDP 2 percent, add at least 2 million jobs, cut unemployment by 1 percent, that that's a plan we should consider. We can also agree that we want to put teachers, firefighters, and first responders back to work, and that we want to build infrastructure so we can be the greatest country that we've always been. And we can also agree that we want tax cuts for employees and employers.

So what's the problem, Mr. Speaker? Is the problem that this is the President's plan? That shouldn't be the problem. Let's get it together and let's work for the people of this great Nation.

#### TRANSPARENCY IN REGULATORY ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS ON THE NATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2401.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 406 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2401.

□ 0920

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOLD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, September 22, 2011, all time for general debate pursuant to House Resolution 406 had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2401

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation Act of 2011".*

#### SEC. 2. COMMITTEE FOR THE CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS OF REGULATIONS THAT IMPACT ENERGY AND MANUFACTURING IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—The President shall establish a committee to be known as the Committee for the Cumulative Analysis of Regulations that Impact Energy and Manufacturing in the United States (in this Act referred to as the "Committee") to analyze and report on the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with sections 3 and 4.

(b) *MEMBERS.*—The Committee shall be composed of the following officials (or their designees):

(1) *The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief Economist.*

(2) *The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Chief Economist and the Under Secretary for International Trade.*

(3) *The Secretary of Labor, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.*

(4) *The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration.*

(5) *The Secretary of the Treasury, acting through the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environment and Energy of the Department of the Treasury.*

(6) *The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.*

(7) *The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.*

(8) *The Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.*

(9) *The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.*

(10) *The Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.*

(11) *The Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, acting through the Office of Economics.*

(c) *CHAIR.*—The Secretary of Commerce shall serve as Chair of the Committee. In carrying out the functions of the Chair, the Secretary of Commerce shall consult with the members serving on the Committee pursuant to paragraphs (5) and (11) of subsection (b).

(d) *CONSULTATION.*—In conducting analyses under section 3 and preparing reports under section 4, the Committee shall consult with, and consider pertinent reports issued by, the Electric Reliability Organization certified under section 215(c) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(c)).

(e) *TERMINATION.*—The Committee shall terminate 60 days after submitting its final report pursuant to section 4(c).

#### SEC. 3. ANALYSES.

(a) *SCOPE.*—The Committee shall conduct analyses, for each of the calendar years 2016, 2020, and 2030, of the following:

(1) *The cumulative impact of covered rules that are promulgated as final regulations on or before January 1, 2012, in combination with covered actions.*

(2) *The cumulative impact of all covered rules (including covered rules that have not been promulgated as final regulations on or before January 1, 2012), in combination with covered actions.*

(3) *The incremental impact of each covered rule not promulgated as a final regulation on or before January 1, 2012, relative to an analytic baseline representing the results of the analysis conducted under paragraph (1).*

(b) *CONTENTS.*—The Committee shall include in each analysis conducted under this section the following:

(1) *Estimates of the impacts of the covered rules and covered actions with regard to—*

(A) *the global economic competitiveness of the United States, particularly with respect to energy intensive and trade sensitive industries;*

(B) *other cumulative costs and cumulative benefits, including evaluation through a general equilibrium model approach;*

(C) *any resulting change in national, State, and regional electricity prices;*

(D) *any resulting change in national, State, and regional fuel prices;*

(E) *the impact on national, State, and regional employment during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, and also in the long term, including secondary impacts associated with increased energy prices and facility closures; and*

(F) *the reliability and adequacy of bulk power supply in the United States.*

(2) *Discussion of key uncertainties and assumptions associated with each estimate.*

(3) *A sensitivity analysis.*

(4) *Discussion, and where feasible an assessment, of the cumulative impact of the covered rules and covered actions on—*

(A) *consumers;*

(B) *small businesses;*

(C) *regional economies;*

(D) *State, local, and tribal governments;*

(E) *local and industry-specific labor markets; and*

(F) *agriculture,*

as well as key uncertainties associated with each topic.

(c) **METHODS.**—In conducting analyses under this section, the Committee shall use the best available methods, consistent with guidance from the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs and the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-4.

(d) **DATA.**—In conducting analyses under this section, the Committee—

(1) shall use the best data that are available to the public or supplied to the Committee by its members, including the most recent such data appropriate for this analysis representing air quality, facility emissions, and installed controls; and

(2) is not required to create data or to use data that are not readily accessible.

(e) **COVERED RULES.**—In this section, the term “covered rule” means the following:

(1) The following published rules (including any successor or substantially similar rule):

(A) “Federal Implementation Plans To Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone”, published at 75 Fed. Reg. 45210 (August 2, 2010).

(B) “National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone”, published at 75 Fed. Reg. 2938 (January 19, 2010).

(C) “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Major Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters”, published at 76 Fed. Reg. 15608 (March 21, 2011).

(D) “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers”, published at 76 Fed. Reg. 15554 (March 21, 2011).

(E) “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from Coal- and Oil-fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units”, signed by Administrator Lisa P. Jackson on March 16, 2011.

(F) “Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Special Wastes; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities”, published at 75 Fed. Reg. 35127 (June 21, 2010).

(G) “Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Sulfur Dioxide”, published at 75 Fed. Reg. 35520 (June 22, 2010).

(H) “Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Nitrogen Dioxide”, published at 75 Fed. Reg. 6474 (February 9, 2010).

(2) The following additional rules or guidelines promulgated on or after January 1, 2009:

(A) Any rule or guideline promulgated under section 111(b) or 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(b), 7411(d)) to address climate change.

(B) Any rule or guideline promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, a State, a local government, or a permitting agency under or as the result of section 169A or 169B of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7491, 7492).

(C) Any rule establishing or modifying a national ambient air quality standard under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409).

(f) **COVERED ACTIONS.**—In this section, the term “covered action” means any action on or after January 1, 2009, by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, a State, a local government, or a permitting agency as a result of the application of part C of title I (relating to prevention of significant deterioration of air quality) or title V (relating to permitting) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), if such application occurs with respect to an air pollutant that is identified as a greenhouse gas in “Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act”, published at 74 Fed. Reg. 66496 (December 15, 2009).

#### SEC. 4. REPORTS; PUBLIC COMMENT.

(a) **PRELIMINARY REPORT.**—Not later than January 31, 2012, the Committee shall make public and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a preliminary report containing the results of the analyses conducted under section 3.

(b) **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.**—The Committee shall accept public comments regarding the preliminary report submitted under subsection (a) for a period of 90 days after such submission.

(c) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than August 1, 2012, the Committee shall submit to Congress a final report containing the analyses conducted under section 3, including any revisions to such analyses made as a result of public comments, and a response to such comments.

#### SEC. 5. REGULATORY DEFERRAL OF CERTAIN RULES.

(a) **NO FINAL ACTION.**—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not take final action with respect to the rule listed in subparagraph (E) of section 3(e)(1) (relating to national emission standards and standards of performance for certain electric generating units) until a date (to be determined by the Administrator) that is at least 6 months after the day on which the Committee submits the final report under section 4(c).

(b) **RULES FINALIZED PRIOR TO ENACTMENT.**—Notwithstanding the final action taken with respect to the rule listed in subparagraph (A) of section 3(e)(1) (relating to Federal implementation plans to reduce interstate transport of fine particulate matter and ozone) and final action (if any) taken with respect to the rule listed in subparagraph (E) of section 3(e)(1) prior to the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) such final action shall not be or become, as applicable, effective until a date (to be determined by the Administrator) that is at least 6 months after the day on which the Committee submits the final report under section 4(c); and

(2) the date for compliance with any standard or requirement in either such finalized rule, and any date for further regulatory action triggered by either such finalized rule, shall be delayed by a period equal to the period—

(A) beginning on the date of the publication of the final action for the respective finalized rule; and

(B) ending on the date on which such final action becomes effective pursuant to paragraph (1).

(c) **APPLICABILITY OF CLEAN AIR INTERSTATE RULE DURING INTERIM PERIOD.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall continue to implement the Clean Air Interstate Rule and the rule establishing Federal Implementation Plans for the Clean Air Interstate Rule as promulgated and modified by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (70 Fed. Reg. 25162 (May 12, 2005), 71 Fed. Reg. 25288 (April 28, 2006), 71 Fed. Reg. 25328 (April 28, 2006), 72 Fed. Reg. 59190 (Oct. 19, 2007), 72 Fed. Reg. 62338 (Nov. 2, 2007), 74 Fed. Reg. 56721 (Nov. 3, 2009)) until the date on which final action with respect to the rule listed in subparagraph (A) of section 3(e)(1) becomes effective pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

#### SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act for fiscal year 2012—

(1) \$3,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, of which not more than \$2,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 3; and

(2) \$500,000 to the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) **OFFSET.**—Effective October 1, 2011, section 797(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, as amended by section 2(e) of the Diesel Reduction Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-364), is amended—

(1) by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”; and

(2) by inserting “\$46,000,000 for fiscal year 2012 and” after “to carry out this subtitle”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 112-213. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112-213.

Mr. WELCH. I seek to offer the amendment of Mr. RUSH of Illinois as his designee.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 2(b)(3), insert “and the Deputy Secretary of Labor” before the period.

In section 2(b)(4), insert “and the Deputy Secretary of Energy” before the period.

At the end of section 2(b), add the following:

(12) The Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality.

(13) The Secretary of the Interior.

(14) The Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(15) The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(16) The Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.

Amend section 2(c) to read as follows:

(c) CHAIR.—The Secretary of Commerce and the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality shall serve as co-chairs of the Committee. In carrying out the functions of the Chair, the co-chairs shall consult with the members of the Committee.

In section 2(d), insert “stakeholders and relevant experts, including” after “reports issued by.”

In section 3(b)(1), insert after subparagraph (D) the following (and redesignate accordingly):

(E) any resulting change in the incidences of asthma and asthma attacks and other pulmonary disease;

(F) any resulting change in the occurrence of birth and developmental defects;

(G) any resulting change in the occurrence of premature mortality;

(H) any resulting change in the occurrence of other adverse health effects;

(I) the effect on clean energy jobs;

(J) the effect on clean energy companies, including companies that export clean energy technology;

(K) the effect on regional air quality, including any resulting change in the impairment of visibility, due to reduced pollution;

(L) the effect on the water quality of lakes and streams;

(M) any resulting change in the number of work days missed;

(N) any resulting change in the number of school days missed;

(O) any resulting change in the use of emergency medical services;

In section 3(b)(4), insert after subparagraph (D) the following (and redesignate accordingly):

(E) vulnerable subpopulations, including the elderly, pregnant women, and populations with pulmonary disease;

(F) the environment, including impacts on global climate change;

(G) development of infants and children;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes needed changes to the economic analysis mandated by the underlying bill; but fundamentally this bill, itself, we believe, is an assault on the Clean Air Act, not really a bill that requires a study.

The legislation began in committee as a bill to require a new study on the economic impacts of EPA rules to cut air pollution. At that point, the bill simply required a burdensome and redundant study of EPA rules and did not affect any of the rules it proposed to examine.

It changed in committee. The Republican members amended it to indefinitely delay implementation of two very key rules to reduce power plant pollution, the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and the Mercury and Air Toxics Rule.

Now Mr. WHITFIELD has proposed amending the bill to further eliminate those rules altogether and prevent EPA from being able to clean up power plants in the future. Mr. LATTA has offered an amendment to force EPA to listen to polluters' accountants rather than scientists when setting air quality standards. This bill is now a direct attack on the heart of the Clean Air Act. That act has saved thousands of lives.

The bill still contains a study on the economic impact of EPA rules, although I'm not sure why it would do that. The Rush amendment, Mr. Chairman, would make the study required by this legislation a little less biased and a little more useful.

The bill creates a new government bureaucracy to conduct a complicated study of EPA rules. It's not necessary. In addition, the bill ensures that the final study will be unbalanced and inherently biased. It's one thing to take a hard look at regulations. It's another thing to cook the outcome of that examination.

The Rush amendment ensures that the committee will look at both the costs and the benefits of EPA rules.

The bill's supporters originally presented this bill as a means to gather more facts on key EPA rules. As amended by the Republicans, it's increasingly clear that the facts really don't matter.

I support the Rush amendment, but I remain staunchly opposed to final passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I rise in opposition to this amendment to a number of reasons. First of all, the TRAIN Act, the underlying bill that we're talking about here, applies to 14 regulations of EPA. It does not delay in any way any of those regulations, except for two, and that's referred to as the Utility MACT and the Cross-State Air Transport Rule. And even on those two acts, it only delays the Cross-State Transport Rule by 3 years, and it delays the Utility MACT by 1 year.

The whole purpose of the TRAIN Act is simply to look more closely at the cumulative impact on jobs, on electricity prices, on American competitiveness in the global marketplace. EPA has done a very thorough job on most of these regulations in calculating benefits, but they had not looked closely in all of them on cost. Under the TRAIN Act, we're simply asking this independent government agency to look at all costs and all benefits.

Another reason that I would speak in opposition to this amendment, one of the things that it requires this independent body to do is to examine the effect on green energy companies. Now, there's nothing in the TRAIN Act that's selecting one industry to give some favorable treatment to, and that's particularly what this amendment does.

I might add, on green energy, the green energy industry has received increases of 153 percent of subsidies. Subsidies have increased 153 percent for green energy. So I don't think that they should be receiving some special benefit from this Rush amendment; and that's why I would oppose it, and I would ask all Members to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. How much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Vermont has 2½ minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

I want to talk a little bit about the Clean Air Act, Mr. Chair. We have power plants that are coal-burning and emit toxins into the air. That's not in dispute. But the attack on any kind of regulation says that if there's any expense associated with providing health and safety to the people downwind of the polluting emitting power plants, they're on their own. They've got to breathe that air, and it's their problem.

Now, I live in Vermont; and the coal-burning plants, the air all comes and falls in Vermont. The Clean Air Act has had tremendous success in actually cleaning up some of these power plants.

Now, of course there's some expense associated with burning clean; but there's also, as you know, Mr. Chair, an enormous cost associated with burning dirty. It may be cheaper for the power plant owner, and it might even be cheaper for the electricity users of that power plant; but the costs associated with the health, the safety, the environmental impacts are simply off-load-

ed by the polluter on to the innocent members of society who are downwind of the mercury-spewing polluting plants.

So, sure, we can have some debate about what should be the proper expense. But should we really have a debate that it is illegitimate for the Federal Government to take actions, regulatory and legislative, that protect the health and safety of innocent people?

The law of physics has air-carrying pollutants going in the direction that nature sends it, and that means everybody downwind gets affected. It's really astonishing that in the legitimate effort to ask legitimate questions about whether a regulation is serving a useful purpose, whether the regulation achieves the intended goal, whether there's a way to achieve that goal at less expense, those are all fair questions. But to abolish the regulations altogether, to suggest that everybody who will be affected by mercury pollution has no remedy and cannot look to the Federal Government to provide them with some protection for their health, for the health of their children, that's extreme, and it's unacceptable, and it's expensive.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. May I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Well, I would say first to the distinguished gentleman that while we're delaying this Cross-State Air Transport Rule, we have in effect today the CAIR Act, which has been in effect since 2005. The EPA itself has said that this act that is currently controlling the cross-wind interstate movements will reduce sulfur dioxide and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by 57 and 63 percent respectively. That regulation is still going to be in effect.

I would also remind everyone that EPA, when they implemented the CAIR Act, pointed out that it would have \$100 billion in health benefits each year, preventing 17,000 premature deaths, 22,000 nonfatal heart attacks, 12,300 hospital admissions, 1.7 million lost workdays, 500,000 lost school days, and it goes on to all of the benefits.

□ 0930

Simply because a court invalidated the CAIR Act because EPA was looking at a regional program rather than at a State-by-State program does not mean that this is not an effective regulation that's in existence today. Even many environmental groups actually supported EPA in opposing the effort to invalidate the CAIR Act. EPA made strong arguments that the CAIR Act was adequate.

So all we're doing is trying to delay this cross-State rule. As I said, even respected independent analyses have indicated that these two rules—the Utility MACT and the Cross-State Air Transport Rule—will have a net effect of a loss of 1.4 million jobs and will increase electric utility bills by 23 percent.

Now, at a time when our economy is so weak and when we're trying to create jobs, we simply wanted to look at it more closely and give EPA a little bit more time. That's all that we're trying to do with our act, and that's why we're very much opposed to the Rush amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112-213.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 22, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 6, line 24, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 6, after line 24, insert the following new subparagraph:

(G) the effect on clean energy jobs and clean energy companies, including companies that export clean energy technology.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a simple and straightforward amendment to H.R. 2401.

My amendment will help make sure that the reports required by H.R. 2401 are fair—not skewed to support the majority's favorite talking points. It's critical that the reports look at the beneficial consequences of environmental protection, including the fact that good environmental policies create jobs in the clean energy sector.

I reject the argument that the majority is making here today. Contrary to what we've heard members of the majority say over and over during today's debate, policies that protect our environment also create jobs. They create good family-wage jobs.

Before I came to Congress, I spent my career as a clean energy engineer. I helped design windmills that overlooked my congressional district in California, and I've seen hundreds of jobs created in the clean energy sector; but to my great distress, I also watched many of those jobs get shipped overseas to places like Germany because our country did not have the right policies in place to support that industry.

I am committed to creating jobs and seeing more goods produced right here in America, a goal I am confident that every Member of this Chamber shares. The clean energy industry is poised to lead the way but only if we make the right decisions. Policies that promote a clean, healthy environment create new incentives for investments in clean energy, creating thousands of jobs, supporting new industries, promoting exports, and benefiting public health.

My amendment simply ensures that we include the job-creating effects of environmental policies on the clean energy sector in the reports provided by this bill. I am confident that a fair, unbiased assessment of environmental rules will show that they also create good, family-wage, clean energy jobs. I hope the majority will accept this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. While I have great respect for the gentleman from California, I would remind everyone that, in his 2008 convention speech, Barack Obama promised to create 5 million green energy jobs, and those jobs have not been created.

I would also point out that renewable energy subsidies increased by 186 percent over the last 3 years: from \$5.1 billion to \$14.7 billion. The wind industry, for example, received a tenfold increase: from \$476 million to \$4.986 billion. Solar subsidies increased by more than a factor of 6: from \$179 million to \$1.134 billion.

Then we noted that, over at the Department of Energy, there are loan guarantee programs. As this article in The New York Times stated, they gave an example of one company that had received \$300 million to create green technology jobs. They ended up creating 150 jobs at a cost of \$2 million per job. Now, coal, nuclear, and natural gas still provide about 95, 96 percent of the electricity produced in America; but the reason we oppose this amendment is that it also gives special treatment to green energy. As illustrated by the increase in renewable subsidies available to them, I think it's quite obvious that government programs favor green energy right now.

Our position is, with the three basics—coal, nuclear, and natural gas—providing the base load to create the industrial growth of this country by providing low-cost electricity, we do not need this amendment to instruct this independent body to look at specifically the impact on green energy exporting companies. So, for that reason, I would oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I don't dispute the facts of my good friend from Kentucky. Basically what I'm asking is that we make sure that these jobs are counted, that they're not

ignored or looked over, which is what I'm afraid will happen.

At this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to emphasize what my friend from California just said. What the amendment does is to make sure that you add to the analysis the impact on clean energy jobs and clean energy companies. Why wouldn't you want to make sure explicitly that that is a part of the analysis?

I invite you to come to Portland, Oregon, where it is, I think, the wind energy capital. It's making a lot of difference in our community and across America. Wind energy, for instance, is the fastest growing in terms of installed capacity, and costs are going down. It is an area that makes a difference to the economy. What my colleague from California is urging is to make sure that it's a part of the study.

It is unfortunate that we're to this point this morning anyway. We started this odyssey in 1990 with the Clean Air Act. After 8 years of study at EPA, the conclusion was this is a real problem, and the Clinton administration and the EPA started the rulemaking process. The Bush administration dug its feet until 2005 with an inadequate response that was thrown out by the courts. Finally now, after 21 years, we're starting to move forward with something that wouldn't take effect until 2015. In the meantime, there would be many jobs that would be available in construction and in clean technology.

At least, at least, at least I hope you're not successful in stretching this out even further to delay the action; but at a minimum, you would think that you would want to have a full picture. Look at the people, like in my community, who are producing product and making it available for export.

Support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 45 seconds remaining.

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

□ 0940

Mr. WHITFIELD. Does the gentleman from California have the right to close?

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Does the gentleman from California have anything else to say on the amendment?

Mr. MCNERNEY. Thank you.

Basically I just want to emphasize I have actually experienced job creation in the green energy sector. I have seen hundreds if not thousands of jobs created. I want to make sure we count those jobs. I don't want this to be a whitewash or anything like that. It's important that this analysis be open



and that it be fair and balanced, and that's all that we are asking on this side.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would say to the gentleman, we all recognize the importance of green energy, but there isn't one of these regulations that we are looking to for an analysis that has any negative impact on green energy. In fact, every one of these regulations will help green energy.

And, as I said, the government's philosophy right now is to do everything possible for green energy, more subsidies, a study going on all of the time on the impact on the jobs. For that reason, we do not feel that this amendment is necessary and would ask the Members to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-213.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I offer an amendment that is at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 10, insert the following new subparagraphs (and redesignate accordingly):

- (E) low-income communities;
- (F) public health;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. I do thank you, Mr. Chair.

My amendment would simply ensure the low-income communities and the public health generally of all Americans are considered in the bill's section on studies about the impact of this regulation.

I offer this amendment, Mr. Chair, in hopes that we might have an honest debate, a debate that is inclusive of those most affected by the very policies that my colleagues are attempting to tie up and, in two cases, outright prevent.

Let me be frank with you, Mr. Chair. I was born in 1951, and I grew up gasping for breath most of my life. I grew up in an industrial city, a manufacturing city in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and I had my first asthma attack shov-

eling coal into a furnace and then gasping for breath because of the smog that was generated from manufacturing. Thank God for the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments.

We have seen tremendous health benefits over the years, thanks to the work of the Environmental Protection Agency, and not only the bureaucracy, but the courts that have made sure the deadlines are enforced and not simply thrown to the curb. According to a recent EPA study, we have substantial and hard scientific proof that protecting our Nation's air quality from hazardous pollutants is a very substantial benefit.

In 2010, the reductions in fine particle and ozone pollution from the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments prevented more than 160,000 cases of premature mortality, 130,000 heart attacks, 13 million lost workdays, and 1.7 million asthma attacks.

We do know that the Clean Air Act regulations by the EPA especially helped low-income communities who are often impacted by environmental injustices and other vulnerable populations.

A recent 2-year-old study by the University of Massachusetts and the University of Southern Carolina analyzed 300 different metropolitan areas and ranked them based on how pollution affects low-income and minority communities.

This study cited that air pollution is unevenly distributed within States as well as between them. A growing body of research has demonstrated that people of color and low-income communities often face the greatest environmental hazards. And the area that I represent in the metro Milwaukee area came in in the top 10 cities in both cases.

I just would like to add my own personal experience to the body of this research.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would like to remind everyone once again that the TRAIN Act is applied to 14 regulations coming out of EPA, and it's seldom that Congress intervenes in these regulations. But there are so many of these, and the cost of jobs and the cost of buying the equipment and the lack of achievability of many of them to meet the criteria is the reason we want to do this study. I would remind everyone we do not delay in any way any of these regulations except two of them.

I would say to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin that I agree with her. Many of the communities that would most suffer high energy prices and unemployment as a result of the EPA regulations are those communities that rely on affordable, reliable, coal-fired energy to light their homes and run

their businesses. These communities are the least able to afford increased unemployment, increased energy prices, and the illness that results from unemployment and being unable to afford fuel.

And I might say that when EPA does their analysis, they never look at the effect of the health of the children of the people working in the coal mines and the utility plants who lose their jobs, and there is an impact on it.

But I think this is a good amendment that would help the analysis, and I would like to tell the lady from Wisconsin we would be happy to accept this amendment.

Ms. MOORE. I'm sorry. You would be happy to accept it, you say?

Mr. WHITFIELD. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. MOORE. Well, I do thank the gentleman for accepting this amendment.

I do repeat that the two parts that this bill had formally included prior to your accepting my amendment would have made it impossible for a State that wanted clear air—they would find themselves hopeless because it would basically eviscerate their ability to prevent pollution from crossing the border. So I do appreciate the gentleman accepting my amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would just like to remind the gentlelady that the CAIR Act is still in effect. As I read earlier, all the benefits are there that the EPA said would be there, and it's significantly reduced NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, SO<sub>x</sub> emissions. We're not doing anything to change that existing law.

Thank you for making the amendment. As I said, we feel like it will really help on this study.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 0950

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-213.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 15, insert the following new paragraph:

- (5) Estimates of the impacts of delaying the covered rules and covered actions on the incidence of birth and developmental defects and infant mortality.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, it's clear that the goal of the TRAIN Act is not simply to study EPA standards. The goal of the majority is to block the efforts of EPA to cut mercury and other toxic pollution from dirty power plants. That's dangerous and it's misguided.

The research is clear, unless EPA enforces these standards, there will be more premature deaths, more heart and asthma attacks, more hospital and emergency room visits.

Up until recently, I thought I was safe from this pollution. I don't live next door to a power plant; I live near the coast of the Pacific Ocean. But I learned that you don't need to live near a dirty power plant to be exposed to its harmful effects. I received test results this summer showing that I have an unsafe level of mercury in my body. And I'm not alone. Tens of millions of American women of child-bearing age, and their children, are at risk from mercury and other toxins that are released into our air each and every year. Every year, hundreds of thousands of babies are exposed to mercury.

Mercury exposure can cause learning disabilities, developmental delays, and other developmental problems. We owe it to our children to clean up toxic mercury pollution, and that's why I'm offering this amendment.

The amendment would simply require that this committee designate the analysis of the true costs of including health effects in blocking EPA's lifesaving clean air safeguards. These costs are clear to mothers and grandmothers across the Nation—brain damage, developmental problems, infant deaths. Support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. All of us certainly are concerned about impacts on children. One of the problems that we have with this amendment is that when you try to determine specifically what causes a birth defect, for example, there are lots of different reasons. Folic acid is a B vitamin. Taking folic acid supplements before getting pregnant and in early pregnancy lowers the risk of having a baby with serious birth defects. Drinking alcohol increases the likelihood of serious birth defects. Smoking. Women who are obese when they get pregnant are at higher risk of having a baby with serious birth defects. Poor control of diabetes in pregnant women increases the chance of having a birth defect. So there's lots of

different reasons, and it's difficult to set out a causal reason.

I would say to the gentlelady from California who we know is genuinely concerned about these health issues and has distinguished her career by raising them frequently, the EPA did extensive analysis of the health benefits of all of these rules with the exception of greenhouse gas. They didn't do any study on anything there. So we have a lot of information about the health benefits.

As far as the mercury issue, I would say to the gentlelady that the Utility MACT, EPA itself said that this would reduce mercury by such a small amount that it would represent only 0.004 percent of the total claimed benefits of the rule, and the remaining 99.996 percent would be due to particulate matter reduction.

And I would also remind the gentlelady that the Department of Energy and other groups have indicated that 99 percent of mercury deposits in the U.S. do not come from utility companies, but they originate from nature and foreign industrial sources in which the wind brings them to the U.S.

We believe that there's adequate information on health benefits. Furthermore, the TRAIN Act does ask the independent body to look at benefits—it can be health, whatever—and cost. For that reason, we would oppose the gentlelady's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, power plants are the biggest industrial source of mercury pollution in the United States, and I believe that the remarks of the chairman of the Energy Committee underscore the very reason that we should have the studies of the health effects included in the study that is requested by the TRAIN Act.

I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a champion of livable cities, to speak on this topic.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy, and I appreciate your offering this amendment. My friends on the other side of the aisle can't have it both ways. There has been a lot of study. For heaven's sake, EPA has already estimated cost of compliance, less than \$1 billion, and the savings to Americans from lives saved, health care costs avoided and days of work and school not missed between \$120 billion and \$280 billion. This is a part of the study effort that has been going on for 20 years.

We had hoped that on the 25th anniversary of the Clean Air Act in 2015 we would probably have full compliance. Yet we are quibbling here about things that EPA has been unable to monetize like a birth defect—but for Heaven's sake, it's serious—in addition to the hundreds of billions that they can monetize.

It is, I think, unfortunate that if this approach is approved, it will enable the Chinese to get ahead of us again. Re-

member, I put in the RECORD last night the front page of the Chinese Daily where they are moving ahead to reduce emissions. They are willing to incur the costs because of the health benefits, but it's not enough for my friends on the other side of the aisle to go ahead after 25 years.

I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Does the gentlelady from California have any time left?

Mrs. CAPPs. May I ask how much time is left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes. The gentlewoman from California has 1 minute.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I don't have any other speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mrs. CAPPs. I am happy to yield my 1 minute to my colleague from Florida, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, a mother of three young children.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPs, and in opposition to the underlying bill—the majority's latest assault on clean air and public health. I'd like to thank Congresswoman CAPPs and all of my colleagues who've spoken in opposition to this bill, which puts the health of all Americans—especially our children—at great risk.

This amendment simply requires recognition of the very real health consequences of air pollution. For example, curbing mercury pollution will protect children and mothers from toxins that damage a developing brain.

With this amendment, the required report must assess the effect on birth and developmental defects and infant mortality rates caused by the delay in better clean air standards. What's wrong with that? Who could be opposed to that?

For such a small additional effort, this assessment would provide crucial information affecting the health of all American families.

As a mother of three young children, whose health is among my absolute greatest concerns, I urge my colleagues who are parents and grandparents to take a moment and consider the impacts of this bad bill.

Delaying EPA's Mercury and Air Toxics Standards will have serious consequences on their children and grandchildren. Remember that we are their first line of defense in this world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this good amendment and opposing the underlying bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would remind everyone just once again that we're talking about 14 regulations. We're not delaying 12 of them in any way. We're asking for further analysis of two of them. For that reason, I would oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).



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

Mrs. CAPP. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KINZINGER OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112-213.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 3(e)(2), add the following:

(D) Any rule addressing fuels under title II of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7521 et seq.) as described in the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions under Regulatory Identification Number 2060-AQ86, or any substantially similar rule, including any rule under section 211(v) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(v)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1000

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I want to thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) for coauthoring this amendment with me to H.R. 2401, the TRAIN Act. It's an important bipartisan amendment that hits directly on what Americans, particularly my constituents in Illinois, are facing every day, the high cost of gasoline.

Later this year, it's expected that the EPA will promulgate rules on gasoline refiners mandating that they offer sulfur levels and vapor pressure by 70 percent. This would be even further below the already low levels mandated in 2004.

In 2004, the EPA's tier 2 rules lowered sulfur and gasoline by 90 percent. The impacts of these new rules could force refineries in the U.S. to slash their gasoline production by up to 14 percent, leaving the United States even more dependent on foreign sources of oil.

Our amendment would require the EPA just to study the economic costs of these new fuel requirements. Before delivering what could be a devastating blow to the customer and to our economy, the EPA should first provide data to show lowering the sulfur content will actually achieve cost-effective, real emissions reductions in air quality and health and welfare benefits.

Americans are fed up with the volatility in the gasoline markets. While we may not be able to control the price of oil on the global market, we can control the cost of regulations on our

fuel. Every dollar that's taken out of the taxpayer pocket due to new regulation is a dollar that's not going to refuel the American economy.

We need commonsense regulations, and we need to know the impacts of regulations on families and businesses before they go into effect.

This amendment is a commonsense approach to ensure Americans are getting the cause-worthy benefits that we need out of regulations. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

At this time it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), co-author of the amendment.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I extend my thanks to my colleague from Illinois for joining me in cosponsoring what I believe is a very important amendment.

We offered this amendment because we have concerns with EPA's intent to proceed with a tier 3 rulemaking which would establish new fuel specification standards without justifying it with the sufficient data that has already been called to be conducted under a study in a previous bill.

In 2007, Congress included a provision in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 that directed EPA to study and implement fuel changes to negate any detrimental air quality impact resulting from the renewable fuel standard. EPA has not conducted this required study.

I am concerned that EPA may be moving too quickly with tier 3 regulations. EPA should complete the study first and provide for adequate comment and feedback from stakeholders before proceeding with the proposed rule. Any proposed changes to gasoline sulfur content and vapor pressure should be backed by sound data. These reductions must be justified because they have real costs. I have concerns about the effects these new regulations could have on refiners. These costs could result in decreased gasoline supplies and possible refinery closures, both of which could undermine our Nation's energy security.

Our amendment simply adds any proposed tier 3 rulemaking to the list of regulations where EPA must conduct additional analyses, as outlined in TRAIN. This additional study will ensure that all of the costs and impacts are known before EPA proceeds with its proposal.

I hope my colleagues in the House can support this straightforward amendment. It simply calls on an agency to simply do that which it was directed to do years ago before proceeding and not to basically proceed before you have the vital information on which to base some very important regulations.

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

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

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

Mr. RUSH. Thank you.

Even if this amendment passes to improve the study of EPA rules, that will not address the underlying problems with this bill. Proponents of this bill imply that it simply requires EPA to study the cumulative impact of EPA rules. That is false. What began as a bill to study EPA rules has morphed into a bill to actually block the EPA rules. In fact, the bill blocks and indefinitely delays two of the most important air pollution rules in decades.

First, the bill blocks EPA from finalizing a proposed rule to cut toxic air pollution from power plants, which are the most egregious and the largest source of toxic mercury pollution in our Nation. Mercury is dangerous in small amounts, and mercury can damage the developing brains of infants and children.

The proposed rule would prevent more than 90 percent of the mercury in coal from being emitted into the air. The rule also would reduce fine particle emissions by more than a quarter, producing tremendous widespread health benefits.

For each year this bill delays the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule, it will allow up to an additional 17,000 premature deaths, 120,000 cases of asthma, and 850,000 days when people miss work due to illness.

But that's not all. The bill also blocks the EPA from implementing the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule to require 27 States to reduce power plant emissions that pollute the air in downwind States.

Each year of delay in implementing this rule will produce up to an additional 35,000 premature deaths, 400,000 cases of asthma, and 1.8 million days when people will miss work or school due to illness.

The benefits of these rules far exceed the costs. For the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule alone, the pollution reductions will yield annual health benefits that outweigh the rule's costs by up to 350 to 1.

The bill still creates a new government bureaucracy to produce a study of EPA rules, but this study is just a Trojan horse to disguise the true intent of this legislation: to block and delay two important EPA rules to protect public health from air pollution.

The bill that emerged from committee already is a horrible, terrible bill. But it promises to get even worse, significantly worse, as my Republican colleagues amend this horrible and horrendous bill before us.

Mr. WHITFIELD himself has offered amendments that completely nullify the two power plant rules and force EPA to start all the way back to the beginning, to start from scratch—but with new limits on what the agency can do to reduce pollution. According to the EPA administrator, these changes could prevent the EPA from ever reissuing these same rules, deny them far into the future from ever reissuing these same rules.

Mr. LATTA has offered an amendment that strikes at the heart of the Clean Air Act by requiring the EPA to prioritize cost over public health when setting national air quality standards. These standards form the foundation of why we have been able to clean up air pollution, and Mr. LATTA wants to throw it out the window.

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

Mr. RUSH. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I yield the balance of my time to my good friend from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding to me.

The EPA is currently developing a tier 3 rulemaking that would further reduce sulfur levels in gasoline to an average of 10 parts per million, a 70 percent change from today's already low standards, while reducing the gasoline volatility.

□ 1010

The EPA is expected to issue a proposed rule by the end of this year. The problem we have is that in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, section 209 required the EPA to conduct a study 18 months after the enactment to determine whether the renewable fuels required by the section would adversely impact air quality and not later than 3 years after that enactment. The problem is EPA has not finished that study we require them to conduct even before these new regulations. Now they're moving forward with a rule with a half-baked study, and that's why I support this amendment to the TRAIN Act, Mr. Chairman. This is not a delay amendment. This is just to make sure we don't get the cart in front of the horse, and we need to have that study finished before the EPA moves forward with that sulfur criteria.

That's why I support my colleague from Illinois' and my colleague from Texas' amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

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

The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title.

H.R. 2883. An act to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the child and family services program through fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### TRANSPARENCY IN REGULATORY ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS ON THE NATION ACT OF 2011

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. DENT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112-213.

Mr. DENT. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, after line 20, insert the following:

(I) "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants", published at 75 Fed. Reg. 54970 (September 9, 2010).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment simply adds the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, NESHAP or Cement MACT, to the covered rules within H.R. 2401. Reasonable efforts to limit the emissions of hazardous pollutants by cement manufacturing facilities are most certainly appropriate, but EPA has failed to craft effective and efficient regulations.

These NESHAP standards will be very, very difficult and extremely costly for domestic cement manufacturers to meet, severely jeopardizing the ability of an essential American basic industry to remain competitive with foreign importers. Including NESHAP and H.R. 2401 will allow the loss of American jobs and the weakening of domestic manufacturers' global competitiveness to become key considerations during the completion of the rulemaking process.

We must understand the impacts of these rules on jobs and our manufacturing competitiveness. Here now are some simple, basic facts about the American cement industry, and I represent the largest cement-producing district in America. I'm cochair of the Cement Caucus along with cosponsor MIKE ROSS of Arkansas. This industry employs about 13,000 Americans. Four thousand of those jobs have been lost

since 2008. There are 97 cement plants in America producing today, and there's a presence in nearly every State as well, I might add. Cement is an absolutely essential basic industry in American manufacturing. It plays a major role in the development of our Nation's infrastructure.

I think we need to better understand some of this background, too, regarding these NESHAP rules.

NESHAP, of course, amends EPA's maximum achievable control technology, or MACT, and performance standards for cement kilns. And this is utilizing an unrealistic pollutant-by-pollutant approach for application of MACT. MACT requirements are designed to direct industries toward the pollution control technology used by the best performers in a certain industry sector. It cobbles together a range of different performance characteristics applicable to different pollutants without determining if it is feasible or even possible for any one kiln to comply with all of these standards.

The truth is there is not a single cement manufacturing plant in America that can comply with all of these standards simultaneously. The chemical composition, too, of key cement inputs, such as limestone, vary from region to region. Consequently, NESHAP will have disproportionate impacts on different manufacturing locations across the country simply based on the type of limestone being used in the process of manufacturing cement.

We should talk, too, about the impacts on the domestic cement industry: \$2.2 billion worth of compliance costs, and that's an EPA estimate; \$3.4 billion in compliance costs, and that's the industry estimate. So there's a lot of cost here. We're in the billions.

There are numerous plants. There are estimates that from 12 to 18 of these plants across the country may be idle or permanently shut down. And these are massive facilities with tremendous capital investment. And we believe that the national price for Portland cement may increase by 5.4 percent. Domestic production will fall by 11 percent. Thousands of high-quality jobs could or would be lost.

One major domestic cement producer has already publicly announced that, due to other regulatory uncertainties of this NESHAP and other pending regulations, it is halting construction of a new state-of-the-art cement kiln, suspending over \$350 million in new investment and the creation of over 1,500 construction jobs.

With respect to global emissions, what will this mean? The reduction of domestic production of cement will naturally lead to an increase in our Nation's reliance on foreign cement. And I can assure you those foreign producers are not going to be complying with the NESHAP rules. So this is going to shift overseas production and will likely increase global greenhouse emissions in two ways:

First, transporting cement to the U.S. from international markets will require tremendous amounts of fossil fuels, substantially increasing the amount of carbon emitted per unit of cement used; and

Second, foreign suppliers will be manufacturing in countries with little or no environmental protections.

So it's critically important that EPA produce realistic and achievable regulations. Including NESHAP in H.R. 2401 will help EPA take into account the economic impact of its flawed regulations, and a more thorough economic analysis will lead to a better final rule.

Finally, I wanted to say one thing. The Federal stimulus law is actually helping to finance the construction of a cement importation terminal in Staten Island, New York City, designed to displace many cement workers in my district and all across the northeastern United States, using Federal money to create a handful of jobs while displacing many in basic industry and manufacturing. That's got to stop.

Pass this amendment, and then pass the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. RUSH. I claim time in opposition for purposes of debate.

The ACTING Chair. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Thank you.

Many organizations are on record opposing the TRAIN Act or opposing efforts to block rules to reduce pollution from the country's dirtiest power plants.

Numerous public health groups, including the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Thoracic Society, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America all sent a letter to Congress expressing their support for full implementation of the Clean Air Act and opposing "all efforts to weaken, delay, or block progress toward the continuing implementation of this vital law."

The American Public Health Association stated that it opposes the TRAIN Act because it is "ill-conceived legislation that would prevent EPA from protecting the public's health from dangerous and deadly air pollution."

The National Association of Clean Air Agencies opposes this bill as well. NACAA sent a letter expressing its concern that the TRAIN Act would "create regulatory delays that could lead to thousands of premature deaths, remove important regulatory tools upon which States and localities depend, impose additional costs on government as well as small businesses, create regulatory uncertainty, cause job losses and defund an important and cost-effective air pollution control program."

□ 1020

Groups representing millions of individual Americans who believe in protecting our environment strongly oppose this bill and other efforts to weaken clean air protections. These groups include the League of Conservative Voters, the Sierra Club, National Resources Defense Council, Environment America, the National Audubon Society, the Environmental Defense Fund, and the Union of Concerned Scientists. They stated in a letter to Congress that "sacrificing tens of thousands of American lives will not create more jobs. Poisoning the air our children and our families breathe will not stimulate the economy."

Three hundred sportsmen's organizations representing our Nation's hunters, anglers, and the businesses that depend on our wildlife and natural resources support the EPA's effort to cut mercury pollution, and I quote them with these words. They said: "Strongly oppose any effort to weaken the Clean Air Act."

The Evangelical Environment Network has been running radio ads expressing their opposition to efforts to block the Mercury and Air Toxics rule. Mercury can damage the developing brain of fetuses and children, causing learning disabilities and neurological problems. The president of this group stated: "We believe that mercury offers a significant potential for hindering our children from developing a pure and wonderful life."

The Obama administration strongly opposes the TRAIN Act. The administration plans to veto this legislation if it ever reaches the President's desk, as the bill would undermine decades of progress in cleaning up the Nation's air quality by—and this is a quote from the Obama administration—"blocking EPA's ability to move forward with two long-overdue Clean Air Act rules."

Americans don't support weakening the Clean Air Act or blocking efforts to reduce dangerous air pollution from power plants. The widespread opposition to the TRAIN Act makes that perfectly clear.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this horrendous bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. RUSH. I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112-213.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, after line 12, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate accordingly):

(f) EXCLUSION FROM REVIEW.—Notwithstanding subsection (e), the Committee may not include in the analyses conducted under section 3 consideration of any rule or guideline promulgated in compliance with Executive Order 12866 (58 Fed. Reg. 51735, relating to regulatory planning and review) or the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Beginning on page 11, line 17, strike section 5 (and redesignate accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2401 is a toxic bill that attempts to dismantle any government regulation to protect our Nation's public health and environment.

To set the stage for my brief remarks, let me cite to the American public Executive Order 12866, which says: "Each agency shall assess both the costs and the benefits of the intended regulation, and recognizing that some costs and benefits are difficult to quantify, propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its cause."

Now, we've been operating under that particular provision for a substantial period of time. And quite frankly, Congress' decisions with reference to the Clean Air Act, signed by President Richard Nixon in 1970, came about as a result of continuing arguments from industry that cleaning up air pollution was too expensive or not feasible.

This bill forbids the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing both the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule and, importantly, the Cross-State Air Pollution rule requiring coal-fired power plants without modern pollution controls to install controls, to reduce emissions of mercury and other toxic air pollutants, fine particulates, and the pollutants that cause smog and acid rain.

In the Rules Committee, I spoke about being in Lavigny in Poland and watching the pollution that was destroying the Black Forest in another country, in Germany. We've had that take place in our States, where one State is offering emissions that come down on another State's population, and therefore the Cross-State Air Pollution rule said that coal-fired plants should install modern pollution controls. And guess what? Sixty percent of them, including one of the largest producers of electricity in this country—Exelon in Illinois—do favor these same rules that are being sought to be delayed. And they favor them for the reason that, among other things, it has produced jobs and it has cured the problems that have been pointed out by

the American Lung Association and countless other organizations that favor the Clean Air Act and are opposed to delaying further two particularly important measures that would allow for pollution to continue to be cleaned up.

Port Everglades in Florida, right outside my constituency, for all of the years that I have lived there—and that nears 50—this coal-powered plant has been producing emissions. Over the course of time, they have reduced those emissions. And Florida Power & Light recently indicated that they're going to do everything that they can to meet the emissions standards rather than sit up and try and oppose them because they recognize, one, that they do have all of the juice—if you can call electricity that.

And in the final analysis, those of us that benefit from it are going to wind up paying more. But to pay more to make sure that children don't have asthma and to make sure that people don't have lung pollution and to make sure that lakes don't go dead from mercury or that fish don't have in them more mercury than they rightly should for food consumption, then I'm willing to pay more; and I believe most Americans are as well in order that we will have clean air.

I ask for support of my amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I have great admiration for the gentleman from Florida, who is always eloquent in his remarks.

□ 1030

He started off his support of his amendment by saying that we are trying to dismantle any regulation. I would like to remind everyone, once again, that this bill applies to 14 EPA regulations and we do not delay in any way 12 of them. And on the other two, we delay one of them, both of them, 6 months after the final report is due.

Now, he had mentioned that Exelon supported the new EPA regulations. Exelon is a company that we all admire and respect, but it's a nuclear energy company, so there's nothing in these regulations that has any impact on them, as far as I know. But all of these regulations are trying to drive the coal industry out of business, that still provides 50 percent of all the electricity in America.

Now, in the TRAIN Act, we simply ask this independent government agency, composed of Obama administration appointees, to examine the cumulative impact of all of these rules, because EPA has never been quite this aggressive. And I might add that the two rules that we asked to delay for further analysis, an independent research group said that the annualized cost would be almost \$18 billion that utili-

ties would have to spend to buy equipment that may not be able to even then achieve the standards because the technology is not available.

The issue is not about mercury. The utilities do a great job of cleaning up mercury. EPA itself said that its Utility MACT would only benefit—the benefit of the Utility MACT would be only .004 percent attributable to mercury because 99 percent of mercury in America comes from nature and from outside other countries that the trade winds bring in to our country. So utilities don't object to the mercury part of this.

But they're now adding hydrogen fluoride and hydrogen chloride, of which there is no technology available to achieve the standard that EPA is setting.

So because of the cost, because of the unique vulnerability of our economy today, 12 of these regulations we don't delay at all. We just say, let's study the cumulative impact, which the President asked for in his Executive order that he issued recently. He said we need to look at the cumulative impact. That's what we're trying to do.

This amendment would basically say, you don't look at the cumulative impact, you just take the existing studies that have been made. I would also say that EPA didn't even do any study on the greenhouse gas, which we're only trying to analyze the full cost of that.

For those reasons, I would respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112-213.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, after line 24, insert the following: (g) ADDITIONAL ANALYSES.—The Committee shall conduct or commission studies to identify pollution control policies that should be adopted and implemented by the United States to provide domestic job growth and ensure that the Nation is internationally competitive in the \$5 trillion global energy industry for clean energy technology development and manufacturing.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, Deutsche Bank, the biggest bank in Europe, recently issued a report on global clean energy investment opportunities in which it stated, "Countries with more TLC, transparency, longevity, and certainty, in their climate policy frameworks will attract more investment and build new clean industries, technologies, and jobs faster than their policy-lagging counterparts."

The TRAIN Act is one more step in the wrong direction by the same Republican House which has held over 110 anti-environmental votes. This unprecedented assault on the environment has devastating consequences for our economy. As the Deutsche Bank report said, "Germany and China have emerged as global leaders in low carbon technologies and investment. The net effect is that while Congress stumbles, the U.S. stands to fall behind."

This investor report, from Europe's largest bank, identified several policy failures that are impeding job growth here at home. First, Congress has not established a carbon reduction target, or required polluters to pay for the cost of greenhouse gas pollution. Congress does not have a national renewable standard or even an energy efficient standard. The Deutsche Bank report notes that the lack of these regulations and incentives has actually forced investors to make investments elsewhere, including in China and other countries, rather than here at home in America. As a result, we have lost solar and other advanced technology market share to our competitors.

My simple amendment to the TRAIN Act establishes a simple process to identify "policies that should be adopted and implemented by the United States to provide domestic job growth, and to ensure that our Nation is internationally competitive in the \$5 trillion global energy industry for clean energy technology, development, and manufacturing." Business leaders have urged Congress to adopt both a regulatory framework and a system of incentives to spur clean energy job creation. In addition to the regulation the Deutsche Bank identified as supporting investment, American entrepreneurs have called on Congress to expand public financing for clean energy.

This month members of the American Energy Innovation Council visited Capitol Hill to express their strong support for just that concept. This group included venture capitalist John Doerr, former Lockheed Martin CEO Norm Augustine, and Bill Gates of Microsoft. The American Energy Innovation Council recently issued a report which stated, "As business leaders, we feel that America's current energy system is deficient in ways that cause serious harm to our economy, our national security, and our environment.

To correct these deficiencies, we must make a serious commitment to modernizing our energy system with cleaner and more efficient technologies.”

This Republican House is an anchor that's dragging down the American economy. It's continued obsession with austerity and opposition to any economic recovery programs, including clean energy, mean that America falls behind while China surges ahead. We cannot afford to let China and Germany dominate industries such as clean technology.

My simple amendment will establish a process to start restoring American leadership in this important sector for economic growth. Rather than repealing commonsense public health standards, we ought to be focused on measures like my amendment, which support high-tech job growth.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. While I have great regard for the gentleman from Virginia, I must rise to oppose this amendment.

In his 2008 convention speech, Barack Obama promised to create 5 million green energy jobs. An article in The New York Times headlines, “Where the Jobs Aren't,” talks about all the government money that's being spent to subsidize green energy today. They gave an example of one government program that provided \$300 million to a company. They created 150 jobs at what turned out to be a cost of \$2 million for every job.

□ 1040

The reason that solar and wind are not taking off is they are too expensive and too inefficient. Having said that, I recognize that they have a part in our economy and that they have a part in producing electricity, but they can never be the base load. That cannot be attained. We cannot provide enough electricity without coal, nuclear, and natural gas.

Now, this amendment gives special attention to the green energy field. I would remind everyone, once again, that renewable energy subsidies increased over the last 3 years by 186 percent: from \$5 billion to \$14 billion. Renewables saw, by far, the largest increase in Federal benefits. Wind alone received a tenfold increase in subsidies: from \$476 million to almost \$5 billion. Solar increased by a factor of 6: from \$179 million to \$1.2 billion.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WHITFIELD. Let me just finish this one sentence.

So these strategies can't work without government support. I don't object to government supporting them, but they do not need to get even more special privileges from this amendment.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would inquire as to what would be the comparable number for oil and gas and coal in the United States. You talk about the growth trend; but in absolute numbers, is it not true that actually the fossil fuels industry gets \$70 billion a year?

Mr. WHITFIELD. The direct expenditure for coal was \$42 million last year, and for wind it was \$3.556 billion.

I will tell you that oil and gas and coal are willing to give up all of their subsidies if green energy wants to give up their subsidies, because they're getting a lot more than anyone else.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I would inquire of the Chair how much time is left on this side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. To conclude on this matter, I have enormous respect for my colleague on the other side; but to oppose a simple study to require that we look at the benefits of clean energy technology, I find that very troubling. That resistance, sadly, is going to impede American growth and competitiveness and is actually going to cost us jobs.

There is no question that in the coal industry, in particular, we've kind of reached a plateau. In fact, in Kentucky, we've lost a lot of jobs relative to, say, 30 years ago; whereas, as my colleague from Massachusetts pointed out last night, in wind energy, just in the last 4 years, we're up to 80,000 jobs. It's a fast-growing, lucrative part of our economy. It's clean, and it actually concretely helps create jobs.

That's a worthwhile thing to study if not to invest in, and I regret the fact that the manager on the other side finds even a study something to be resisted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Once again, I oppose the amendment.

Green energy is getting every benefit possible from this administration—money, studies, and in every other way. It will never be able to meet the base load of our electricity needs. Therefore, unless we can continue to have low-cost electricity, we're not going to compete in the global marketplace, and we're going to continue to lose jobs. The EPA is making direct attacks against an industry. For that reason, I respectfully oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON  
LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 112-213.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, line 10, strike “90” and insert “120”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I rise today to support my amendment. I call my amendment “Can We All Get Along?” It is an amendment simply to ask that all of those who are impacted by this proposed legislation have an expanded time to be able to present their views.

It is a “can we all get along?”-type amendment because it is important to note again that those of us who come from different States, whether it's Illinois or Texas, recognize that the Environmental Protection Agency and the Clean Air Act were formulated under a bipartisan Congress and were signed, as my colleague reminded us, by President Richard Nixon. Republicans and Democrats voted for the Clean Air Act and for the Environmental Protection Agency's jurisdiction.

It's important to note that there is not only a value in what the EPA does but that there are organizations, such as the American Lung Association, the American Thoracic Society, the Physicians for Social Responsibility, the American Public Health Association, and the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, which need their input and are concerned about this legislation.

So my concern as we move forward on the transparency and regulatory analysis of impact is how much time has been given for the public comment. My State, in fact, has been impacted for the lack thereof of public comment. I believe that there are civilians who are not businesses who should be protected and given the opportunity to have input.

For example, it's important to note that the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule, which I don't think my colleagues can in any way dissuade me from believing, has been the basis of preventing 17,000 premature deaths, 11,000 heart attacks, 120,000 cases of aggravated asthma, 12,000 hospital and emergency room visits, 11,000 cases of bronchitis, and 850,000 missed days.

The idea of putting a superlayer over the already existing regulatory

scheme, to me, sounds like we are adhering to the supercommittee concept, which many of us, by way of absolute necessity, voted on during the debt ceiling debate; but we realize that the responsibility of the purse strings is in the United States House of Representatives. Well, the law has given authority to the EPA and to the Clean Air Act as its authorizing aspect to be able to control and balance.

I believe we should create jobs; but the question becomes whether or not the TRAIN Act, in the format of adding another layer of review, actually does that—or does it create another level of bureaucracy that we neither want nor need? At a time when these regulations will both decrease health costs and can create thousands of jobs, why would my colleagues propose a bill that would only slow job growth?

It has been 260 days. I think we should, as I started out, get along, try to create jobs, recognize the value of the EPA, find a way to be able to resolve the present conflict on the Cross State Air Pollution Rule but not eliminate the authority and the oversight of the Environmental Protection Agency.

What I would say to my colleagues is that the EPA has protected all of our constituents. Therefore, I think it's important to pass this amendment because it's about constituents. It's about constituents no matter what side of the aisle they're on. This is an amendment that moves the public comment from 90 days to 120 days. There may have been some who wanted to comment who cannot comment because they did not have the amount of time.

So I would ask my colleagues to support this "can we all get along?" amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. First, I would like to say to the gentlelady from Texas, who does such a great job on all of these issues, that we do not intend in any way to remove any of the authority of the EPA to regulate the Cross State Transport Rules. As a matter of fact, of the 14 rules that we're examining that EPA has issued, 12 of them we do not delay in any way. On the Air Transport Rule, we simply go back to the original Air Transport Rule of which EPA talked about all of the marvelous benefits. The EPA defended it in court. The environmental groups supported it: 67 and 53 percent reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. That will remain in effect.

As far as the gentlelady's amendment, we would be happy to accept it, because I think it's a good amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1050

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me indicate to the gentleman first of all

that I thank him for accepting the amendment, and I conclude my remarks by saying that my asking for a roll call vote is not in any way a reflection of my lack of acceptance, but I am just so gratified for this timeframe that I hope that the gentleman will encourage those to support the amendment.

Therefore, let me say to the gentleman—I finish on this note—there is some thought that we are putting in another regulatory scheme, but I think the important point from my perspective is that there was value when Richard Nixon signed the bill on how do we find a way to make this work so that we save lives and we create jobs.

I think my amendment provides the opportunity for that kind of input, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment #4 to H.R. 2401, "The Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation Act," which extends the public comment period from 90 days to 120 days.

The Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation (TRAIN) Act establishes a committee to conduct studies and review the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations based upon the Mercury and Air Toxics Standard Rule (MATS) and the Cross State Air Pollution (CSAP) Rule promulgated. This committee is composed of Administration officials from different federal agencies and under H.R. 2401 will analyze the effect of the regulations on the economy, U.S. competitiveness in the global market, employment, and energy production and cost. In effect this is creating more regulations and more bureaucracy at time when Republicans are calling for all of us to tighten our belts. So now before us is a Super Committee for the Budget and again we are going to have a Super Committee for Clean Air. We already have an agency charged with protecting our air. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been up to the task for 40 years. According to the EPA, the pollution reductions required by the rule they have proposed will yield health benefits of \$120 to \$280 billion per year, which is 150 to 350 times the cost. I have always been a stalwart for a firm balance between the needs of the energy industry and our environment. But then there is just plain common sense. The TRAIN Act goes overboard. It is an extreme response that does not add value to ensuring Clean Air.

The argument proposed by some of my colleagues has been that this will cost jobs. Implementing regulations will create jobs. Old power plants and other utilities will have to hire workers in order to fulfill the requirements of the regulation. The EPA has determined that this will not be overly burdensome to the industry. We as a body must ensure that the regulations issued by the EPA will not destroy any industry but at the same token TRAIN is too extreme. It creates the very bureaucracy that we neither need nor want. At a time when these regulations will both decrease health costs and can create thousands of jobs, why would my colleagues propose a bill that will only slow job growth. It has been 260 days and the Republicans, who have been in the majority, have not presented a clear and consistent job growth package. Instead time and time again they have put forth measures to cut

Medicare and social security at a time when so many of our constituents are dependent upon those resources to cover health costs and living expenses.

The TRAIN Act, which I could easily consider a bill like a steam train and it steams right through the power of the EPA to regulate clean air, requires that the committee publicly publish its initial findings and then provide the public with 90 days to comment. If this flawed bill is going to pass at least my amendment is an attempt to take into account the number of interested parties who may wish to give their input and extends the public comment period from 90 days to 120 days. I have offered this amendment to ensure that everyone who wishes to comment will have ample opportunity to do so.

My home state of Texas was not initially included in the Cross State Air Pollution Rule. When my state was added, there was no time provided for public input, a courtesy that was extended to the other 6 states included in the Cross State Air Pollution Rule. Stakeholders throughout Texas were afforded no opportunity to discuss the impact of including Texas at the last minute. Had there been opportunity for public comment, the EPA and stakeholders would have been able to work together towards a consensus.

The proposed regulations have different impacts on different stakeholders, and it is extremely important that everyone's point of view is considered. An open dialogue that encourages frank and productive communication can foster compromise.

As the Representative for Houston, the country's energy capital, I am committed to creating an environment in which the energy industry and regulating agencies can work together.

For more than 40 years the EPA has been charged with protecting our environment. There has been a consistent theme of chipping away at the ability of the EPA to protect our air. We have to consider the long term costs to public health if we fail to establish reasonable measures for clean air.

Outdoor air pollution is caused by small particles and ground level ozone that comes from car exhaust, smoke, road dust and factory emissions. Outdoor air quality is also affected by pollen from plants, crops and weeds. Particle pollution can be high any time of year and are higher near busy roads and where people burn wood.

When we inhale outdoor pollutants and pollen this can aggravate our lungs, and can lead us to developing the following conditions; chest pain, coughing, digestive problems, dizziness, fever, lethargy, sneezing, shortness of breath, throat irritation and watery eyes. Outdoor air pollution and pollen may also worsen chronic respiratory diseases, such as asthma. There are serious costs to our long term health. The EPA has promulgated rules and the public should be allowed to weigh in to determine if these rules are effective.

The purpose of having so many checks and balances within the EPA is to ensure that the needs of industries and the needs of our communities are addressed. Providing a time for individuals to support or oppose any regulations is a meaningful first step. This bill is a step in the wrong direction.

The EPA has spent years reviewing these standards before attempting to issue regulations. In terms of the Mercury and Air Toxics



Standard (MATS) Rule the new standard will significantly reduce mercury and toxic air pollution from power plants and electric utilities. The EPA estimates that for every year this rule is not implemented, mercury and toxic air pollution will have a serious impact on public health. Think for a moment about the lives that can be saved. We are talking about thousands of health complications and deaths. What more do we need to know. According to the EPA this rule would prevent the following: 17,000 premature deaths; 11,000 heart attacks; 120,000 cases of aggravated asthma; 12,000 hospital and emergency room visits; 11,000 cases of bronchitis; and 850,000 missed work days.

The second rule that is targeted by this bill is the Cross State Air Pollution (CSAP) Rule. As a Representative from the State of Texas, I have a few reservations about the rules implementation in my home state; however, the rule can be more fairly implemented.

This rule will significantly cut sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions released into the atmosphere. The regulation impacts 27 states where power plant emissions cause poor air quality that affects neighboring states. It is important to know that the EPA designed this rule again by keeping the lives of our families, our children, our communities and the environment in mind. According to the EPA this rule when implemented will prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths, 15,000 heart attacks, and 400,000 cases of aggravated asthmas.

Sometimes we can get caught up in the numbers and forget the people behind each. If these rules are allowed to be implemented there are 51,000 more people who will be able to spend another day, week, month or year with their families. These are our friends and family members who with the implantation of these rules can enjoy another cup of coffee.

The prolonged or indefinite delay of these life saving regulations threaten the very air that Americans, our constituents, breathe. I cannot speak for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but I certainly do not want to repeal regulations that protect the 18th Congressional District's access to clean air.

The analysis required by this legislation is focused solely on the impact of EPA regulations on economic competitiveness, fuel prices, and employment without taking into consideration the public health benefits of the regulations. The Mercury and Air Toxics Standard Rule will significantly reduce mercury and toxic air pollution from power plants and electric utilities.

The Cross State Air Pollution Rule will significantly cut sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions released into the atmosphere. The regulation impacts 27 states where power plant emissions cause poor air quality that affects neighboring states.

My amendment will not affect the intent of the bill; it merely ensures that should this ill conceived measure pass that there is plenty of time given for our constituents who live in states affected by mercury and toxic pollution and cross state air pollution to weigh in on the public health aspects of these regulations.

I have offered this amendment not only to benefit those who live in states that would be affected by these regulations, but also to ensure that the industry being regulated has ample time to provide their input. Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have worked tirelessly to foster better relationship between the

energy industry and regulating agencies. With an open dialogue and productive communication, we can forge compromise that will protect the environment without harming economic growth, and the intent behind this amendment is to do just that.

As the Representative of the 18th Congressional District of Houston, Texas, I can attest to the importance of a healthy energy industry. My district is the energy hub of Texas and is recognized worldwide for its energy industry, particularly for oil and natural gas, as well as biomedical research and aeronautics. Renewable energy sources—wind and solar—are also growing economic bases in Houston.

I understand the economic impacts of regulation, but we must also act responsibly. We cannot ignore the public health risks associated with breathing polluted air, nor can we pretend that these emissions do not exacerbate global warming. Alternatively, we certainly do not want to hinder job creation and economic growth.

Lest we forget that since 1999, Houston has exchanged titles with Los Angeles for the poorest air quality in the Nation. The poor air quality is attributed to the amount of aerosols, particles of carbon and sulfates in the air. The carcinogens found in the air have been known to cause cancer, particularly in children. The EPA is the very agency charged with issuing regulations that would address this serious problem. This bill may very well jeopardize the air that we breathe, the water that we drink, our public lands, and our public health by deep funding cuts in priority initiatives.

The least that can be done is to extend the opportunity for the committee formed by this bill to hear the concerns of the public. I am sure this will certainly go a long way to encourage robust discussion on health, job creation and economic improvements without putting the environment or the American people at risk.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment in order to strike a balance between the EPA and the energy industry, forge compromise that will protect the environment without harming economic growth by extending the public comment period from 90 to 120 days. My amendment does not change the intent of the bill, it creates the opportunity for communication and consensus.

SEPTEMBER 21, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned public health and medical organizations, we write to state our strong opposition to any efforts under consideration by the U.S. House of Representatives that hinder the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) ability to protect health through the implementation the Clean Air Act.

Majority Leader Eric Cantor's August 29, 2011 memo to House Republicans specifically called for passage of bills including H.R. 2401, which would indefinitely delay the EPA's proposal to reduce mercury and other toxics from power plants and would block implementation of the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, a finalized rule that is expected to prevent the premature deaths of thousands of Americans each year and to make it easier for states downwind of pollution sources to achieve healthful air for their residents. The memo also signals plans with H.R. 2250 and H.R. 2861, which would delay EPA efforts to reduce mercury and other toxics from industrial facilities and cement plants. Further, it signals plans to thwart EPA's ability to propose a health standard for particulate mat-

ter, calling for passage of HR 1633, a bill that would block the completion of the review of the health effects associated with deadly soot or particulate matter and prevent EPA from even proposing a standard and receiving public comment on that standard.

We urge you to oppose this plan and ask that you, instead, support protecting public health. This Rep. Cantor-led effort would impact EPA's ability to implement the Clean Air Act: a law that protects public health and reduces health care costs for all by preventing thousands of adverse health outcomes, including: cancer, asthma attacks, strokes, emergency department visits, hospitalizations and premature deaths. A rigorous, peer reviewed analysis, The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act from 1990 to 2020, conducted by EPA, found that the air quality improvements under the Clean Air Act will save \$2 trillion by 2020 and prevent at least 230,000 deaths annually.

Additionally, the public supports EPA's efforts to implement and update the Clean Air Act. A recent bipartisan survey, which was conducted for the American Lung Association by the Republican firm Moore Information and Democratic polling firm Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research indicate that those pushing riders or otherwise interfering with EPA are out of touch with voters. The survey shows that over seventy percent of voters do not want Congress to stop the EPA from setting stricter pollution limits and sixty-six percent of voters would prefer that EPA set pollution standards, not Congress.

We believe that in an ironic twist, the Majority Leader's memo lays out an agenda that will expose the public to levels of air pollution that can make them sick or kill them. This agenda will certainly drive up health costs for all as people continued to be exposed to life-threatening air pollution. We ask you to support full implementation of the Clean Air Act and oppose all efforts to weaken, delay or block progress toward the continued implementation of this vital law.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN LUNG  
ASSOCIATION.  
AMERICAN THORACIC  
SOCIETY.  
PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL  
RESPONSIBILITY.  
AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH  
ASSOCIATION.  
ASTHMA AND ALLERGY  
FOUNDATION OF AMERICA.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 112-213.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 5 and insert the following:

### SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN RULES.

#### (a) CROSS-STATE AIR POLLUTION RULE/TRANSPORT RULE.—

(1) EARLIER RULES.—The rule entitled “Federal Implementation Plans: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone and Correction of SIP Approvals”, published at 76 Fed. Reg. 48208 (August 8, 2011), and any successor or substantially similar rule, shall be of no force or effect, and shall be treated as though such rule had never taken effect.

(2) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF CLEAN AIR INTERSTATE RULE.—In place of any rule described in paragraph (1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (in this section referred to as the “Administrator”) shall continue to implement the Clean Air Interstate Rule.

#### (3) ADDITIONAL RULEMAKINGS.—

(A) ISSUANCE OF NEW RULES.—The Administrator—

(i) shall not issue any proposed or final rule under section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) or section 126 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), 7426) relating to national ambient air quality standards for ozone or particulate matter (including any modification of the Clean Air Interstate Rule) before the date that is 3 years after the date on which the Committee submits the final report under section 4(c); and

(ii) in issuing any rule described in clause (i), shall base the rule on actual monitored (and not modeled) data and shall, notwithstanding section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), allow the trading of emissions allowances among entities covered by the rule irrespective of the States in which such entities are located.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.—In promulgating any final rule described in subparagraph (A)(i), the Administrator shall establish a date for State implementation of the standards established by such final rule that is not earlier than 3 years after the date of publication of such final rule.

(4) DEFINITION OF CLEAN AIR INTERSTATE RULE.—For purposes of this section, the term “Clean Air Interstate Rule” means the Clean Air Interstate Rule and the rule establishing Federal Implementation Plans for the Clean Air Interstate Rule as promulgated and modified by the Administrator (70 Fed. Reg. 25162 (May 12, 2005), 71 Fed. Reg. 25288 (April 28, 2006), 72 Fed. Reg. 55657 (Oct. 1, 2007), 72 Fed. Reg. 59190 (Oct. 19, 2007), 72 Fed. Reg. 62338 (Nov. 2, 2007), 74 Fed. Reg. 56721 (Nov. 3, 2009)).

#### (b) STEAM GENERATING UNIT RULES.—

(1) EARLIER RULES.—The proposed rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units” published at 76 Fed. Reg. 24976 (May 3, 2011), and any final rule that is based on such proposed rule and is issued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be of no force and effect, and shall be treated as though such proposed or final rule had never been issued. In conducting analyses under section 3(a), the Committee shall analyze the rule described in section 3(e)(1)(E) (including any successor or substantially similar rule) as if the preceding sentence did not apply to such rule.

(2) PROMULGATION OF FINAL RULES.—In place of the rules described in paragraph (1), the Administrator shall—

(A) issue regulations establishing national emission standards for coal-and oil-fired electric utility steam generating units under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412) with respect to each hazardous air pol-

lutant for which the Administrator finds such regulations are appropriate and necessary pursuant to subsection (n)(1)(A) of such section;

(B) issue regulations establishing standards of performance for fossil-fuel-fired electric utility, industrial-commercial-institutional, and small industrial-commercial-institutional steam generating units under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 111); and

(C) issue the final regulations required by subparagraphs (A) and (B)—

(i) after issuing proposed regulations under such subparagraphs;

(ii) after consideration of the final report submitted under section 4(c); and

(iii) not earlier than the date that is 12 months after the date on which the Committee submits such report to the Congress, or such later date as may be determined by the Administrator.

#### (3) COMPLIANCE PROVISIONS.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPLIANCE DATES.—In promulgating the regulations under paragraph (2), the Administrator—

(i) shall establish a date for compliance with the standards and requirements under such regulations that is not earlier than 5 years after the effective date of the regulations; and

(ii) in establishing a date for such compliance, shall take into consideration—

(I) the costs of achieving emissions reductions;

(II) any non-air quality health and environmental impact and energy requirements of the standards and requirements;

(III) the feasibility of implementing the standards and requirements, including the time needed to—

(aa) obtain necessary permit approvals; and

(bb) procure, install, and test control equipment;

(IV) the availability of equipment, suppliers, and labor, given the requirements of the regulations and other proposed or finalized regulations; and

(V) potential net employment impacts.

(B) NEW SOURCES.—With respect to the regulations promulgated pursuant to paragraph (2)—

(i) the date on which the Administrator proposes a regulation pursuant to paragraph (2)(A) establishing an emission standard under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412) shall be treated as the date on which the Administrator first proposes such a regulation for purposes of applying the definition of a new source under section 112(a)(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(a)(4));

(ii) the date on which the Administrator proposes a regulation pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) establishing a standard of performance under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411) shall be treated as the date on which the Administrator proposes such a regulation for purposes of applying the definition of a new source under section 111(a)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(a)(2));

(iii) for purposes of any emission standard or limitation applicable to electric utility steam generating units, the term “new source” means a stationary source for which a preconstruction permit or other preconstruction approval required under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) has been issued after the effective date of such emissions standard or limitation; and

(iv) for purposes of clause (iii), the date of issuance of a preconstruction permit or other preconstruction approval is deemed to be the date on which such permit or approval is issued to the applicant irrespective of any administrative or judicial review occurring after such date.

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to restrict or otherwise affect the provisions of paragraphs (3)(B) and (4) of section 112(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(i)).

#### (4) OTHER PROVISIONS.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS ACHIEVABLE IN PRACTICE.—The regulations promulgated pursuant to paragraph (2)(A) of this section shall apply section 112(d)(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(d)(3)) in accordance with the following:

(i) NEW SOURCES.—With respect to new sources:

(I) The Administrator shall identify the best controlled similar source for each source category or subcategory.

(II) The best controlled similar source for a category or subcategory shall be the single source that is determined by the Administrator to be the best controlled, in the aggregate, for all of the hazardous air pollutants for which the Administrator intends to issue standards for such source category or subcategory, under actual operating conditions, taking into account the variability in actual source performance, source design, fuels, controls, ability to measure pollutant emissions, and operating conditions.

(ii) EXISTING SOURCES.—With respect to existing sources:

(I) The Administrator shall identify one group of sources that constitutes the best performing 12 percent of existing sources for each source category or subcategory.

(II) The group constituting the best performing 12 percent of existing sources for a category or subcategory shall be the single group that is determined by the Administrator to be the best performing, in the aggregate, for all of the hazardous air pollutants for which the Administrator intends to issue standards for such source category or subcategory, under actual operating conditions, taking into account the variability in actual source performance, source design, fuels, controls, ability to measure pollutant emissions, and operating conditions.

(B) REGULATORY ALTERNATIVES.—For the regulations promulgated pursuant to paragraph (2) of this section, from among the range of regulatory alternatives authorized under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), including work practice standards under section 112(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(h)), the Administrator shall impose the least burdensome, consistent with the purposes of such Act and Executive Order 13563 published at 76 Fed. Reg. 3821 (January 21, 2011).

Strike subparagraph (A) of section 3(e)(1) and insert the following:

(A) The Clean Air Interstate Rule (as defined in section 5(a)(4)).

Strike subparagraph (B) of section 3(e)(1) and insert the following:

(E) “National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone”, published at 73 Fed. Reg. 16436 (March 27, 2008).

On page 13, line 17, in the matter before paragraph (1) in section 6(a), strike “for fiscal year 2012”.

On page 13, line 18, in section 6(a)(1), insert “for fiscal year 2012.” before “\$3,000,000”.

Strike paragraph (2) in section 6(a) and insert the following:

(2) to the Environmental Protection Agency—

(A) for fiscal year 2012, \$1,000,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2013, \$500,000.

Strike subsection (b) in section 6 and insert the following:

(b) OFFSET.—Effective October 1, 2011, section 797(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, as amended by section 2(e) of the Diesel Reduction Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-364), is amended—

(1) by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”;

(2) by inserting “\$45,500,000 for fiscal year 2012, \$49,500,000 for fiscal year 2013, and” after “to carry out this subtitle”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Thank you.

It's already been stated today that the TRAIN Act examines 14 EPA regulations. On 12 of them, we do not delay in any way, but we do ask for a study of the cumulative impact on jobs, on American competitiveness, on the price of electricity and the reliability of electricity.

We do that because we are in a very fragile time in our economy. We have high unemployment, we've been unable to get out of it; and in order to do it, we have to have some certainty on these regulations. Business people tell us they are not investing right now because of uncertainty about health care, uncertainty about the new financial regulations and uncertainty about the plethora of EPA regulations coming down the road.

So although we don't touch 12 regulations, the two that we are concerned about—and the reason we're concerned about them—is that they are the most expensive ever issued by EPA. Independent analysts have indicated that there will be a net, after including job gains, a net loss of almost 1.4 million jobs.

My amendment would do this: it would provide that the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule has no legal force or effect, and it does direct EPA to continue to apply the Clean Air Interstate Rule, which is in effect today.

As I had indicated earlier, EPA, when they adopted CAIR, they talked about the billions of dollars in health benefits, 17,000 premature deaths that they would prevent, 22,000 nonfatal heart attacks that they would prevent; and I could go on and on and on. And EPA defended the CAIR Act in court. The environmental groups supported the CAIR Act.

Our air transport rules and regulations are still going to be in effect; and we simply say that for at least 3 years, EPA cannot change the CAIR Act, but during that time do a more detailed analysis of the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule because of the enormous cost, the enormous impact on jobs and so forth.

The amendment also requires that the proposed Utility Maximum Achievable Control Technology rule has no legal force in effect and that any subsequent Utility MACT rule be issued no sooner than 1 year after the study called for in the TRAIN Act. So we simply ask the EPA to repropose the utility rule.

Now, people are saying, oh my gosh, if we don't have this utility rule in effect, mercury is going to do all of these horrible things.

I would remind everyone once again EPA says that 99 percent of the mercury in America comes from nature and from trade winds coming in from other countries. And EPA itself said Utility MACT benefits by mercury reductions of that whole bill would be .004 percent.

I would also say that utility companies have no problem with mercury. They're doing a good job on that, and they can do even better. But the two gases that they are asking them to regulate have never been regulated before—I had the name of them awhile ago and I can't remember them—but the technology is not available to meet the requirements of the Utility MACT. So you are asking these companies to spend this money, provide this uncertainty, and so that's what my amendment does. It basically delays the implementation of the Utility MACT, asks for a reproposal, and it also maintains the existing CAIR air transport rule.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I rise in strong opposition to this Whitfield amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment is objectionable from the standpoint of public health and the legislative process. Throughout the debate on this bill, Mr. WHITFIELD has claimed that his bill just requires a study and delays two rules for further analysis.

Well, the indefinite delay of these two rules is terrible for public health, but this amendment would be a disaster because this amendment nullifies these two critical EPA rules to cut air pollution from old, dirty power plants by requiring them to install modern pollution technology.

First, the EPA amendment abolishes EPA mercury air toxics proposal by requiring EPA to start scratch on a rule that's long overdue. There are two rules at stake. The EPA mercury air toxic rule, which was opposed by EPA, would prevent 17,000 deaths, 11,000 heart attacks, 120,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 850,000 lost workdays each year. Now, that doesn't even include the benefits that are harder to put a dollar figure on such as reducing toxic air pollution that can lead to birth defects and developmental delays.

The EPA rule would also prevent 91 percent of the mercury in burned coal from being emitted into the air. Mercury is dangerous in tiny amounts. It's a powerful neurotoxin that can damage the developing brain, leading to learning disabilities and developmental delays in children.

We heard about the delay in letting this rule go forward that was in the bill, but this amendment negates these benefits and ensures that power plants

will not have to reduce their emissions of toxic air pollution, including mercury, for at least 7 years.

The amendment also tosses aside the way EPA has long been setting these emission limits for toxic air pollution for two decades, and it replaces it with an entirely new approach for power plants that is completely unworkable. It guarantees years of litigation and, according to the EPA administrator, may well prevent EPA from ever requiring power plants to clean up their mercury pollution.

So this isn't just a delay, as we were told, for further study. It may well lead to no rule ever being put in place to stop these mercury emissions that cause such terrible public health disasters. The Whitfield amendment also nullifies the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, which is designed to reduce emissions from power plants that cause ozone and particulate matter violations in downwind States.

□ 1100

Well, this rule has tremendous health benefits. The EPA cross-state rule will prevent 34,000 deaths, 15,000 heart attacks, 400,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 1.8 million lost days of work each year.

The Whitfield amendment negates these benefits and ensures that power plants will not have to reduce their pollution for at least 8 years. But this new rule may ensure that it will never happen. The EPA administrator testified that the language in the amendment barring reliance on modeling likely will block EPA from ever issuing another cross-state pollution rule to address ozone and particulate problems in downwind States.

These are two radical proposals, and they're coming to the floor without a single day of hearings in the Energy and Commerce Committee. The amendment's sponsor, Mr. WHITFIELD, is the chairman of the relevant subcommittee. But he didn't ask for a single day of testimony or debate on these proposals. Instead he took a bill that asked for a lot more analysis before rules go into effect, and then just dropped this amendment on that bill because it was a moving train. He didn't insist that the TRAIN Act was requiring a study. He insisted it was only going to do a study, and now it is preventing them from implementing anything.

Today we have 10 minutes of debate whether this body should eliminate two critical EPA rules that prevent premature death, asthma attacks, and other respiratory diseases and fundamentally alter the Clean Air Act. I find that inexcusable, both on the substance and the process.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would just say that the two gases I was trying to think of are hydrogen chloride and hydrogen fluoride. Those are the real problems in this Utility MACT: the lack of technology, the unachievability of the standards, and that's why this amendment is asking that the implementation be delayed for 3 years of this air transport rule.

With that, I urge Members to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 112-213.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 5, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

**SEC. 6. CONSIDERATION OF FEASIBILITY AND COST IN ESTABLISHING NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS.**

In establishing any national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall take into consideration feasibility and cost.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 2401. This amendment should be one of the most noncontroversial EPA-related votes this House has faced in quite awhile because it doesn't repeal any EPA rules or regulations and it doesn't block the EPA from doing anything. It simply requires the EPA administrator to consider the implementation costs and feasibility of compliance when setting National Ambient Air Quality Standards. We all want clean air.

The Clean Air Act required the EPA to review these standards in 5-year intervals and make revisions or set new standards if appropriate. Under current law, the EPA administrator is forbidden from taking the economic consequences of these rules under consideration when setting these standards, which means every 5 years the EPA is required to create new regulations, but

does not have the legal authority to consider how they will affect the economy.

This approach to regulation is a contributing factor to why unemployment numbers refuse to budge in many parts of our country and we have millions of Americans still looking for jobs. Last year the EPA decided to voluntarily review the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone despite being a full 3 years away from review of the Clean Air Act's requirements in 2013.

The standards they discussed would have had a devastating effect on my home State of Ohio, putting every one of the 33 counties monitored into a state of nonattainment status, as well as over 85 percent of the other counties monitored nationwide. States and localities not in attainment are required to meet expensive and complex regulatory requirements, more stringent permitting requirements, and comply with a number of other antigrowth measures.

Fortunately, President Obama realized the urgency of this situation and asked the EPA not to propose a more stringent standard. Perhaps if the EPA administrator had considered the cost and feasibility of the tighter standard, we would have avoided the situation entirely. Now with this amendment we have the opportunity to make sure it doesn't happen in the future.

I sent the President a letter commending his decision and requesting his support of the amendment in helping to get it passed both here in the House and in the Senate. Now I'm requesting your support.

This is not a Republican idea or a Democrat idea. Considering the economy and the well-being of the unemployed Americans who are looking for jobs, it is the right thing to do.

I urge support of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise not just in opposition, but strong opposition to this amendment. The bill as reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee is a bad bill for air quality and public health, but this bill appears doomed to get even worse as we continue to amend it on the floor.

If the Latta amendment were adopted, it would eviscerate a cornerstone of the Clean Air Act without a single committee hearing to discuss the implications of this action, and that's nothing short of reckless policymaking.

The Clean Air Act requires EPA to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards based on the science of how air pollution affects health and the environment. EPA scientists and an independent scientific advisory committee then recommend health-based standards. That is peer-reviewed, and they look at the impact of air pollution on

health overall, and then on sensitive groups, such as children and the elderly, because we don't want a society where the sensitive people like the children and the elderly can't live with the rest of us.

These national air quality standards essentially identify the level of ambient air pollution that's safe for people to breathe. With these health-based standards as the goalposts, States develop plans to control pollution and meet these goals. Cost is front and center in this planning. States can identify which pollution-control measures are most cost effective and rule out measures that produce more costs than benefits.

The Latta amendment turns this whole approach upside down. The amendment would require EPA to consider industry cost up front when determining what level of air pollution is safe for human health. That's like a doctor basing your diagnosis on the cost of the treatment. If the treatment is expensive, the doctor would tell you that you're healthy. For a doctor, that would be malpractice. It's no different here.

The Latta amendment would allow polluters to override scientists and require EPA to set air quality standards based on profits rather than the public health. The scientific determination of what is safe to breathe doesn't depend on the cost of cleaning up the pollution.

My Republican colleagues throughout the debate on this bill have been happy to come to the floor and talk about the tremendous progress in reducing air pollution in this country. That's true, but it doesn't mean we no longer have a need for the tools that got us here and that job is already done. We've made progress because Congress enacted a strong and effective Clean Air Act. If we weaken the law, air quality will suffer. And anyone who thinks that the air is clean enough isn't thinking about the kids who can't play outside on a summer day without risking a potentially life-threatening asthma attack.

For 40 years—and we are celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Clean Air Act—the essential basis of the law was to set health-based standards as our goals.

□ 1110

Despite the progress we've made, that job isn't done on air pollution. The Latta amendment, if it becomes law, would reverse decades of progress in cleaning up the smog and soot pollution that triggers asthma attacks, heart attacks, other respiratory diseases, and the mercury pollution that causes brain damage and learning disabilities in children.

It is preposterous that we have only 10 minutes to debate this fundamental change to the Clean Air Act that would upend 40 years of progress.

I urge my colleagues to vote this amendment down based on its impact

on public health as well as the mockery it makes of the legislative process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTI. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise on this amendment and in support of the underlying TRAIN Act.

The TRAIN Act is a bipartisan plan to analyze cumulative economic impacts of EPA's regulations to better understand how these policies affect American manufacturing, energy prices, and private industry's ability to create jobs.

The question that Americans want to know is: Why are our jobs leaving? Why aren't we making things? This bill will help us to define that.

Here today in support of the TRAIN Act are Jennifer Fraser and Jeff Rose from Vantage Data Centers, a NextGen data center and a small business from my State of California that has become an industry leader in performance efficiency and environmental stewardship. Since its inception in 2010, Vantage has sought to minimize electricity consumption at their data centers, as electricity is far and away their greatest cost.

The price of electricity has caused many companies in their industry to flee to other countries with a more welcoming business climate and cheaper electricity prices. Despite this existing competitive disadvantage for the United States, the EPA proposes new Utility MACT standards that will raise electricity prices and will have an adverse effect on even an environmentally friendly data center like Vantage and force more jobs overseas.

The EPA has proposed regulation after regulation that would stifle job creation, hurt American economic competitiveness abroad, and increase energy prices on families already strained by the tough economy. The House Republican jobs agenda focuses on removing these barriers to job creation and includes necessary reforms like the TRAIN Act.

The support of job creators like the National Association of Manufacturers, the Association of Builders and Contractors, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Small Business Entrepreneurship Council further proves the need for the TRAIN Act to ensure that the administration does not continue to hamper the economic recovery and job creation of private industry.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind all Members not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. WAXMAN. May I inquire how much time is left on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. I urge my colleagues to vote against this Latta amendment.

This is a radical, extreme amendment that reverses the Clean Air Act which was signed by President Nixon, has been enforced by Democratic and Republican administrations, voted almost unanimously on a bipartisan basis in the House and the Senate, and it would strip away the goalposts of achieving health-based standards.

I think to have only 10 minutes to debate on this extreme proposal is an affront to the legislative process. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this amendment.

When we were all back in our districts in August, I went to 18 different plants and facilities in my district, and the number one issue out there against creating jobs was EPA regulations. EPA. That's all I heard. EPA, EPA, EPA.

We're not going to move this country forward unless we get these regulations under control, and it's about time that they start looking at what they have to do under this amendment to make sure that we've got things back on course. I mentioned this yesterday in committee that we've lost 180,000 manufacturing jobs alone, in the Energy and Commerce Committee, since earlier this year. We've got to get this economy moving.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 112-213.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, line 16, strike "(a) AUTHORIZATION.—".

Beginning on page 13, line 23, strike subsection (b) of section 6.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 406, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is intended to strike the provision that reduces the amount of funding to implement the Diesel Emissions Reduction program.

Five years ago, Congress passed the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act as a

part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The program was authorized at \$200 million per year for 5 years. In 2011, the Congress acted responsibly, and in light of our fiscal crisis situation, we reduced that amount by a hundred million per year.

This amendment brings into question whether it makes sense to reduce a proven successful program that is not increasing regulations, as my former colleague just mentioned, but in fact is helping companies to be able to meet those regulations in a cost-effective way.

DERA has helped fund more than 360 retrofit projects to date, which has reduced well over 1.6 million tons of emissions and provided more than \$4 billion in public health benefits while employing thousands of workers who manufacture, sell, and repair diesel vehicles and their components in each of our States.

Recognizing today's budgetary challenges, industry, environmental, and public sector representatives support the return of full-year 2008 funding levels for DERA, or \$50 million for 2012.

The United States relies upon diesel power to transport commuters, tourists, and students, harvest our crops, build infrastructure, and move our freight. New clean diesel technology is reaching near zero emissions but fleet turnover will take us many more years to come. Emissions from older diesel vehicles and equipment can be reduced, and we can help to make that happen.

Some of our program results have been 119 projects affecting more than 14,000 diesel-powered vehicles and equipment, new State clean diesel grant programs in over 50 States, 2,200 tons of particulate matter emissions reduced, 580 million benefits to health, and—this is a very important one—3.2 million gallons of fuel that has been saved per year by implementing this program.

This is why in the last Congress I introduced legislation that extended DERA for 5 more years. The legislation received bipartisan support on both sides of the aisle and was signed by the President.

In February during debate on H.R. 1, there was an amendment put forward by a Representative on the other side of the aisle that would have eliminated full funding for DERA. The amendment in the continuing resolution at that time was soundly defeated by both of us, both sides of the aisle, 352 Members. In fact, the chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. SIMPSON, called the cuts to DERA—and I'm talking about my colleague from the other side—the wrong choice. I'm here to present that this cut is still the wrong choice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TERRY. I believe that the gentelady from California's amendment is heartfelt and sincere to the DERA program but irresponsible as it's produced here today. There are costs associated with the EPA going forward with the studies that we are requesting of them.

Under our rules of the House, there's PAYGO rules. We must offset those costs. This is one of those tough decisions made to offset the costs. So the first line of irresponsibility would be it will add to the deficit but for this offset.

□ 1120

The second line of irresponsibility would be, well, it may feel responsible. And this really is a poison pill because if the offset is eliminated, they get to kill the whole bill because of that. So it's not as innocent an amendment as it is portrayed on the surface. The real issue of this bill in entirety must stand.

As previous speakers have said, Mr. Chairman, and rightfully so, the EPA is a rogue agency. They are producing rules in a fast and furious manner that greatly affects this Nation's ability to generate electricity. This bill just wraps three of them together and says, take a step back and do a cost analysis, as the President has asked of agencies. This agency, though, as headed by Ms. Jackson, has said to us in our committee that she will not be beholding or follow the President's own executive order to look at the cost benefit analysis. They say, as we have heard here today, their modeling says that they can reduce asthma so, therefore, no cost benefit analysis.

But there are real effects that I'm concerned with here, and the reason why I do believe this needs to be studied before implemented is we need to slow down the EPA and Lisa Jackson and their attempts to do a cap program without Congress' involvement or approval. They couldn't get it done legislatively, so she's doing it by rule and edict from the EPA.

This rule will add significant costs to the ability of small generators to generate electricity, which will force them to shut down without any path forward to replace that. In fact, they haven't even done a study on reliability to determine if electricity can be wheeled into the areas that the plants will have to shut down.

In fact, there are two plants near my district in Nebraska: Grand Island and Fremont. Grand Island is saying that these rules of the EPA are fast and furious and without any cost benefit analysis will force the Grand Island plant to close. How will they get their electricity? They will have to find a creative way to do it; yet there's been no study on reliability. Secondly, in Fremont, Nebraska, they say what they'll do is just lower their plant level, just do a minimum amount of electricity. Where are they going to make that up?

This is a directive. This is part of the radical environmentalist agenda being

placed on America by one agency and one person, Lisa Jackson. We need to slow this down and take a hard look at it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that the gentleman would say that this might be irresponsible. What I heard of the comments was I didn't talk about the legislation within itself. We're talking about the amendment of how this is going to be paid for. And so the question before the House is going to be, is it appropriate to take additional funds to use DERA as the whipping boy time and time again for a program that is helping what my colleague from the other side is saying?

I would actually say that DERA is responsible. What's irresponsible is continuing to put the health of Americans in jeopardy. I will repeat the quote for my colleagues from the chairman of the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, Mr. SIMPSON. He called the cuts to DERA "the wrong choice." We have already been responsible, and DERA has already paid its fair share, and it's being cut as other programs have been cut. The question is, is it right to continue to deplete this program?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I think it's interesting that she didn't refute the point that if the PAYGO is eliminated, hers passes, they raise a point of order and kill the bill, which is the real impetus behind this amendment.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. No.

I think it's also interesting—you have the right to close—that the President's budget, for which there was no pushback by this other side of the aisle, zeroed it out. Ours didn't. We're just cutting it by \$4 million, and it's a tough choice. We agree.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would say, I think I've said twice now, the issue that we have before us is the question of this amendment whether DERA is the appropriate funding source that would be considered for the offset. That's the question that we have before us.

It's interesting that Mr. WHITFIELD himself has benefited from this program. In Kentucky, the construction ports utilized \$1.16 million to retrofit 73 pieces of nonroad construction equipment. Also, the Kentucky Association General Contractors benefited from retrofitting 87 pieces of equipment. I would say to you it's irresponsible to have the American public driving on our highways and roads and going through our airports breathing this air.

What I've reached out to the other side is that it's important. We're talking about EPA regulations. Why would we reduce funding of a program that helps companies to meet the regulations? It's counterintuitive and it doesn't make sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for the Richardson amendment; and the Richardson amendment is intended for exactly that, to eliminate cutting this program.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentelady from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-213 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 4 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 9 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. LATTA of Ohio.

Amendment No. 12 by Ms. RICHARDSON of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 236, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 728]

AYES—173

Ackerman	Baldwin	Becerra
Andrews	Barrow	Berkley
Baca	Bass (CA)	Berman



Bishop (GA) Hahn  
 Bishop (NY) Hanabusa  
 Blumenauer Hastings (FL)  
 Boswell Heinrich  
 Brady (PA) Higgins  
 Braley (IA) Himes  
 Brown (FL) Hinchey  
 Butterfield Hinojosa  
 Capps Hochul  
 Capuano Holt  
 Cardoza Hoyer  
 Carnahan Inslee  
 Carney Israel  
 Carson (IN) Jackson (IL)  
 Castor (FL) Johnson (IL)  
 Chandler Johnson, E. B.  
 Cicilline Jones  
 Clarke (NY) Keating  
 Clay Kildee  
 Cleaver Kind  
 Clyburn Kissell  
 Connolly (VA) Kucinich  
 Cooper Langevin  
 Costa Larsen (WA)  
 Costello Larson (CT)  
 Courtney Levin  
 Crowley Lewis (GA)  
 Cuellar Lipinski  
 Cummings Loeb sack  
 Davis (CA) Lofgren, Zoe  
 Davis (IL) Lowey  
 DeFazio Lujan  
 DeGette Lynch  
 DeLauro Maloney  
 Deutch Markey  
 Dicks McCarthy (NY)  
 Dingell McCollum  
 Doggett McDermott  
 Dold McGovern  
 Donnelly (IN) McIntyre  
 Doyle McNerney  
 Edwards Meehan  
 Ellison Meeks  
 Engel Michaud  
 Eshoo Miller (NC)  
 Farr Miller, George  
 Fattah Moore  
 Filner Moran  
 Frank (MA) Murphy (CT)  
 Fudge Nadler  
 Garamendi Napolitano  
 Gibson Neal  
 Gonzalez Oliver  
 Green, Gene Pallone  
 Grijalva Pascrell  
 Gutierrez Pastor (AZ)

NOES—236

Adams Chabot  
 Aderholt Chaffetz  
 Akin Coble  
 Alexander Coffman (CO)  
 Altmire Cole  
 Amash Conaway  
 Amodei Cravaack  
 Austria Crawford  
 Bachus Crenshaw  
 Barletta Critz  
 Bartlett Culberson  
 Barton (TX) Davis (KY)  
 Bass (NH) Denham  
 Benishkek Dent  
 Berg DesJarlais  
 Biggert Diaz-Balart  
 Bilbray Dreier  
 Billirakis Duffy  
 Bishop (UT) Duncan (SC)  
 Black Duncan (TN)  
 Blackburn Ellmers  
 Bonner Emerson  
 Bono Mack Farenthold  
 Boren Fincher  
 Boustany Fitzpatrick  
 Brady (TX) Flake  
 Brooks Fleischmann  
 Broun (GA) Fleming  
 Buchanan Flores  
 Buechson Forbes  
 Buerkle Fortenberry  
 Burgess Kellie  
 Burton (IN) Franks (AZ)  
 Calvert Frelinghuysen  
 Camp Gallegly  
 Campbell Gardner  
 Canseco Garrett  
 Cantor Gerlach  
 Capito Gibbs  
 Carter Gingrey (GA)  
 Cassidy Gohmert

Payne Lankford  
 Pelosi Latham  
 Perlmutter LaTourette  
 Peters Latta  
 Pingree (ME) Lewis (CA)  
 Platts LoBiondo  
 Polis Long  
 Price (NC) Lucas  
 Quigley Luetkemeyer  
 Rangel Lummis  
 Reyes Lungren, Daniel  
 Richardson E.  
 Richmond Mack  
 Rothman (NJ) Manzullo  
 Roybal-Allard Marchant  
 Ruppertsberger Marino  
 Rush Matheson  
 Ryan (OH) McCarthy (CA)  
 Sánchez, Linda McCaul  
 T. McClintock  
 Sanchez, Loretta McCotter  
 Sarbanes McHenry  
 Schakowsky McKeon  
 Schiff McKinley  
 Schrader McMorris  
 Schwartz Rodgers  
 Scott (VA) Mica  
 Scott, David Miller (FL)  
 Serrano Miller (MI)  
 Sewell Miller, Gary  
 Sherman Mulvaney  
 Sires Murphy (PA)  
 Slaughter Myrick  
 Smith (NJ) Neugebauer  
 Smith (WA) Noem  
 Stark Nugent  
 Sutton Nunes  
 Thompson (CA) Nunnelee  
 Thompson (MS) Olson  
 Tierney Bachmann  
 Doyle Chu  
 Edwards Towns  
 Ellison Meeks  
 Engel Michaud  
 Eshoo Miller (NC)  
 Farr Miller, George  
 Fattah Moore  
 Filner Moran  
 Frank (MA) Murphy (CT)  
 Fudge Nadler  
 Garamendi Napolitano  
 Gibson Neal  
 Gonzalez Oliver  
 Green, Gene Pallone  
 Grijalva Pascrell  
 Gutierrez Pastor (AZ)

NOT VOTING—24

Honda  
 Hurl  
 Jackson Lee  
 (TX)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Kaptur  
 Lee (CA)  
 Matsui  
 Paul

□ 1155

Messrs. AMODEI, OLSON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCHENRY, and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CARNEY and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, today I was unavoidably detained and missed the following vote:

Welch (VT)/Rush (IL) Amendment to H.R. 2401. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on this amendment.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I was unable to cast my vote today on the Welch amendment to H.R. 2401, the TRAIN Act. Had I cast my vote I would have voted “yea.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 229, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 729]

AYES—184

Ackerman Gibson  
 Amodei Gonzalez  
 Andrews Green, Al  
 Baca Green, Gene  
 Baldwin Grijalva  
 Barrow Gutierrez  
 Bass (CA) Hahn  
 Becerra Hanabusa  
 Berkley Hanna  
 Berman Hastings (FL)  
 Bilbray Heck  
 Bishop (GA) Heinrich  
 Bishop (NY) Higgins  
 Blumenauer Himes  
 Boswell Hinchey  
 Brady (PA) Hinojosa  
 Braley (IA) Hochul  
 Brown (FL) Holden  
 Butterfield Holt  
 Capps Hoyer  
 Capuano Inslee  
 Cardoza Israel  
 Carnahan Jackson (IL)  
 Carney Jackson Lee  
 Carson (IN) (TX)  
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA)  
 Chandler Johnson (IL)  
 Cicilline Johnson, E. B.  
 Clarke (MI) Kaptur  
 Clarke (NY) Keating  
 Cleaver Kind  
 Clyburn Kissell  
 Cohen Kucinich  
 Connolly (VA) Lance  
 Cooper Langevin  
 Costello Larsen (WA)  
 Courtney Larson (CT)  
 Critz Lee (CA)  
 Crowley Levin  
 Cuellar Lewis (GA)  
 Cummings Lipinski  
 Davis (CA) LoBiondo  
 Davis (IL) Loeb sack  
 DeFazio Lofgren, Zoe  
 DeGette Lowey  
 DeLauro Lujan  
 Deutch Lynch  
 Dicks Maloney  
 Doggett Markey  
 Donnelly (IN) Matheson  
 Doyle Matsui  
 Edwards McCarthy (NY)  
 Ellison McCollum  
 Engel McDermott  
 Eshoo McGovern  
 Fattah McIntyre  
 Filner McNerney  
 Fitzpatrick Meeks  
 Fortenberry Michaud  
 Frank (MA) Miller (NC)  
 Fudge Miller, George  
 Garamendi Moore

Stearns  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Sullivan  
 Terry  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner (NY)  
 Turner (OH)  
 Upton  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Webster  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Olver  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Ross (AR)  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Stark  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Woolsey

Brooks  
 Broun (GA)  
 Buchanan  
 Bucshon  
 Buerkle  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Canseco  
 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  
 Camp  
 Canseco  
 Capito  
 Carter  
 Cassidy  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Coble  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cole  
 Conaway  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boren  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brooks  
 Broun (GA)  
 Buchanan  
 Buechson  
 Buerkle  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Canseco  
 Capito  
 Carter  
 Cassidy  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Coble  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cole  
 Conaway  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boren  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)

Davis (KY)  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dold  
 Dreier  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers  
 Emerson  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fox  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Gardner

NOES—229

Garrett	Lummis	Rogers (AL)	[Roll No. 730]	Schrader	Sutton	Walz (MN)
Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (KY)		Schwartz	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Gibbs	E.	Rogers (MI)		Schweikert	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Gingrey (GA)	Mack	Rohrabacher		Scott (VA)	Thornberry	Watt
Gohmert	Manzullo	Rokita	Ackerman	Scott, Austin	Tiberi	Waxman
Goodlatte	Marchant	Rooney	Adams	Scott, David	Tierney	Welch
Gosar	Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Aderholt	Serrano	Tipton	Wheat
Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)	Roskam	Akin	Sewell	Tonko	Whitfield
Granger	McCaul	Ross (FL)	Alexander	Shimkus	Towns	Wilson (FL)
Graves (GA)	McClintock	Royce	Andrews	Shuster	Tsongas	Wilson (SC)
Graves (MO)	McCotter	Runyan	Austria	Simpson	Turner (NY)	Wittman
Griffin (AR)	McHenry	Ryan (WI)	Baca	Sires	Turner (OH)	Wolf
Griffith (VA)	McKeon	Schilling	Bachus	Slaughter	Upton	Womack
Grimm	McKinley	Schmidt	Baldwin	Smith (NE)	Van Hollen	Woolsey
Guinta	McMorris	Schock	Barletta	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez	Yoder
Guthrie	Rodgers	Schweikert	Barrow	Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Hall	Meehan	Scott (SC)	Barton (TX)	Stark	Walberg	Young (IN)
Harper	Mica	Scott, Austin	Bass (CA)	Stivers	Walden	
Harris	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Bass (NH)			
Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Sessions	Becerra			
Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Shimkus	Benishek			
Hayworth	Mulvaney	Shuster	Berg			
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Simpson	Berkley			
Herger	Myrick	Smith (NE)	Berman			
Herrera Beutler	Neal	Smith (TX)	Biggart			
Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Southerland	Bilbray			
Huizenga (MI)	Noem	Stearns	Bilirakis			
Hultgren	Nugent	Stivers	Bishop (GA)			
Hunter	Nunes	Stutzman	Bishop (NY)			
Hurt	Nunnelee	Sullivan	Bishop (UT)			
Issa	Olson	Terry	Black			
Jenkins	Owens	Thompson (PA)	Blackburn			
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Thornberry	Blumenauer			
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Tiberi	Bonner			
Jones	Pence	Tipton	Bono Mack			
Jordan	Peterson	Turner (NY)	Boren			
Kelly	Petri	Turner (OH)	Boswell			
King (IA)	Pitts	Upton	Boustany			
King (NY)	Platts	Walberg	Brady (PA)			
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Walden	Braley (IA)			
Kinzingler (IL)	Pompeo	Walsh (IL)	Brown (FL)			
Kline	Posey	Webster	Buchanan			
Labrador	Price (GA)	West	Bucshon			
Lamborn	Quayle	Westmoreland	Buerkle			
Landry	Rahall	Whitfield	Burgess			
Lankford	Reed	Wilson (SC)	Burton (IN)			
Latham	Rehberg	Wittman	Butterfield			
LaTourette	Renacci	Wolf	Calvert			
Latta	Ribble	Womack	Camp			
Lewis (CA)	Rigell	Woodall	Campbell			
Long	Rivera	Yoder	Cantor			
Lucas	Roby	Young (FL)	Capito			
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Young (IN)	Capps			
			Capuano			
			Cardoza			
			Carnahan			
			Carney			
			Carson (IN)			
			Carter			
			Cassidy			
			Castor (FL)			
			Chaffetz			
			Chandler			
			Cicilline			
			Clarke (MI)			
			Clarke (NY)			
			Clay			
			Cleaver			
			Clyburn			
			Coble			
			Cohen			
			Cole			
			Conaway			
			Connolly (VA)			
			Cooper			
			Costa			
			Costello			
			Courtney			
			Cravaack			
			Crawford			
			Crenshaw			
			Critz			
			Crowley			
			Cuellar			
			Culberson			
			Cummings			
			Davis (CA)			
			Davis (IL)			
			Davis (KY)			
			DeFazio			
			DeGette			
			DeLauro			
			Denham			
			Dent			
			Deutch			
			Diaz-Balart			
			Dicks			
			Doggett			
			Dold			
			Donnelly (IN)			
			Doyle			
			Dreier			
			Duffy			
			Edwards			
			Ellison			
			Emerson			
			Engel			
			Eshoo			
			Farenthold			
			Farr			
			Fattah			
			Finer			
			Fincher			
			Fitzpatrick			
			Fleischmann			
			Fleming			
			Flores			
			Forbes			
			Fortenberry			
			Fox			
			Frank (MA)			
			Frelinghuysen			
			Fudge			
			Gallegly			
			Garamendi			
			Gardner			
			Garrett			
			Gerlach			
			Gibbs			
			Gibson			
			Gingrey (GA)			
			Gonzalez			
			Goodlatte			
			Gosar			
			Granger			
			Green, Al			
			Green, Gene			
			Griffin (AR)			
			Grijalva			
			Grimm			
			Guinta			
			Guthrie			
			Gutierrez			
			Hahn			
			Hall			
			Hanabusa			
			Hanna			
			Hastings (FL)			
			Hayworth			
			Heinrich			
			Hensarling			
			Herrera Beutler			
			Higgins			
			Himes			
			Hinche			
			Hinojosa			
			Hochul			
			Holden			
			Holt			
			Hoyer			
			Huizenga (MI)			
			Hultgren			
			Hunter			
			Inslee			
			Israel			
			Issa			
			Jackson (IL)			
			Jackson Lee			
			(TX)			
			Johnson (GA)			
			Johnson (IL)			
			Johnson (OH)			
			Johnson, E. B.			
			Johnson, Sam			
			Jones			
			Jordan			
			Kaptur			
			Keating			
			Kelly			
			Kildee			
			Kind			
			Kissell			
			Kline			
			Kucinich			
			Lance			
			Landry			
			Langevin			
			Larsen (WA)			
			Larson (CT)			
			Latham			
			LaTourette			
			Latta			
			Lee (CA)			
			Levin			
			Lewis (GA)			
			Lipinski			
			LoBiondo			
			Loeback			
			Lofgren, Zoe			
			Lowey			
			Lucas			
			Luetkemeyer			
			Luján			
			Lynch			
			Maloney			
			Manzullo			
			Marchant			
			Marino			
			Markey			
			Matsui			
			McCarthy (CA)			
			McCarthy (NY)			
			McCaul			
			McCollum			
			McCotter			
			McDermott			
			McGovern			
			McIntyre			
			McKeon			
			McKinley			
			McMorris			
			Rodgers			
			McNerney			
			DesJarlais			
			Duncan (SC)			
			Duncan (TN)			
			Ellmers			
			Flake			
			Franks (AZ)			
			Gohmert			
			Gowdy			
			Graves (GA)			
			Graves (MO)			
			Griffith (VA)			
			Harper			
			Harris			
			Hartzler			
			Hastings (WA)			
			Heck			
			Bachmann			
			Chu			
			Conyers			
			Dingell			
			Giffords			
			Herger			
			Hirono			
			Honda			
			Hurt			
			Paul			
			Polis			
			Reichert			
			Scalise			
			Sherman			
			Honda			

[Roll No. 731]

AYES—195

Ackerman Gerlach Olver  
 Altmore Gibson Pallone  
 Andrews Green, Al Pascrell  
 Baca Grijalva Pastor (AZ)  
 Bachus Gutierrez Payne  
 Baldwin Hahn Pelosi  
 Barrow Hanabusa Perlmutter  
 Bass (CA) Hanna Peters  
 Becerra Hastings (FL) Peterson  
 Berkley Heinrich Pingree (ME)  
 Berman Higgins Platts  
 Bishop (GA) Himes Poliss  
 Bishop (NY) Hinchey Price (NC)  
 Blumenauer Hinojosa Quigley  
 Boren Hochul Rahall  
 Boswell Holden Rangel  
 Brady (PA) Holt Reyes  
 Braley (IA) Hoyer Richardson  
 Brown (FL) Insee Richmond  
 Buchanan Israel Ross (AR)  
 Butterfield Jackson (IL) Rothman (NJ)  
 Capps Jackson Lee Roybal-Allard  
 Capuano (TX) Runyan  
 Carnahan Johnson (GA) Ruppersberger  
 Carney Johnson, E. B. Rush  
 Carson (IN) Kaptur Ryan (OH)  
 Castor (FL) Keating Sánchez, Linda  
 Chandler Kildee T.  
 Cicilline Kind Sanchez, Loretta  
 Clarke (MI) Kissell Sarbanes  
 Clarke (NY) Kucinich Schakowsky  
 Clay Lance Schiff  
 Cleaver Langevin Schilling  
 Clyburn Larsen (WA) Schrader  
 Cohen Larson (CT) Schwartz  
 Connolly (VA) LaTourette Scott (VA)  
 Cooper Lee (CA) Scott, David  
 Costello Levin Serrano  
 Courtney Lewis (GA) Sewell  
 Crowley Lipinski Sherman  
 Cuellar LoBiondo Sires  
 Cummings Loeb sack Slaughter  
 Davis (CA) Lofgren, Zoe Smith (NJ)  
 Davis (IL) Lowey Smith (WA)  
 DeFazio Luján Stark  
 DeGette Lynch Stivers  
 DeLauro Maloney Sutton  
 Dent Markey Thompson (CA)  
 Deutch Matsui Thompson (MS)  
 Dicks McCarthy (NY) Tiberi  
 Doggett McCollum Tierney  
 Donnelly (IN) McCotter Tonko  
 Doyle McDermott Towns  
 Edwards McGovern Tsongas  
 Ellison McIntyre Van Hollen  
 Engel McNeerney Velázquez  
 Eshoo Meehan Visclosky  
 Farr Meeks Walz (MN)  
 Fattah Michaud Wasserman  
 Filner Miller (NC) Schultz  
 Fitzpatrick Moore Watt  
 Fortenberry Moran Waxman  
 Frank (MA) Murphy (CT) Welch  
 Frelinghuysen Nadler Wilson (FL)  
 Fudge Napolitano Wolf  
 Garamendi Neal Woolsey

NOES—221

Adams Burton (IN) Duffy  
 Aderholt Calvert Duncan (SC)  
 Akin Camp Duncan (TN)  
 Alexander Campbell Ellmers  
 Amash Canseco Emerson  
 Amodei Cantor Farenthold  
 Austria Capito Fincher  
 Barletta Cardoza Flake  
 Bartlett Carter Fleischmann  
 Barton (TX) Cassidy Fleming  
 Bass (NH) Chabot Flores  
 Benishek Chaffetz Forbes  
 Berg Coble Foss  
 Biggert Coffman (CO) Franks (AZ)  
 Bilbray Cole Gallegly  
 Bilirakis Conaway Gardner  
 Bishop (UT) Costa Garrett  
 Black Cravaack Gibbs  
 Blackburn Crawford Gingrey (GA)  
 Bonner Crenshaw Gohmert  
 Bono Mack Broun (GA) Gonzalez  
 Boustany Culbertson Goodlatte  
 Brady (TX) Davis (KY) Gosar  
 Brooks Denham Gowdy  
 Broun (GA) DesJarlais Granger  
 Bucshon Diaz-Balart Graves (GA)  
 Buerkle Dold Graves (MO)  
 Burgess Dreier Green, Gene

Griffin (AR) Manzano  
 Griffith (VA) Marchant  
 Grimm Marino  
 Guinta Matheson  
 Guthrie McCarthy (CA)  
 Hall McCaul  
 Harper McClintock  
 Harris McHenry  
 Hartzler McKeon  
 Hastings (WA) McKinley  
 Hayworth McMorris  
 Heck Rodgers  
 Hensarling Mica  
 Herger Miller (FL)  
 Herrera Beutler Miller (MI)  
 Huelskamp Miller, Gary  
 Huizenga (MI) Mulvaney  
 Hultgren Murphy (PA)  
 Hunter Myrick  
 Hurt Neugebauer  
 Issa Noem  
 Jenkins Nugent  
 Johnson (IL) Nunes  
 Johnson (OH) Nunnelee  
 Johnson, Sam Olson  
 Jones Owens  
 Jordan Palazzo  
 Kelly Paulsen  
 King (IA) Pearce  
 King (NY) Pence  
 Kingston Petri  
 Kinzinger (IL) Pitts  
 Kline Poe (TX)  
 Labrador Pompeo  
 Lamborn Posey  
 Landry Price (GA)  
 Lankford Quayle  
 Latham Reed  
 Latta Rehberg  
 Lewis (CA) Renacci  
 Long Ribble  
 Lucas Rigell  
 Luetkemeyer Rivera  
 Lummis Roby  
 Lungren, Daniel E.  
 Mack Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann Honda  
 Chu Miller, George  
 Conyers Paul  
 Dingell Reichert  
 Giffords Scalise  
 Hirono Shuler

□ 1211

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KINZINGER OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 145, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 732]

AYES—269

Adams Amodei Barton (TX)  
 Aderholt Austria Bass (NH)  
 Akin Bachus Benishek  
 Alexander Barletta Berg  
 Altmore Barrow Biggert  
 Amash Bartlett Bilbray

Bilirakis Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (UT) Bishop (UT)  
 Black Blackburn  
 Blackburn Blackburn  
 Bonner Bonner  
 Bono Mack Bono Mack  
 Boren Boren  
 Boswell Boswell  
 Boustany Boustany  
 Brooks Brooks  
 Broun (GA) Broun (GA)  
 Bucshon Bucshon  
 Buerkle Buerkle  
 Burgess Burgess  
 Burton (IN) Burton (IN)  
 Calvert Calvert  
 Camp Camp  
 Canseco Canseco  
 Cantor Cantor  
 Capito Capito  
 Cardoza Cardoza  
 Carter Carter  
 Cassidy Cassidy  
 Chabot Chabot  
 Chaffetz Chaffetz  
 Coble Coble  
 Coffman (CO) Coffman (CO)  
 Cole Cole  
 Conaway Conaway  
 Costa Costa  
 Cravaack Cravaack  
 Crawford Crawford  
 Crenshaw Crenshaw  
 Crenshaw Crenshaw  
 Crenshaw Crenshaw  
 Culbertson Culbertson  
 Davis (KY) Davis (KY)  
 Denham Denham  
 DesJarlais DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart  
 Dold Dold  
 Dreier Dreier

NOES—145

Ackerman Capps Connolly (VA)  
 Andrews Andrews  
 Baca Capuano Cooper  
 Baldwin Carnahan Courtney  
 Becerra Carson (IN) Crowley  
 Berkley Castor (FL) Cummings  
 Berkley Cicilline Davis (CA)  
 Berman Clarke (MI) Davis (IL)  
 Bishop (NY) Clarke (NY) DeGette  
 Blumenauer Clay DeLauro  
 Brady (PA) Cleaver DeLauro  
 Brown (FL) Clyburn Dicks  
 Butterfield Cohen Doggett

Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Camp	Hastings (WA)	Pitts	Hoyer	McIntyre	Sánchez, Linda
Edwards	Loeb sack	Reed	Campbell	Hayworth	Platts	Inslee	McNerney	T.
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)	Canseco	Heck	Poe (TX)	Israel	Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta
Engel	Lowey	Royal-Allard	Cantor	Hensarling	Pompeo	Jackson (IL)	Michaud	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Lynch	Rush	Cantor	Herger	Posey	Jackson Lee	Miller (NC)	Schakowsky
Farr	Maloney	Ryan (OH)	Cardoza	Herrera Beutler	Price (GA)	(TX)	Miller, George	Schiff
Fattah	Markey	Sánchez, Linda	Carney	Hinojosa	Quayle	Johnson (GA)	Moore	Schwartz
Filner	Matsui	T.	Carter	Hochul	Rahall	Johnson (IL)	Moran	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Cassidy	Holden	Reed	Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (CT)	Serrano
Fudge	McCollum	Sarbanes	Chabot	Huelskamp	Rehberg	Kaptur	Nadler	Sherman
Garamendi	McDermott	Schakowsky	Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci	Keating	Napolitano	Sires
Grijalva	McGovern	Schiff	Chandler	Hultgren	Reyes	Kildee	Neal	Slaughter
Gutierrez	McNerney	Schrader	Coble	Hunter	Ribble	Kind	Olver	Smith (WA)
Hahn	Meeks	Schwartz	Coffman (CO)	Hurt	Rigell	Kucinich	Owens	Stark
Hanabusa	Michaud	Scott (VA)	Cole	Hurt	Rivera	Langevin	Pallone	Sutton
Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Serrano	Conaway	Issa	Roby	Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Heinrich	Miller, George	Sherman	Costa	Jenkins	Roe (TN)	Larson (CT)	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (MS)
Higgins	Moore	Sires	Costello	Kline	Rogers (AL)	Lee (CA)	Payne	Tierney
Himes	Moran	Slaughter	Crawford	Jones	Rogers (KY)	Levin	Pelosi	Tonko
Hinche y	Murphy (CT)	Smith (WA)	Crenshaw	Jordan	Rogers (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Perlmutter	Towns
Hochul	Nadler	Stark	Critz	Kelly	Rohrabacher	Loeb sack	Peters	Tsongas
Holt	Napolitano	Sutton	King (IA)	King (IA)	Rokita	Lofgren, Zoe	Pingree (ME)	Van Hollen
Hoyer	Neal	Thompson (CA)	King (NY)	King (NY)	Royce	Lowey	Polis	Velázquez
Inslee	Olver	Tierney	Kingston	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen	Luján	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Israel	Owens	Tonko	Kinzinger (IL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam	Lynch	Quigley	Walz (MN)
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Towns	Kissell	Kissell	Ross (AR)	Maloney	Rangel	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Tsongas	Kline	Kline	Ross (FL)	Markey	Richardson	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)	Van Hollen	Labrador	Labrador	Royce	Matsui	Richmond	Watt
Kaptur	Payne	Velázquez	Lamborn	Lamborn	Runyan	McCarthy (NY)	Rothman (NJ)	Waxman
Keating	Pelosi	Visclosky	Lance	Lance	Ruppersberger	McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Kildee	Perlmutter	Wasserman	Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Ryan (WI)	McDermott	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Kind	Peters	Schultz	Doggett	Doggett	Schilling	McGovern	Ryan (OH)	Woolsey
Kucinich	Pingree (ME)	Watt	Dold	Dold	Schmidt			
Langevin	Polis	Waxman	Donnelly (IN)	Donnelly (IN)	Schock			
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Welch	Dreier	Dreier	Schrader	Bachmann	Honda	Speier
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Wilson (FL)	Duffy	Duffy	Schweikert	Chu	Paul	Waters
Levin	Rahall	Woolsey	Duncan (SC)	Duncan (SC)	Scott (SC)	Dingell	Reichert	Yarmuth
			Duncan (TN)	Duncan (TN)	Scott, Austin	Giffords	Scalise	Young (AK)
			Ellmers	Ellmers	Scott, David	Hirono	Shuler	
			Emerson	Emerson	Sensenbrenner			
			Farenthold	Farenthold	Sessions			
			Fattah	Fattah	Sewell			
			Fincher	Fincher	Shimkus			
			Fitzpatrick	Fitzpatrick	Shuster			
			Fleischmann	Fleischmann	Simpson			
			Fleming	Fleming	Smith (NE)			
			Flores	Flores	Smith (NJ)			
			Forbes	Forbes	Smith (TX)			
			Fortenberry	Fortenberry	Southerland			
			Fox	Fox	Stearns			
			Franks (AZ)	Franks (AZ)	Stivers			
			Frelinghuysen	Frelinghuysen	Stutzman			
			Gardner	Gardner	Sullivan			
			Garrett	Garrett	Terry			
			Gerlach	Gerlach	Thompson (PA)			
			Gibbs	Gibbs	Thornberry			
			Gibson	Gibson	Tiberi			
			Gingrey (GA)	Gingrey (GA)	Tipton			
			Gohmert	Gohmert	Turner (NY)			
			Gonzalez	Gonzalez	Turner (OH)			
			Goodlatte	Goodlatte	Upton			
			Gosar	Gosar	Walberg			
			Gowdy	Gowdy	Walden			
			Granger	Granger	Walsh (IL)			
			Graves (GA)	Graves (GA)	Webster			
			Graves (MO)	Graves (MO)	West			
			Green, Gene	Green, Gene	Westmoreland			
			Griffin (AR)	Griffin (AR)	Whitfield			
			Griffith (VA)	Griffith (VA)	Wilson (SC)			
			Grimm	Grimm	Wittman			
			Guinta	Guinta	Wolf			
			Guthrie	Guthrie	Womack			
			Hall	Hall	Woodall			
			Hanna	Hanna	Yoder			
			Harper	Harper	Young (FL)			
			Harris	Harris	Young (IN)			
			Hartzler	Hartzler				

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	Giffords	Shuler
Bass (CA)	Gohmert	Speier
Brady (TX)	Hirono	Waters
Braley (IA)	Honda	Yarmuth
Chu	Paul	Young (AK)
Conyers	Reichert	
Dingell	Scalise	

□ 1215

Mr. HALL changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”  
So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. DENT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 150, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 733]

AYES—269

Adams	Bass (NH)	Boren
Aderholt	Benishek	Boswell
Akin	Berg	Boustany
Alexander	Berkley	Brady (TX)
Altmire	Biggert	Brooks
Amash	Bilbray	Brown (GA)
Amodei	Bilirakis	Brown (FL)
Austria	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Barletta	Black	Buerkle
Barrow	Blackburn	Burgess
Bartlett	Bonner	Burton (IN)
Barton (TX)	Bono Mack	Calvert

NOES—150

Ackerman	Clarke (NY)	Engel
Andrews	Clay	Eshoo
Baca	Cleaver	Farr
Baldwin	Clyburn	Filner
Bass (CA)	Cohen	Flake
Becerra	Connolly (VA)	Frank (MA)
Berman	Conyers	Fudge
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Garamendi
Blumenauer	Courtney	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Grijalva
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Blumenauer
Butterfield	Corn (CA)	Gutierrez
Capps	DeGette	Hahn
Capuano	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Carnahan	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Carson (IN)	Dicks	Heinrich
Castor (FL)	Doyle	Higgins
Cicilline	Edwards	Himes
Clarke (MI)	Ellison	Hinche y

Johnson (WA)	Pitts	Hoyer
Hayworth	Platts	Inslee
Heck	Poe (TX)	Israel
Hensarling	Pompeo	Jackson (IL)
Herger	Posey	Jackson Lee
Herrera Beutler	Price (GA)	(TX)
Hinojosa	Quayle	Johnson (GA)
Hochul	Rahall	Johnson (IL)
Holden	Reed	Johnson, E. B.
Huelskamp	Rehberg	Kaptur
Huizenga (MI)	Renacci	Keating
Hultgren	Reyes	Kildee
Hunter	Ribble	Kind
Hurt	Rigell	Kucinich
Issa	Rivera	Langevin
Jenkins	Roby	Larsen (WA)
Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)	Larson (CT)
Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)	Lee (CA)
Jones	Rogers (KY)	Levin
Jordan	Rogers (MI)	Lewis (GA)
Kelly	Rohrabacher	Loeb sack
King (IA)	Rokita	Lofgren, Zoe
King (NY)	Royce	Lowey
Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen	Luján
Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam	Lynch
Kissell	Ross (AR)	Maloney
Kline	Ross (FL)	Markey
Labrador	Royce	Matsui
Lamborn	Runyan	McCarthy (NY)
Lance	Ruppersberger	McCollum
Landry	Ryan (WI)	McDermott
Lankford	Schilling	McGovern
Latham	Schmidt	
LaTourette	Schock	
Latta	Schrader	Bachmann
Lewis (CA)	Schweikert	Chu
Lipinski	Scott (SC)	Dingell
LoBiondo	Scott, Austin	Giffords
Long	Scott, David	Hirono
Lucas	Sensenbrenner	
Luetkemeyer	Sessions	
Lummis	Sewell	
Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus	
E.	Shuster	
Mack	Simpson	
Manzullo	Smith (NE)	
Marchant	Smith (NJ)	
Marino	Smith (TX)	
Matheson	Southerland	
McCarthy (CA)	Stearns	
McCaul	Stivers	
McClintock	Stutzman	
McCotter	Sullivan	
McHenry	Terry	
McKeon	Thompson (PA)	
McKinley	Thornberry	
McMorris	Tiberi	
Rodgers	Tipton	
Meehan	Turner (NY)	
Mica	Turner (OH)	
Miller (FL)	Upton	
Miller (MI)	Walberg	
Miller, Gary	Walden	
Mulvaney	Walsh (IL)	
Murphy (PA)	Webster	
Myrick	West	
Neugebauer	Westmoreland	
Noem	Whitfield	
Nugent	Wilson (SC)	
Nunes	Wittman	
Nunnelee	Wolf	
Olson	Womack	
Palazzo	Woodall	
Paulsen	Yoder	
Pearce	Young (FL)	
Pence	Young (IN)	
Peterson		
Petri		

NOT VOTING—14

Honda	Speier
Paul	Waters
Reichert	Yarmuth
Scalise	Young (AK)
Shuler	

□ 1220

Ms. BERKLEY changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 254, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 734]

AYES—165

Ackerman	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Andrews	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Baca	Cicilline	Deutch
Baldwin	Clarke (MI)	Dicks
Bass (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Becerra	Clay	Doyle
Berkley	Cleaver	Edwards
Berman	Clyburn	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Engel
Bishop (NY)	Connolly (VA)	Eshoo
Blumenauer	Conyers	Farr
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Fattah
Braley (IA)	Costello	Filner
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Butterfield	Crowley	Fudge
Capps	Cummings	Garamendi
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Carnahan	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Carney	DeFazio	Gutierrez

Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
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  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Luján  
Lynch

Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McColum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Richardson  
Rohrabacher  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger

Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey

NOES—254

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodei  
Austria  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishak  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Costa  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham

Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt

Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen

Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita

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

Honda  
Paul  
Reichert  
Scalise  
Shuler

Spieler  
Waters  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

□ 1224

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 232, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 735]

AYES—186

Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Ciocilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay

Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah

Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Luján  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McColum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney

Meehan  
Meeks  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey

NOES—232

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodei  
Austria  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishak  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Costa  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Holden  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Landry  
Lankford

Latham  
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  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney

Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson	Upton	Dicks	Kissell	Reyes	Jordan	McKeon	Schmidt
Roskam	Smith (NE)	Walberg	Doggett	Kline	Ribble	Keating	Miller, Gary	Scott (SC)
Ross (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Walden	Dold	Kucinich	Richardson	Kelly	Mulvaney	Sessions
Royce	Smith (TX)	Walsh (IL)	Donnelly (IN)	Lance	Richmond	King (IA)	Myrick	Shimkus
Runyan	Southerland	Webster	Doyle	Landry	Rigell	King (NY)	Nunes	Simpson
Ryan (WI)	Stearns	West	Dreier	Langevin	Rivera	Kingston	Nunnelee	Southerland
Schilling	Stivers	Westmoreland	Duffy	Lankford	Roby	Labrador	Palazzo	Stivers
Schmidt	Stutzman	Whitfield	Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Roe (TN)	Lamborn	Pitts	Stutzman
Schock	Sullivan	Wilson (SC)	Edwards	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)	Latta	Poe (TX)	Terry
Schweikert	Terry	Wittman	Ellison	Latham	Rogers (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Pompeo	Tiberi
Scott (SC)	Thompson (PA)	Wolf	Ellmers	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)	Long	Price (GA)	Walsh (IL)
Scott, Austin	Thornberry	Womack	Emerson	Lee (CA)	Rohrabacher	Marchant	Quayle	Westmoreland
Sensenbrenner	Tiberi	Woodall	Engel	Levin	Rooney	Marino	Quigley	Woodall
Sessions	Tipton	Yoder	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen	McClintock	Rokita	Young (IN)
Shimkus	Turner (NY)	Young (FL)	Farenthold	Lipinski	Roskam	McHenry	Royce	
Shuster	Turner (OH)	Young (IN)	Farr	LoBiondo	Ross (AR)			

## NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann	Honda	Shuler
Chu	Paul	Speier
Dingell	Reichert	Waters
Giffords	Rush	Yarmuth
Hirono	Scalise	Young (AK)

□ 1228

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, had I been present for the following rollcall Nos., I would have voted as follows: 728, yea; 729, yea; 730, yea; 731, yea; 732, no; 733, no; 734, yea; 735, yea.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON  
LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 346, noes 74, not voting 13 as follows:

[Roll No. 736]

AYES—346

Ackerman	Bono Mack	Clay
Adams	Boren	Cleaver
Aderholt	Boswell	Clyburn
Alexander	Boustany	Coble
Altmire	Brady (PA)	Coffman (CO)
Amodei	Braley (IA)	Cohen
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Cole
Austria	Buchanan	Conaway
Baca	Bucshon	Connolly (VA)
Bachus	Buerkle	Conyers
Baldwin	Butterfield	Cooper
Barletta	Camp	Costello
Barrow	Campbell	Courtney
Bartlett	Canseco	Cravaack
Barton (TX)	Cantor	Crawford
Bass (CA)	Capito	Crenshaw
Bass (NH)	Capps	Critz
Becerra	Capuano	Crowley
Benishek	Cardoza	Cuellar
Berkley	Carney	Culberson
Berman	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Biggert	Carter	Davis (CA)
Bilbray	Cassidy	Davis (KY)
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	DeLauro
Black	Chu	Dent
Blackburn	Cicilline	DesJarlais
Blumener	Clarke (MI)	Deutch
Bonner	Clarke (NY)	Diaz-Balart

Dicks	Kissell	Reyes	Jordan	McKeon	Schmidt
Doggett	Kline	Ribble	Keating	Miller, Gary	Scott (SC)
Dold	Kucinich	Richardson	Kelly	Mulvaney	Sessions
Donnelly (IN)	Lance	Richmond	King (IA)	Myrick	Shimkus
Doyle	Landry	Rigell	King (NY)	Nunes	Simpson
Dreier	Langevin	Rivera	Kingston	Nunnelee	Southerland
Duffy	Lankford	Roby	Labrador	Palazzo	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Roe (TN)	Lamborn	Pitts	Stutzman
Edwards	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)	Latta	Poe (TX)	Terry
Ellison	Latham	Rogers (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Pompeo	Tiberi
Ellmers	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)	Long	Price (GA)	Walsh (IL)
Emerson	Lee (CA)	Rohrabacher	Marchant	Quayle	Westmoreland
Engel	Levin	Rooney	Marino	Quigley	Woodall
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen	McClintock	Rokita	Young (IN)
Farenthold	Lipinski	Roskam	McHenry	Royce	
Farr	LoBiondo	Ross (AR)			
Fattah	Loeb sack	Ross (FL)			
Filner	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)	Bachmann	Paul	Waters
Fincher	Lowe	Roybal-Allard	Carnahan	Reichert	Yarmuth
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Runyan	Davis (IL)	Scalise	Young (AK)
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Ruppersberger	Dingell	Shuler	
Fleming	Lujan	Rush	Giffords	Speier	
Flores	Lummis	Ryan (OH)			
Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)			
Fortenberry	E.	Sánchez, Linda			
Frank (MA)	Lynch	T.			
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Sanchez, Loretta			
Fudge	Maloney	Sarbanes			
Garamendi	Manzullo	Schakowsky			
Gardner	Markey	Schiff			
Garrett	Matheson	Schilling			
Gerlach	Matsui	Schock			
Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)	Schrader			
Gibson	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz			
Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Schweikert			
Gonzalez	McCollum	Scott (VA)			
Goodlatte	McCotter	Scott, Austin			
Granger	McDermott	Scott, David			
Green, Al	McGovern	Sensenbrenner			
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Serrano			
Griffin (AR)	McKinley	Sewell			
Griffith (VA)	McMorris	Sherman			
Grijalva	Rodgers	Shuster			
Grimm	McNerney	Sires			
Guinta	Meehan	Slaughter			
Guthrie	Meeks	Smith (NE)			
Gutierrez	Mica	Smith (NJ)			
Hahn	Michaud	Smith (TX)			
Hall	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)			
Hanabusa	Miller (MI)	Stark			
Hanna	Miller (NC)	Stearns			
Harris	Miller, George	Sullivan			
Hastings (FL)	Moore	Sutton			
Hastings (WA)	Moran	Thompson (CA)			
Heck	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)			
Heinrich	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)			
Hensarling	Nadler	Thornberry			
Herrera Beutler	Napolitano	Tierney			
Higgins	Neal	Tipton			
Himes	Neugebauer	Tonko			
Hinche	Noem	Towns			
Hinojosa	Nugent	Tsongas			
Hirono	Olson	Turner (NY)			
Hochul	Oliver	Turner (OH)			
Holden	Owens	Upton			
Holt	Pallone	Van Hollen			
Honda	Pastrell	Vélázquez			
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	Visclosky			
Huelskamp	Paulsen	Walberg			
Huizenga (MI)	Payne	Walden			
Hurt	Pearce	Walz (MN)			
Insee	Pelosi	Wasserman			
Israel	Pence	Schultz			
Issa	Perlmutter	Watt			
Jackson (IL)	Peters	Waxman			
Jackson Lee	Peterson	Webster			
(TX)	Petri	Welch			
Jenkins	Pingree (ME)	West			
Johnson (GA)	Platts	Whitfield			
Johnson (IL)	Polis	Wilson (FL)			
Johnson (OH)	Posey	Wilson (SC)			
Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Wittman			
Jones	Rahall	Wolf			
Kaptur	Rangel	Womack			
Kildee	Reed	Woolsey			
Kind	Rehberg	Yoder			
Kinzinger (IL)	Renacci	Young (FL)			

## NOES—74

Akin	Chabot	Gowdy
Amash	Costa	Graves (GA)
Berg	Denham	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Brady (TX)	Flake	Hartzler
Brooks	Foxx	Hayworth
Broun (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Heger
Burgess	Gallegly	Hultgren
Burton (IN)	Gohmert	Hunter
Calvert	Gosar	Johnson, Sam

## NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann	Paul	Waters
Carnahan	Reichert	Yarmuth
Davis (IL)	Scalise	Young (AK)
Dingell	Shuler	
Giffords	Speier	

□ 1232

Mr. TIPTON changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 737]

AYES—234

Adams	Cardoza	Franks (AZ)
Aderholt	Carter	Gallegly
Akin	Cassidy	Gardner
Alexander	Chabot	Garrett
Altmire	Chaffetz	Gerlach
Amash	Chandler	Gibbs
Amodei	Coble	Gingrey (GA)
Austria	Coffman (CO)	Gohmert
Bachus	Cole	Goodlatte
Barletta	Conaway	Gosar
Barrow	Costello	Gowdy
Bartlett	Cravaack	Granger
Barton (TX)	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Benishek	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Berg	Critz	Griffin (AR)
Bilirakis	Culberson	Griffith (VA)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Grimm
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Guinta
Black	Dent	Guthrie
Blackburn	DesJarlais	Hall
Bonner	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bono Mack	Dreier	Harper
Boren	Duffy	Harris
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Brooks	Ellmers	Heck
Broun (GA)	Emerson	Hensarling
Buchanan	Farenthold	Herger
Bucshon	Fincher	Herrera Beutler
Buerkle	Fitzpatrick	Holden
Burgess	Flake	Huelskamp
Calvert	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Camp	Fleming	Hultgren
Campbell	Flores	Hunter
Canseco	Forbes	Hurt
Cantor	Fortenberry	Issa
Capito	Foxx	Jenkins



Johnson (IL) Miller (MI)  
 Johnson (OH) Miller, Gary  
 Johnson, Sam Mulvaney  
 Jones Murphy (PA)  
 Jordan Myrick  
 Kelly Neugebauer  
 King (IA) Neom  
 King (NY) Nugent  
 Kingston Nunes  
 Kinzinger (IL) Nunnelee  
 Kline Olson  
 Labrador Palazzo  
 Lamborn Paulsen  
 Landry Pearce  
 Lankford Pence  
 Latham Peterson  
 LaTourette Pitts  
 Latta Platts  
 Lewis (CA) Poe (TX)  
 Long Pompeo  
 Lucas Posey  
 Luetkemeyer Price (GA)  
 Lummis Quayle  
 Lungren, Daniel Rahall  
 E. Reed  
 Mack Rehberg  
 Manzullo Renacci  
 Marchant Ribble  
 Marino Rigell  
 Matheson Rivera  
 McCarthy (CA) Roby  
 McCaul Roe (TN)  
 McClintock Rogers (AL)  
 McCotter Rogers (KY)  
 McHenry Rogers (MI)  
 McKeon Rohrabacher  
 McKinley Rokita  
 McMorris Rooney  
 Rodgers Ros-Lehtinen  
 Meehan Roskam  
 Mica Ross (AR)  
 Miller (FL) Ross (FL)

NOES—188

Ackerman Eshoo  
 Andrews Farr  
 Baca Fattah  
 Baldwin Filner  
 Bass (CA) Frank (MA)  
 Bass (NH) Frelinghuysen  
 Becerra Fudge  
 Berkley Garamendi  
 Berman Gibson  
 Biggert Gonzalez  
 Bilbray Green, Al  
 Bishop (NY) Green, Gene  
 Blumenauer Grijalva  
 Boswell Gutierrez  
 Brady (PA) Hahn  
 Braley (IA) Hanabusa  
 Brown (FL) Hastings (FL)  
 Burton (IN) Hayworth  
 Butterfield Heinrich  
 Capps Higgins  
 Capuano Himes  
 Carnahan Hinchey  
 Carney Hinojosa  
 Carson (IN) Hirono  
 Castor (FL) Hochul  
 Chu Holt  
 Cicilline Honda  
 Clarke (MI) Hoyer  
 Clarke (NY) Insee  
 Clay Israel  
 Cleaver Jackson (IL)  
 Clyburn Jackson Lee  
 Cohen (TX)  
 Connolly (VA) Johnson (GA)  
 Conyers Johnson, E. B.  
 Cooper Kaptur  
 Costa Keating  
 Courtney Kildee  
 Crowley Kind  
 Cuellar Kissell  
 Cummings Kucinich  
 Davis (CA) Lance  
 Davis (IL) Langevin  
 DeFazio Larsen (WA)  
 DeGette Larson (CT)  
 DeLauro Lee (CA)  
 Deutch Levin  
 Dicks Lewis (GA)  
 Doggett Lipinski  
 Dold LoBiondo  
 Donnelly (IN) Loeb sack  
 Doyle Lofgren, Zoe  
 Edwards Lowey  
 Ellison Lujan  
 Engel Lynch

Royce Ryan (WI)  
 Schilling Ryan (WI)  
 Schmidt Schmidt  
 Myrick Schock  
 Neugebauer Schweikert  
 Neom Scott (SC)  
 Nugent Scott, Austin  
 Nunes Sensenbrenner  
 Nunnelee Sessions  
 Olson Shimkus  
 Palazzo Shuster  
 Paulsen Simpson  
 Pearce Smith (NE)  
 Pence Smith (TX)  
 Peterson Southerland  
 Pitts Stearns  
 Platts Stivers  
 Poe (TX) Stutzman  
 Pompeo Sullivan  
 Posey Terry  
 Price (GA) Thompson (PA)  
 Quayle Thornberry  
 Rahall Tiberi  
 Reed Tipton  
 Rehberg Turner (NY)  
 Renacci Turner (OH)  
 Ribble Upton  
 Rigell Walberg  
 Rivera Walden  
 Roby Walsh (IL)  
 Roe (TN) Webster  
 Rogers (AL) West  
 Rogers (KY) Westmoreland  
 Rogers (MI) Whitfield  
 Rohrabacher Wilson (SC)  
 Rokita Womack  
 Rooney Woodall  
 Ros-Lehtinen Woodall  
 Roskam Yoder  
 Ross (AR) Young (FL)  
 Ross (FL) Young (IN)

Maloney  
 Markey  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McNeerney  
 Meeks  
 Michaud  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Olver  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Petri  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Runyan  
 Ruppberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell

Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Stark  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)

Bachmann  
 Dingell  
 Giffords  
 Paul

Tierney  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)

NOT VOTING—11

Reichert  
 Scalise  
 Shuler  
 Speier

Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey

Waters  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (AK)

McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meehan  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Myrick  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Pence  
 Peterson  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Quayle  
 Rahall

Reed  
 Rehberg  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rigell  
 Rivera  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross (FL)  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Schilling  
 Schmidt  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (SC)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster

NOES—192

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

Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Garamendi  
 Gonzalez  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hahn  
 Hanabusa  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hayworth  
 Heinrich  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Hochul  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson Lee  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kildee  
 Kind  
 Kissell  
 Kucinich  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lee (CA)  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lujan  
 Lynch  
 Maloney  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McNeerney  
 Meeks  
 Michaud  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George

Simpson  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Southerland  
 Stearns  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Sullivan  
 Terry  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner (NY)  
 Turner (OH)  
 Upton  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Webster  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Young (IN)

Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Olver  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Ross (AR)  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Runyan  
 Ruppberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Stark  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey

□ 1235

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) on  
 which further proceedings were post-  
 poned and on which the noes prevailed  
 by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 227, noes 192,  
 not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 738]  
 AYES—227

Adams  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Austria  
 Bachus  
 Barletta  
 Bartlett  
 Barton (TX)  
 Benishek  
 Berg  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Bonner  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foy  
 Boren  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brooks  
 Broun (GA)  
 Buchanan  
 Bucshon  
 Buerkle  
 Burgess  
 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  
 Dreier  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers  
 Emerson  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Flake  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foy  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Gardner  
 Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Grimm  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hall  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (WA)

Heck  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurt  
 Issa  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Kelly  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 Labrador  
 Lamborn  
 Landry  
 Lankford  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Long  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Mack  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCotter  
 McHenry  
 McKeon  
 McKinley

Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Critz  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 Deutch  
 Dicks  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly (IN)  
 Doyle  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Frank (MA)

Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Olver  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Ross (AR)  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Runyan  
 Ruppberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Stark  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey

## NOT VOTING—14

Bachmann	Reichert	Waters
Dingell	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
Gallegly	Scalise	Young (AK)
Giffords	Shuler	Young (FL)
Paul	Speier	

□ 1239

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS.  
RICHARDSON

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. EMERSON). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 237, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 739]

AYES—181

Ackerman	Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe
Altmore	Dold	Lowe
Andrews	Donnelly (IN)	Lujan
Baca	Doyle	Lynch
Baldwin	Edwards	Maloney
Barrow	Ellison	Markey
Bartlett	Engel	Matsui
Bass (CA)	Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)
Bass (NH)	Farr	McCollum
Becerra	Fattah	McDermott
Berkley	Filner	McGovern
Berman	Frank (MA)	McIntyre
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	McNerney
Bishop (NY)	Garamendi	Meeks
Blumenauer	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Boren	Grijalva	Miller, George
Boswell	Gutierrez	Moore
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Moran
Braley (IA)	Hanabusa	Murphy (CT)
Brown (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Butterfield	Heinrich	Napolitano
Capps	Higgins	Oliver
Capuano	Himes	Pallone
Cardoza	Hinche	Pascarell
Carnahan	Hirono	Payne
Carney	Hochul	Pelosi
Carson (IN)	Holden	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Holt	Peters
Chandler	Honda	Peterson
Chu	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Cicilline	Inslee	Price (NC)
Clarke (MI)	Israel	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Clay	Jackson Lee	Reyes
Cleaver	(TX)	Richardson
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Connolly (VA)	Kaptur	Ross (AR)
Conyers	Keating	Rothman (NJ)
Cooper	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Kind	Ruppersberger
Costello	Kissell	Rush
Courtney	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Critz	Lance	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	Langevin	T.
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Schiff
DeFazio	Levin	Schwartz
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lipinski	Scott, David
Deutch	LoBiondo	Serrano
Dicks	Loeb	Sewell

Sherman	Thompson (MS)
Shimkus	Tierney
Sires	Tonko
Slaughter	Towns
Smith (NJ)	Tsongas
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen
Stark	Velázquez
Sutton	Visclosky
Thompson (CA)	Walz (MN)

Wasserman	Watt
Schultz	Waxman
Watt	Welch
Wilson (FL)	Woolsey

□ 1243

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2401) to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 406, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I am opposed to the bill in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. McCollum moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2401 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

**SEC. 7. PROTECTING GREAT LAKES DRINKING WATER FROM TOXIC SUBSTANCES.**

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall plan and implement a strategy, consistent with the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, using existing authority as of the date of enactment of this Act, to control air pollution to be deposited in the Great Lakes, including toxic pollution, in order to ensure safe drinking water and protection of public health and the environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, this amendment does not kill the bill or send it back to committee.

## NOES—237

Adams	Gosar	Nugent
Aderholt	Gowdy	Nunes
Akin	Granger	Nunnelee
Alexander	Graves (GA)	Olson
Amash	Graves (MO)	Owens
Amodei	Green, Gene	Palazzo
Austria	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pearce
Barletta	Grimm	Pence
Barton (TX)	Guinta	Petri
Benishek	Guthrie	Pitts
Berg	Hall	Platts
Biggert	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Bilbray	Harper	Pompeo
Bilirakis	Harris	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Black	Hastings (WA)	Quayle
Blackburn	Hayworth	Rahall
Bonner	Heck	Reed
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Rehberg
Boustany	Herger	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Brooks	Hinojosa	Rigell
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Rivera
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Bucshon	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Buerkle	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rogers (MD)
Calvert	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Canseco	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	Jones	Roskam
Capito	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Carter	Kelly	Royce
Cassidy	King (IA)	Runyan
Chabot	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Kingston	Schilling
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schmidt
Coffman (CO)	Kline	Schock
Cole	Labrador	Schrader
Conaway	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cravaack	Landry	Scott (SC)
Crawford	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Cuellar	LaTourette	Sessions
Culberson	Latta	Shuster
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Denham	Long	Smith (NE)
Dent	Lucas	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stearns
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Duffy	E.	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Mack	Sullivan
Duncan (TN)	Manzullo	Terry
Ellmers	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Emerson	Marino	Thornberry
Farenthold	Matheson	Tiberi
Fincher	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Turner (NY)
Flake	McClintock	Turner (OH)
Fleischmann	McCotter	Upton
Fleming	McHenry	Walberg
Flores	McKeon	Walden
Forbes	McKinley	Walsh (IL)
Fortenberry	McMorris	Webster
Fox	Rodgers	West
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Whitfield
Gardner	Michaud	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Gibbs	Miller, Gary	Womack
Gibson	Mulvaney	Woodall
Rush	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gohmert	Myrick	Young (FL)
Gonzalez	Neugebauer	Young (IN)
Goodlatte	Noem	

## NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann	Paul	Shuler
Dingell	Polis	Speier
Gallegly	Reichert	Waters
Giffords	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
Pastor (AZ)	Scalise	Young (AK)

If this amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately be voted on for final passage.

This amendment is about protecting the Great Lakes, one of America's greatest treasures and important natural resources. For those of us who represent these States adjacent to the Great Lakes, we know and understand that any harm done to our lakes threatens the economy and the health of our citizens.

Lake Superior, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario make up the largest freshwater system in the entire world. Our Great Lakes hold 95 percent of America's freshwater and 20 percent of the freshwater on the planet.

Over 30 million people rely on the Great Lakes for their drinking water. There is an estimated 1.5 million jobs that are directly connected to the Great Lakes, and these jobs generate \$62 billion in wages.

Over 40 years ago, this critical ecosystem and economic engine was on the verge of collapse. Time magazine reported in August 1969: "Lake Erie is in danger of dying by suffocation." The days when polluters dumped toxic chemicals into the air and water without consequence are over.

Because of the responsible cleanup policies like the Clean Air Act, the health of the Great Lakes has improved, but threats to the Great Lakes have not disappeared. Air pollutants like mercury are emitted from power plants and continue to fall on the ground, wash into the water, and build up in quantities that threaten the brain development of young children and place limits on the amount of fish that we can consume.

Rising mercury levels is one of the mounting threats that motivated an unprecedented coalition into action. Governors of the eight Great Lakes States, Republicans and Democrats, along with local officials and leaders from tribal nations, nonprofits and the private sector came together to save the Great Lakes.

Early last decade, they created a plan for environmental restoration and economic recovery of the Great Lakes. In 2004, President Bush responded to this bipartisan effort by issuing an executive order that called the Great Lakes "a national treasure," and he directed his Cabinet to establish an interagency task force to report these State and local efforts.

Now, Governor Scott Walker of Wisconsin and Governor Mark Dayton of Minnesota never agree about politics, and they certainly don't agree on football, but as members of the Council of Great Lakes Governors, they agree on the need to reduce air and water pollution in the Great Lakes. Years of planning and partnership in the Great Lakes region and in Washington are now making a difference on the ground through the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

□ 1250

The initiative is protecting drinking water, it's restoring fish and wildlife habitat, and it's supporting the growth of small businesses that depend on healthy waters. The work under way is 300 projects across this region.

Now, my role as a legislator from the Great Lakes region is to do no harm to this effort. The TRAIN Act will make the enforcement of many of the environmental protections uncertain, and it will create confusion in the EPA about which public health efforts they can pursue.

And my amendment does not give the EPA any new authority. Instead, it directs the EPA to use its existing authority to do what Republican and Democratic Governors, mayors, State legislators and other elected officials in the Great Lakes have agreed upon must be done: protect drinking water and protect public health.

Our job in Congress is to protect the Great Lakes, not to undo the hard work of all these Governors and, yes, industry leaders. My amendment makes it clear that the TRAIN Act will not prohibit this work from moving forward.

Let me be clear, my amendment does not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, it will immediately be voted on on final passage.

Regardless of your position on the TRAIN Act, this amendment makes the bill stronger. Regardless of how you feel about the TRAIN Act, I'm sure you agree Congress should protect the safety of drinking water and continue to ensure the viability of the economic interests of the Great Lakes.

Again, let me be clear. This amendment does not kill the bill. It does not send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, it will immediately be voted on for final passage.

Colleagues, let us work together, let us pass this amendment, and let us restore the Great Lakes. Let us protect America's public health.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would say to the gentlelady that not only are we concerned about the Great Lakes, but we're concerned about every body of water in America, and we believe that the TRAIN Act protects that water, does not take away any authority from the EPA to deal with water issues.

The TRAIN Act is very simple. It asks the government commission to study 14 regulations of EPA. On 12 of them we do not delay them in any way. On the other two, we delay one for 1 year and the other for 3 years.

We have adequate protections in place. We simply think that we should examine the cumulative impact of the regulations from the most aggressive EPA in recent memory to determine

what impact it is going to have on jobs; what impact it is going to have on electricity prices; what impact it is going to have on electricity reliability, and will it damage America's competitiveness in the world marketplace.

I would urge passage of this legislation.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 233, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 740]

YEAS—180

Ackerman	Fattah	Michaud
Altmire	Filner	Miller (NC)
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Miller, George
Baca	Fudge	Moore
Baldwin	Garamendi	Moran
Barrow	Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)
Bass (CA)	Green, Al	Nadler
Becerra	Grijalva	Napolitano
Berkley	Gutierrez	Neal
Berman	Hahn	Oliver
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Blumenauer	Heinrich	Pascarell
Boren	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Boswell	Himes	Payne
Brady (PA)	Hinchev	Pelosi
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Hirono	Peters
Capps	Hochul	Peterson
Capuano	Holden	Pingree (ME)
Cardoza	Holt	Price (NC)
Carnahan	Honda	Quigley
Carney	Hoyer	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Inslee	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Israel	Reyes
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Chu	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Ciциlline	(TX)	Ross (AR)
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Rothman (NJ)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kind	T.
Connolly (VA)	Kissell	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Cooper	Langevin	Schiff
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Costello	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Critz	Levin	Serrano
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sewell
Cuellar	Lipinski	Sherman
Cummings	Loeb sack	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Luján	Stark
DeGette	Lynch	Sutton
DeLauro	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	Matheson	Tierney
Dingell	Matsui	Tonko
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Donnelly (IN)	McCollum	Tsongas
Doyle	McDermott	Van Hollen
Edwards	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McIntyre	Vislosky
Eshoo	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Farr	Meeks	



ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,  
SEPTEMBER 26, 2011

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, September 26, 2011, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it shall meet at 11 a.m. on Thursday, September 29, 2011.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1320

#### PAKISTAN—DISLOYAL ALLY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ever since we found Osama bin Laden living the high life in Abbottabad, we've had our suspicions about Pakistan. Turns out they are disloyal, deceptive, and a danger to the United States. This so-called ally takes billions in U.S. aid, while at the same time supporting the militants who attack us.

According to Admiral Mike Mullen, the Pakistani Government supported the groups who were behind the truck bombing attack that wounded more than 70 U.S. and NATO troops and the recent attack on the U.S. embassy.

This should be the last rodeo for Pakistan.

Last night I introduced legislation to freeze all U.S. aid to Pakistan with the exception of funds that are designated to help secure their nuclear weapons. By sending aid to Pakistan, we are funding the enemy, endangering Americans, and undermining our efforts in the region.

We pay them to hate us. Now we pay them to bomb us. Let's not pay them at all.

And that's just the way it is.

#### PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Palestinian Authority's bid for statehood at the United Nations. Supporting a Palestinian state is the right thing to do, and now is the right time to do it. It is wholly consistent with American values. We have supported people's aspirations for freedom and democracy around the world, and we should not treat the Palestinian people differently.

There is global support for a Palestinian state. More people around the world support a Palestinian state than oppose it, including Americans. Seventy percent of Israelis would accept a Palestinian state if the U.N. approved it. Last year, President Obama said he hoped to see a Palestinian state admitted to the United Nations.

Previously, Palestinians sought statehood through violence and ter-

rorism, which the world rightly rejected. Now that they are nonviolently following the internationally recognized process to gain statehood, why we are discouraging them?

A Palestinian state is in the national interests of everyone. It would help stabilize the Middle East. It would help end Israel's diplomatic isolation. It would deal a devastating blow to al Qaeda and Hamas, which refuse to recognize Israel. Recognizing Palestine would reaffirm Israel's own status.

#### MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST HONOR FLIGHT

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, since the first Honor Flight to bring World War II era veterans from the Mississippi Gulf Coast to Washington, D.C. on May 11, almost 200 veterans have had the opportunity to see the memorial built in their honor. I was privileged to walk and speak with the Greatest Generation this week as they remembered the sacrifices that preserved our freedom and liberated the world from tyranny and oppression. This generation of men and women fought and secured America's future with unwavering courage. Their selfless sacrifices to their country and stories of heroism inspired future generations to join the armed services.

In my life, it was a grandfather, a marine Guadalcanal veteran, whose story encouraged me to join and serve in the Marine Corps. As we honor those who fought to protect America's exceptionalism, I also want to recognize those Honor Flight volunteers who worked so tirelessly to preserve the legacy of the Greatest Generation.

#### THE AL QAEDA-QODS FORCE NEXUS

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with the U.N. General Assembly meeting in New York this week and with Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of the Islamic Republic of Iran giving his usual anti-American rant yesterday, I would like to make a few points about my concerns over Iran's strategic aims in the Middle East and here in the Western Hemisphere.

My friends at Kronos Advisory, including Medal of Honor winner Major General James Livingston of Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, released their Al Qaeda-Qods Force Nexus report in April, the text of which I ask to be inserted into the RECORD. Their report goes to the heart of the matter detailing that "Iran has quietly forged a strong working relationship with core al Qaeda leaders."

I am greatly concerned about Iran's growing influence in Latin America.

The Treasury Department has stated that Hezbollah's operating center is in the tri-border region of Brazil, Argentina, and Paraguay. Hezbollah's state sponsor, Iran, has opened six embassies in South America over the last 5 years.

When the lives of Americans could face threats from Iran's growing reach through Hezbollah, why would this administration even consider giving President Ahmadinejad a visa to attend the United Nations General Assembly meeting?

[From Kronos]

#### THE AL-QA'IDA-QODS FORCE NEXUS SCRATCHING THE SURFACE OF A "KNOWN UNKNOWN"

Kronos is a strategic advisory firm founded by Congressional Medal of Honor recipient MajGen James E. Livingston, USMC (Ret), Mallory Factor, and Michael S. Smith II to provide global stakeholders the situational awareness solutions they need to address strategic and tactical threats to their interests. We help our clients achieve their organizational goals by providing them the resources they need to better understand and define their operational environments—rather than allowing their organizational capabilities and goals to be defined by them.

Kronos harnesses the resources of a diverse international network of talented professionals with highly valuable skill sets who have extensive experience helping officials address complex national security threats, both domestic and foreign.

Kronos investigative project case teams consist of counter-intelligence professionals, accomplished field investigators, seasoned security analysts, and preeminent subject experts. We seek to help our clients detect, deter, and neutralize eminent challenges posed by gray area phenomena and collusive adversarial regimes.

Through independent missions, our teams collect and analyze unique and often otherwise inaccessible information that reveals key threat features like emerging partnerships, operational capabilities and the objectives of transnational terrorist networks. Our teams also gather information that exposes implications of important emerging theater-specific and regional trends. We then use this data to produce tailor made strategic threat assessments that provide holistic explanations of imminent threats, and can be used by officials to identify new opportunities to reduce them.

Kronos is strongly positioned to assist private companies who support official missions, defense and intelligence organizations operating in mission critical zones, as well as policy makers in Washington. Our principals can also help officials identify strategic opportunities to strengthen relationships with key foreign partners.

#### THE AL-QA'IDA-QODS FORCE NEXUS ISSUE SUMMARY, KRONOSADVISORY.COM

Despite a nearly decade-long effort to dismantle al-Qa'ida and its affiliates, these terrorists still pose the most immediate threats to America's security. Al-Qa'ida and affiliated movements also threaten many other major and emerging powers alike. Yet one ascendant power, Iran, has quietly forged a strong working relationship with Core al-Qa'ida's leaders. This relationship has been established to counter American influence in the Middle East and South Asia. Through it, Iran will likely also help al-Qa'ida mobilize terrorists to carry out attacks against the U.S. and our allies, providing the support required to extend al-Qa'ida's operational reach.

Attention to the longstanding ties between top Iranian officials and al-Qa'ida leaders, including Osama bin Laden's top lieutenant, Ayman al-Zawahiri, has been eschewed by a pervasive fundamental attribution error: "Shiite Iran will not work with Sunni militants comprising the ranks of al-Qa'ida." This assessment fully ignores readily available evidence to the contrary. Indeed, such relationships span back to the early 1990s, when top officials from the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps' clandestine Qods Force, working in concert with Iran's chief global terrorist proxy, Lebanese Hizballah, began training and equipping bin Laden's warriors. Then, following the 1996 attack on the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 Americans, more evidence surfaced of operational linkages between al-Qa'ida and the Qods Force, an official Iranian paramilitary organization which possesses a mandate from Iran's Supreme Leader to fund, train, and equip Islamist terrorists. These very operational linkages are referenced within the 9/11 Commission Report, whose authors acknowledged the relationship between al-Qa'ida and Iran demonstrates that Sunni-Shiite divisions "did not necessarily pose an insurmountable barrier to cooperation in terrorist operations."

Since 9/11, these partnerships have become all the more pronounced. Hundreds of al-Qa'ida members, along with family members of Core al-Qa'ida leaders like Osama bin Laden, have found refuge inside Iran. Officials now know Iran's minister of defense, formerly a commander of the Qods Force, furnished safe houses for many of these terrorists. Officials also know that while under "house arrest" inside Iran al-Qa'ida's top military commanders like Saif al-Adl were able to coordinate attacks against Western targets. Examples of these attacks include the May 2003 bombings in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia that killed eight Americans.

Since 2005, Iran has rapidly evolved from a theocracy into a garrison state. With help from the Islamic Republic's unelected officials, notably Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamene'i, and Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (a former member of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps), the IRGC has seized control of most critical sectors inside Iran. Having secured their future grips on power by elevating the domestic roles of the IRGC, Iran's leaders are now pursuing their lust for regional hegemonic status. Their strategy entails both a persistent quest for nuclear weapons—the acquisition of which Iran's leaders view as the means to ensure their recent regional gains will be irreversible—and support of terrorist organizations which are able to help Iran destabilize unfriendly states, and perhaps even Iran's entire neighborhood.

Today, the Middle East is more volatile than at any time since the Islamic Revolution's leaders seized control of Iran, and hardliners in Tehran are better positioned than ever before to influence the future of this critical region. Concurrently, with support from a state sponsor like Iran, al-Qa'ida will be better positioned than ever before to strike the West and our allies, and to foment chaos in both the Arab world and South Asia that would ultimately benefit Iran. As the implications of working partnerships between Iran and al-Qa'ida carry weighty implications for not just the security of the Middle East and South Asia, but also America's national security interests, it is incumbent upon policy makers in Washington to address this issue. For if left unchecked, Iran's relationship with al-Qa'ida could cost America and our allies dearly.

This report focuses on the history of Iran's relationship with al-Qa'ida, and briefly addresses potential implications of these ties.

Additionally, its author provides a list of recommended action items for Members of the United States Congress, as well as a list of questions that may help Members develop a better understanding of this issue through interactions with defense and intelligence officials.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 639

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 639, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROKITA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### STORING NUCLEAR WASTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, this marks the first of what I hope to be many times to address you and my colleagues on an issue that I have been graced with having the responsibility to deal in the public policy arena, and that's the issue of nuclear waste.

When people talk about nuclear waste and this debate about where it is and why it's there, they primarily talk about our nuclear utilities. Especially after Fukushima Daiichi, people understand that when you store high-level nuclear waste onsite and if there's a disaster that occurs and if the pools run dry, then you might have a melting which might spread radioactivity, and that's not good for anybody. That's a good debate to have because we have nuclear waste stored all over this country.

But I'm not here really to talk about the private for-profit sector, the nuclear industry today. I'm here to tell another story, another story that really talks about why we have government and why there's still a need for some government entities.

Back during World War II—and we just heard my colleague talk about the Honor Flights—back during World War II, we decided as a Nation to win these wars. One way to make sure that we wouldn't lose thousands upon thousands of soldiers in an invasion of Japan was to develop the nuclear bomb. Two were dropped; the war ended. Many people historically know that development, that occurred because of the Manhattan Project.

What I think a lot of people don't know is that we still are dealing with much of the history of winning the war in the Manhattan Project and that winning the Cold War relied upon a strong military and a strong nuclear deterrence. So even after World War II, we continued to develop nuclear weapons, which we deal with today.

So I had a chance to visit during our last district work period, I took a day and visited a place called Hanford, Washington. Hanford, Washington was part of the Manhattan Project. Hanford was the site that the U.S. military picked to help produce plutonium. The "Fat Man" bomb was developed there. That area was picked for a lot of reasons. There weren't a lot of people there. As you can see, the Columbia River is right next to it. You had some low-cost power production, and so it was a good site. And, hence, people got moved off the land, the government took over, and the government has been controlling hundreds of acres in Washington State even today.

The result of the Cold War and winning World War II is that millions of gallons of nuclear waste now reside in Hanford, Washington. And I'm not exaggerating. In fact, 53 million gallons of nuclear waste is onsite. And what's interesting about Hanford, of course, when you started storing this nuclear waste, our technology, our information, our knowledge was not as great as it is now. The way we stored this material then would not be an acceptable process today. It is an environmental disaster and a hazard that has to be cleaned up.

You have approximately 174 storage tanks. These storage tanks are from 750,000 gallons to a million gallons, all with nuclear waste in these tanks. These tanks are buried, as it says here, 10 feet underground and 250 feet above the water table, a mile from the Columbia River. Some of these tanks are leaking. It's just not a good thing for us to have. And so the government has been trying to deal with this one site of nuclear waste in this country.

Why do I bring this before you, Mr. Speaker, and why is this important? Because in 1982, part of the process of dealing with Hanford was to pass a law.

□ 1330

The law was called the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and in that law it says, We've got a solution. We're going to collect all the high-level nuclear waste, and we have a storage facility that we're going to place it in. And that place is Yucca Mountain. Now, many of you may have heard about Yucca Mountain before. I've visited it twice. Yucca Mountain is in a desert, and it's a mountain. So I do the side-by-side comparisons here.

Right now at Hanford we have 53 million gallons of nuclear waste on site. Yucca Mountain, which is a site we designed, we picked. We studied for decades. We spent \$12.5 billion. We currently have no nuclear waste there.

The nuclear waste at Hanford is stored 10 feet underground. The nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain would be stored a thousand feet underground. The nuclear waste at Hanford is 250 feet above the groundwater. The nuclear waste at Yucca will be stored a thousand feet above the water table. The nuclear waste at Hanford is a mile



from the Columbia River. The closest river to Yucca Mountain is the Colorado River, which is 100 miles away.

I'll come back to this floor throughout the year and highlight different locations around the country where there's waste and start pleading with my colleagues to help us stop two people—the President of the United States and Majority Leader HARRY REID. Majority Leader REID has blocked our ability to continue to move forward and take nuclear waste from around this country and place it underneath a mountain in a desert.

This location is exhibit number 1. There is no more compelling location in this country that cries out for this waste to be moved than Hanford. In fact, in the clean-up process, the scientific design of the casks that will be used to clear out these 53 million gallons of waste and put into storage containers, they are designed specifically for Yucca Mountain. Again, we have spent \$12.5 billion to prepare this site to receive nuclear waste.

The House went on record this year on a vote in the appropriation bill for energy and water and said, yes, Yucca Mountain is still where we believe high-level nuclear waste ought to go. And that vote was 297 Members voting to increase funding to complete the safety review of the DOA application so that Yucca Mountain could move forward.

One Senator is blocking this, one Senator from the State of Nevada. But it's time for the other Senators from these other States who are affected, regardless of their party, to say, "I don't want this high-level nuclear waste in my State. We have a Federal law to move it to underneath a mountain in a desert." And it's time for them to stand up and be counted. That's why this is my first trip to the well identifying one location in this country, I think the most compelling argument for Yucca Mountain, and it's not even tied to that nuclear power generating for-profit industry. It is tied to our World War II legacy and the environment and the health of not only the land here in Washington State but also the great Columbia River.

So who are we asking to stand up and be counted and help us move this? Well, we just happen to have four U.S. Senators, two from the State of Washington, two from the State of Oregon: Senator CANTWELL; Senator MURRAY; Senator WYDEN; and Senator MERKLEY.

Now, if you look at this site, the Columbia River, those of you who know your geography know that the Columbia River, when it gets closer to the west side of the State, separates the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, to the north. North of the Columbia is Washington State, south is Oregon.

These Senators need to step up to the plate, and these Senators need to do their job. They need to speak to the majority leader. We understand the majority leader who wants to protect

the State of Nevada. So I'm not trying to lift mountains that I can't personally lift. But what I can do is start making the clarion call to Senators around this country who have high-level nuclear waste in their States when we have already spent \$12.5 billion for a single repository, and as I've said numerous times, underneath a mountain in a desert.

The numbers here in Washington—on the House side, we have an overwhelming majority. In the other body, their majority is not as big as it once was. And because of that, these centers are even empowered more to be able to go to their leader and plead for their State and make the compelling argument.

Again, if you can't make it for Hanford, you can't make it for anywhere.

I'm from southern Illinois. I don't have a nuclear facility in my congressional district, although I am from the State of Illinois, and Illinois is a huge nuclear power State. We have six locations, 11 reactors. So we have high-level nuclear waste stored 40 miles from downtown Chicago.

Now, does that make sense? Does that make sense in a day when we've already spent \$12 billion to prepare, locate, research a single repository that can be kept safe, secure, and stored? It doesn't make sense.

So that's why in the coming weeks you'll see other posters like this. I'll definitely keep this one. But we'll compare Yucca Mountain to downtown Chicago. We'll compare Yucca Mountain to Boston, Massachusetts. We'll compare Yucca Mountain to Savannah, Georgia.

If you live in a State and may not have a nuclear power plant, you may very well have the legacy of World War II Manhattan-type projects and nuclear waste that has to be stored elsewhere than in the place where it is today.

As the chairman of the Environment and the Economy Subcommittee, my congressional responsibility is that of nuclear waste. It is a challenge for this country. It is a challenge that we already have a plan to deal with. In fact, ratepayers of States that have nuclear power have been paying an additional charge on their utility bills to prepare Yucca Mountain to receive this waste.

To have one man and a President who's complicit in his design to stop this is not in the best interest of this country, and I will continue to come down to the well to fight this fight so that we take full advantage of the great resources we have and follow up on the planning and the funding that we've done for decades to have a single repository.

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

□ 1340

#### THE PRESIDENT'S JOBS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 45 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we're going into recess for a week. We passed a bill to keep the government running. Some of us were concerned that we were compromising with ourselves, but supposedly it was a bill that, though we compromised with ourselves, that the Senate could pass. Now we find out they've tabled the bill, and now they're talking shutdown.

It's extremely disconcerting when it seems that one group believes that the best way to win politically is to have a shutdown and blame Republicans. It's also disconcerting to have a President come into this body here, speak to the House and Senate, stand here at the historic podium and lecture this body on the President's jobs bill that didn't exist while he was lecturing us.

It was entirely consistent, though, with exactly 2 years before that when the President's polling data showed that people didn't think that the President's ideas for health care were good, and since he is such an incredibly gifted reader of speeches, apparently he felt if he came back to the House floor and were able to use the teleprompters and read to the body that he would be able to convince everyone to go along with the government takeover of health care completely. And that day, he kept representing things about "his bill," "this bill," "my bill," "my plan," "this plan," and there was no plan. There was no bill at that time either.

So it was not terribly surprising that the President would come in here again 2 years later when polls are not looking good and tell us that we had to pass a bill that didn't exist and that he had a plan but the plan didn't really exist.

Eventually, we got a copy of his bill, even though for 6 days nobody filed an American Jobs Act. So I went to the trouble of filing one. I felt if the President wanted to fuss at us for not passing the American Jobs Act, there ought to be one. So mine was two pages. His is 155.

But it's amazing, and especially with all the stuff going on with Solyndra in California and the scandal that that has become, that this administration twisted and pushed and potentially distorted things in order to get half a billion dollars to a company which wasn't doing well, and then turn around and turn the agreement upside down.

Secured creditors, those that provide the money, are supposed to be paid first in the event that there's not enough to go around for everyone. And yet somebody in this administration—maybe a number of somebodies it appears right now—changed the deal so that the secured creditors, the American taxpayer, the government, would not get paid back first.

My days as a district judge in Texas and chief justice would seem to indicate that that kind of thing is fraud

upon the American people. The investigation is going on, so we'll find out more about that as it does.

It's interesting that in the President's so-called jobs bill that really will destroy more jobs than it creates, he's got these constant references to priority to the use of green practices, and it's got lots of provisions, apparently, that will ensure that any other Solyndras out there, any other companies that are trying to get government money for a business that can't make it on its own but they're close enough to the administration, they feel like they could get loans, they could get grants for things that cannot be commercially feasible, that this is the way to go. And we see that throughout the bill.

Apparently, half a billion dollars squandered for crony capitalism was not enough. There's more provisions for that in the President's so-called jobs bill. Of course, we've got the payback to unions and language in here for prevailing rates and that kind of thing. Some folks that I talk to would be glad to have a job at whatever rate they could get. There are those folks.

Yet, when the administration pushes a jobs bill that's going to make the prevailing wage the price to be paid for wages so high that a business cannot afford to hire those extra people, have we really done the American people any favors? We can't even create entry-level jobs because of what this administration keeps pushing and trying to heap upon the American people.

And there is a little bit of money for infrastructures. I say "a little bit." Compared to the overall price tag of \$450 billion, you would think that we could do a little better than what the President is proposing if he wants a \$450 billion infrastructure bill. But the truth is it isn't an infrastructure bill.

We heard this same language about the so-called stimulus back in January of 2009, that we needed bridges. He talked about bridges back then, the bridge in Minnesota, this bridge, that bridge, they all need to be fixed, and we can do it, but we need this stimulus bill to do all this infrastructure repair. Well, it was kind of the bait-and-switch thing.

I certainly didn't support that stimulus bill. I believe Republicans were unanimous on that. It was not a stimulus bill. You could see that. There was such a small percentage going to stimulus that we would consider true stimulus. Infrastructure, we do have failing infrastructure, roads, bridges, things that need to be repaired, sewage plants and different things, but that bill had just a tiny trickle coming out. And again, this is percentagewise, it really was not an infrastructure stimulus. The people were told one thing and yet got another.

Now, one of the ways the Federal Government gets its control of people, State governments and local governments, is by throwing money out there and saying, Here, we're going to help

you. And once that money is received, they start getting all these strings that go with it. Now, if you're going to keep getting Federal money, then you're going to have to start doing this, that, and the other.

In fact, there is one provision in the President's so-called jobs bill that ought to send shivers through people in the State governments all over the country, because there's a provision that says if the States receive any money at all from the Federal Government, basically for any program, then they waive their sovereign immunity, opening up themselves for lawsuits in yet another area where States have never been able to be sued before.

So I'm not sure what jobs that creates. I know it helps the plaintiffs' lawyers, and perhaps that's the whole goal of the President, to help plaintiffs' lawyers. But what a disaster.

Nonetheless, we know that Fannie and Freddie, which may end up costing the country trillions of dollars, brought us to the brink of absolute financial disaster. And so what does the President propose? Well, houses, maybe they get a loan, \$50,000, \$100,000 or so, different amounts. Well, what costs more than housing? That would be infrastructure. When we talk about houses, we're talking about tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, maybe. With infrastructure, we're talking about hundreds of millions, billions.

So what does the President propose for that? The American Infrastructure Financing Authority. And the good news is that that will be—and I'm reading from page 40 of the President's so-called jobs bill. It says the American Infrastructure Financing Authority is established as a wholly-owned government corporation.

□ 1350

Happy days. Wholly owned government corporation. But if somebody's concerned that people that would be running the President's American Infrastructure Financing Authority that would start trying to do the financing for these massive infrastructure projects, if you're concerned they might not have good business sense, if you're concerned they might not understand how an economy really is stimulated, how real jobs in the real private sector are created, you don't have to worry because the next page, page 41, says the board of directors—and this is just so exciting to read—is consisting of seven voting members appointed by the President.

Now there's excitement. The President has shown that when he picks people—well, okay, it's true that they come from universities and places where they have letters after their names. But do they really know how to create jobs? Well, so far we've got a big old "no." They don't know what they're doing. They have PhDs after their names, and they just don't know what they're doing in trying to get the

economy going, stimulating the economy. It's scaring investors these days. But the President will appoint the seven board members of the American Infrastructure Financing Authority.

When you look through the President's bill, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a good indication of the aspirations and goals of this administration if the people of America will give them 4 more years. Because if you look, the Federal Government will be in charge of infrastructure. Well, we've seen how that worked with student loans. Students, their parents, trying to go to college, get college paid for. We know that college costs have gone through the roof. I wanted my three children to have the chance that I did to go to a major university. I didn't want them to be burdened with debt simply because I gave up lucrative work and decided to try to help my State and country.

So we took out student loans. You can take them from banks, from private lending institutions; and there were provisions for student loans. But under Speaker PELOSI and this President, HARRY REID in the Senate's leadership, the Federal Government took over the student loan business. Well, I thank God that I got loans for my kids to go through college before we took over, as a Federal Government, the student loan business. Because I would hate for not just me, but anyone, especially from the opposite party of the President, those in power, to have to go begging to the Obama administration: Please, would you loan me money so my child can get a college education?

We put the Federal Government in charge of who can get loans? Who can get a college education? That's not what was intended for this country, to have the Federal Government make decisions on who can get educated and who doesn't.

I know it scares people sometimes to have these examples brought up; but in 1973, that summer I was an exchange student to the Soviet Union—I had had a couple of years of Russian language, and I was an exchange student there. And one of the things that surprised me was, in the Soviet Union, the federal government there decides who gets to go to college. They tell you who gets to go to college.

Now, never mind that here in America sometimes the most successful business people, some of the most successful scientists may have made some grades that weren't very good in college, but maybe came back in grad school and then really showed promise and did well, but it didn't matter. Maybe they didn't do all that great in high school, got to college and made good grades here in America.

But in Russia, it didn't matter. It didn't matter what your inner drive was, that you had a yearning to help in health care, make some discovery in medicine. It didn't matter that you had

a vision for how to create some new engineering work. It didn't matter because the government told every student whether you would be allowed to go to college or whether you would not, whether you would go work in the factory or whether you would go and teach. The government told people what they got to do with their lives and who got to have a college education.

Now, I became friends with numerous Russian college students. I was impressed and I liked them very much. But I could not imagine such a system back then. And I was so grateful and thankful that I was from the United States. I made good grades in high school and college, good enough to go to law school, but I just was so grateful that I lived in a country that really was the land of the free and the home of the brave.

It's fantastic. Because when I had a yearning in my heart to do something and fix something here, I didn't have to beg the government: Will you please allow me to follow my life's goal, my life's pursuit?

This used to be the only country in the world where any parent could tell their child you can be whatever you want to be. Now, we're kind of proud of Jamie Foxx in east Texas. He grew up in Terrell. And I ran into him in Los Angeles last year and told him I was from Tyler, Texas.

He said Tyler, Texas. He said, you know, my childhood memory about Tyler, our family came over to the Tyler State Park—it's a beautiful park on a lake, one of the most visited State parks in the State of Texas—and he said, you know, Tyler had the highest diving board I had ever seen. I had never seen one that high. And people told me, Jamie, if you can climb up there and go off that diving board, you can do anything you want with your life, anything. He said he was scared, but he climbed up there, that high diving board, and went off the board because he wanted to be whatever he wanted to be. And now he is so successful as a singer, actor, all these kinds of things.

You could be what you really wanted to be in this country, but it's scary to see that changing. And when I see moves in this country that I had nightmares seeing them happen in the Soviet Union, it's a little scary here. The Federal Government's going to get to tell people whether they can have a student loan or not? That's not a good idea. And yet the Federal Government, under Speaker PELOSI's leadership and the President's leadership, President Obama, and HARRY REID, we put the private lenders out of business because the Federal Government—I guess they sold some people on the idea it would be politics free. Yeah, right—they would do a better job of picking out who should get a student loan to go to college. I couldn't believe those things came back.

And seeing the socialized medicine in the Soviet Union back in those days,

visiting med schools, clinics and things—I had a little need for health care back then—I was so thankful that in America we had so much better health care. And we didn't have to depend on the government to tell us what we could have treatment for or what we couldn't, what we had to get on a list to maybe get treatment for or what we couldn't. This was America, where doctors could strive to be the greatest they could be and to help humanity, and then make money at the same time.

I had one Soviet friend, college friend that summer, who some lady ran off to tell on him. And I said, why would she do that?

□ 1400

He said, well, in America you can get ahead by working hard and making money, and money can give you power in America. Here, in the Soviet Union, he said, the only way to elevate yourself is by stepping on others.

You saw it repeatedly. They couldn't wait to run and tell government authorities on each other. Basically, you could tell who was spying on an American. It wasn't hard to see. You could tell who was spying on the other students. It wasn't hard to see.

And I was grateful to be from the home of the brave, land of the free, land of the free and home of the brave. And I see things changing, and it breaks my heart.

Now, another thing I observed in the Soviet Union back in 1973, we went to a daycare facility, and it was made very clear that children didn't really belong to parents in the Soviet Union. They were the property of the government.

The parents would be allowed to keep their children so long as they trained them up in the way the government said. But if the government ever had one of these stool pigeons that ran in and reported that parents maybe were teaching children that they should strive to be the greatest they could be and do what they wanted to do, for example, that was totally opposite of the government's teaching, and it would be a basis for you're teaching them evil things.

I had a student friend, Russian friend who was removed from the camp where I was because somebody told on him, that he was being too friendly to me. He never said anything negative about his country, but we had frank discussions about a free market system compared to a socialist system. And they were very honest, candid discussions. And yet, he did nothing wrong, but he was removed, and he was told if he had contact with me again, he would be kicked out of college and go to work in Siberia or some other place that would be very unpleasant.

I saw when a government controls people's lives. And I was shocked at daycare. And I was so grateful to live in a country where children belong to their parents, and the parents cared

about seeing that they were raised up in the way they should go. And they may disagree with the government and that's okay in America. But they could disagree with the government, and they were still not at risk of having their children removed.

And now, more and more, with political correctness setting in in this country, people are told, you raise the children the way we say is proper; otherwise, we'll take them away. And it keeps coming back as hints from what I saw 38 years ago. It's hard to believe this stuff is happening.

When I look at the American Infrastructure Financing Authority, I see things down the road that this creates. And you can't help but believe that it will end up as the student loan business was. We create a Federal entity run by the President's cronies that will make decisions on who gets lending for infrastructure.

You could envision a day, just like with student loans, maybe the private lenders still keep lending and that goes for a while. But as we saw with flood insurance, the Federal Government got into the flood insurance market and said, you know what? These private lenders are not selling it as cheaply as we think they should, so we'll get involved to give them a choice.

Well, what the private insurance companies found was they are not allowed to run at a loss for a long period of time. They go out of business, go bankrupt. Yet, the Federal Government has no problem with running in the red, so the Federal flood program has run in the red for years. It doesn't appear there's any hope that it will ever get to the black.

And, naturally, the Federal Government drives all the private insurance companies out of the business because the Federal Government can do it cheaper and run in the red. I can envision that happening with the American Infrastructure Financing Authority.

Mr. Speaker, you think about a day when a local government, a State government, has no lender that can lend on infrastructure because the Federal Government started small and got bigger, and now nobody lends but the Federal Government. And once again, we create a situation. It's the potential, and if you don't look at the potential consequences of what we do in this body and the unintended consequences that can occur, we do damage to America.

If the President had his way, and I feel sure that if he has four more years, there's a good chance he will, we'll have an American Infrastructure Financing Authority, and eventually local governments, State governments, entities will have to come begging to the President or to the new czar of whatever it is and say, please, please, could we please have a loan to fix our roads or to build new infrastructure that our people are crying out for? Please? We promise we'll be good. We'll do what you tell us. God forbid we

should get to a system that way. But we're on the way. We see it happening more and more.

We dangle money out to States and local government through grants. You want to keep getting the grants? Do what we tell you. The Founders never intended that. Never intended that. Bad enough that we set up a system where we order unfunded mandates of State governments. Before the 17th amendment things weren't perfect. They did need fixing, so I'm not advocating complete repeal.

But there has got to be a way to restore power back to the States that it lost when State legislatures could no longer select the U.S. Senators. And I'm aware, there were some abuses there, but we have got to get a veto power, some leverage back to the States again so the Federal Government doesn't keep doing the kind of thing that this President throws out in his bill.

And, of course, more and more of the airwaves are being moved toward broadband. So at page 75, something that tells you a lot about where this President wants to go for the future, he has the establishment of the Public Safety Broadband Corporation. But not to worry, page 76 points out this establishes a private, nonprofit corporation to be known as the "Public Safety Broadband Corporation." It says, and I'm quoting, "which is neither an agency nor establishment of the U.S. Government or the District of Columbia."

But they will control broadband. So anyone that might have broadband coming in, maybe get television, computer, Internet, radio through broadband, well, guess who comes into your home or place of business through your broadband? It's control of the new Public Safety Broadband Corporation.

In 1984 there was that eye that looked out into every room from something hanging on the wall. It was Big Brother watching everything. How comforting to know this President wants Big Brother watching us through our computer, watching us through the means of broadband.

But if you're worried, well, it says, this will not be, and I'm quoting, "neither an agency nor establishment of the United States Government or the District of Columbia." That's great news.

So who will be controlling this new Public Safety Broadband Corporation? We see that in the next section a little further down in page 76.

"The following individuals, or their respective designees, shall serve as Federal members." These are the people that will control the Public Safety Broadband Corporation that this administration wants to impose and inflict upon America, controlling all broadband.

□ 1410

You have the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General of the

United States, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

That's comforting, very comforting.

There will be non-Federal members so they don't have just a total monopoly on control. In fact, there will be—the next section says—non-Federal members on the board. Well, who might they be? The Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, shall appoint 11 individuals to serve as non-Federal members of the board.

Isn't that comforting. You've got Cabinet members appointed by the President—but don't worry. The President won't control all of it, although his appointees appoint the rest of them, and they're going to control the broadband.

I think this is what America can expect when you have the President push forward a bill that, until I filed my American Jobs Act, there was no American Jobs Act down here in the House; and that's where it had to be filed because the Constitution requires all revenue-raising bills to begin here in the House. They have to originate here.

So great news. I mean, boy, if the President has his way, more and more Federal control. Infrastructure. If you need infrastructure, well, isn't that rosy. You can go begging to the Federal Government someday.

But it's at page 133, as I'm moving through this bill, that you find section 376: Federal and State Immunity. But it doesn't address Federal immunity at all. It doesn't even touch Federal immunity. It, in fact, says, "A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment of the Constitution from a suit brought in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction for a violation of this act."

We don't have the constitutional power to waive sovereign immunity for the State. This is an incredible overreach by the President taking away the sovereign immunity of a State not to be sued. He proposes a bill, and says, Not only am I proposing this bill, but I'm going to stick in a provision—it's here on page 133—that says, States, you can be sued if you don't follow my law—my bill—to the T.

How could the Federal Government waive States' sovereign immunity? I can tell you. Under constitutional law, the Federal Government cannot waive States' sovereign immunity. Only a State can waive its sovereign immunity. The Federal Government cannot have anyone waive its sovereign immunity. Sovereign immunity is only waived for the Federal Government if the Federal Government decides to waive it.

So how can the President stick in a bill that allows States to be sued willy-nilly under this bill? It's in the next provision.

"A State's receipt or use of Federal financial assistance for any program or activity of a State shall constitute a

waiver of sovereign immunity under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution, or otherwise, to a suit brought by an employee or applicant for employment."

He recognizes constitutional law. The Federal Government cannot waive sovereign immunity for a State, but the President says, You know what? If you receive one dime from the Federal Government for any program, then that is an affirmative waiver of your right not to be sued under some bill that we make up here in my czar capital in Washington.

We also heard about going after the millionaires and billionaires. Now, as people have been told over and over, the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—that scores bills cannot score a speech unless, of course, the Director gets called to the White House and gets intimidated, and then perhaps they will. But in the meantime, generally, you cannot score a speech. There has got to be a bill. So it doesn't matter what a President says in a speech in this body or if he spends millions and millions and millions of dollars running around the country telling people to pass a bill that for so long did not exist here in the House. What matters is what's in a bill.

So the President says he's going after millionaires and billionaires, but if you look at page 134 and page 135, you'll find out what the President really thinks constitutes a millionaire or a billionaire. At the bottom of page 134, it's subtitled, "A 28 percent limitation on certain deductions and exclusions."

So who loses deductions? Who is going to get punished for making too much money? How many millions do you have to have before this President wants you punished and taxed extra? What does this President consider to be a millionaire or a billionaire who's not paying their fair share and who should pay more?

It's in black and white now. The President's bill says that it applies to the taxpayer whose adjusted gross income is above \$125,000 if you're married, filing separately.

So, under the President's definition of who's a millionaire and billionaire who's not paying their fair share and who needs to pay a lot more, it's defined here in black and white as a married person filing separately who makes more than \$125,000. That's in the President's bill. If you're married filing jointly, then you get to be exempted unless you make over \$250,000 jointly as a couple. Well, with \$250,000 as a couple and \$125,000 as an individual, it's still \$125,000.

So how about if you're single and you're not married? Well, good news there. You can have either a \$200,000 exemption or a \$225,000 exemption if you're single and head of the household. So it's potentially worth \$100,000 to get divorced. The government is saying we'll give you an extra \$75,000 to \$100,000 exemption if you'll just get divorced and live together.

Now, I'm not sure who came up with this. Obviously, the President's waving the bill around now, now that there's one printed, but he's advocating that you're better off financially—we'll reward you financially—if you'll just get divorced and live together. I'm not sure if that's his effort to placate people who want gay marriage to say, Look. You're financially better off not getting married, see? You've got an extra \$75,000, \$100,000 exemption if you'll just stay unmarried.

So why would you want to get married?

I don't know what his thinking was. I can't imagine why he would want to punish married people who are working hard and making this kind of money. But sure enough, that's in the President's bill.

Happy days.

He's had talks before about eliminating the alternative minimum tax, which was never meant to apply to the tens of thousands of people that it does. Well, guess what? On page 135, subsection (b) talks about additional amounts. Subsection (c) talks about the additional AMT amount. So we're going to add to the AMT. I know he said we were going to get rid of it, but actually, in his bill, where you really see what he's thinking, he adds to it.

Now, the biggest help for independent oil producers is called the "deductibility of intangible drilling costs." These are the expenses of an independent oil company in producing a well; it's the costs of doing business. Any other manufacturer that produces a product is allowed to deduct the costs of doing business, but this President wants to demonize those things and call them what they're not. He calls them a subsidy. They're not a subsidy. A "subsidy" under any dictionary's definition is, in essence, a gift or a grant of money. There's no gift or grant of money to the people taking these deductions. They get to deduct the cost of producing oil and gas.

□ 1420

And when you find out that over 94 percent of the oil and gas wells drilled on the land in the continental United States are drilled by independent producers, not Exxon, not Shell, not the President's dear friends at British Petroleum who were so ready to endorse the cap-and-trade bill, negotiating when to come out in favor of cap-and-trade the very day the Deepwater Horizon platform blew, losing lives, devastating the gulf.

But then at the same time giving the President a chance to punish States like Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi who had so many thousands of jobs lost when he declared a moratorium that it has cost this country dearly by rigs having to leave American waters and go to other countries. And does that hurt the big oil companies? No. It means there is less oil and gas being produced, which means they will charge more and make more profit.

So taking out the most important deduction for independent oil companies will devastate them, and it doesn't even apply to the major companies he says he's going after. So, once again, he says he's going after major oil, taking away their subsidies. Well, they're not subsidies. They're deductions for business expense.

And on the other, what he really does in black and white in the bill—nobody has to take my word for it—he repeals the deduction that only applies to oil companies that produce less than a thousand barrels of oil a day. It doesn't even apply to the majors. The majors don't get that. They're able to do such vast production that they can survive without it. The independent producers can't.

And a lot of people don't know like we do in East Texas where, during World War II, it was the largest oil field ever discovered in the world, but those, mainly wells still being drilled there, a lot of it for natural gas now, being drilled by independent producers, produce less than a thousand barrels a day. You can't go to a bank and get a loan to drill an oil or gas well. You can't. The odds are not good enough that it's going to be commercially productive.

So what most independents do, they'll say take 18, 25 percent, something like that of their own well that they're going to drill and then they will sell working interests in that well and get investors to put up their money, because if an independent oil producer supplies all the money for their own wells, they hit three or four dry holes, it's what puts some of them out of business. So they're smart enough, they spread out the risk, because it certainly is risk, and so they don't lose everything when it's a dry hole.

What section 435 does is devastate the ability to raise capital through investors investing because it repeals the oil and gas working interest exception to passive activity rules. So the working interests don't get the deductions passed through to them that they are normally allowed to do for the expenses they invest.

Any independent oil producer can tell folks—and I've heard it over and over—you take away people's ability to invest, to deduct for what they're paying in, they're not going to pay into that. The odds aren't too good, that oftentimes the money they get back—if it is a commercial well—just barely pays the amount of expenses. If you don't pass through the deductibility of what they paid in, then it's a huge loss to them. So you're not going to have people investing like they do now. And it is tough to raise capital. They'll tell you.

The President devastates an independent oil company's ability or gas company's ability to raise capital. This bill will devastate America. It's a great example of the President and Senate leadership saying we're going to do this

and they do something entirely opposite. Those who have ears need to hear.

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

#### A BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on September 16, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2887. To provide an extension of surface and air transportation programs, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 26, 2011, at noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3217. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Veterinary Accreditation Program; Currently Accredited Veterinarians Performing Accredited Duties and Electing To Participate [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0093] (RIN: 0579-AC04) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3218. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Peppers From Panama [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0002] (RIN: 0579-AD16) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3219. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — European Larch Canker; Expansion of Regulated Areas [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0029] received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3220. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Quarantined Areas and Regulated Articles [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0128] received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3221. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Horses From Contagious Equine Metritis-Affected Countries [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0112] (RIN: 0579-AD31) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3222. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Display of DoD Inspector General Fraud Hotline Posters (DFARS Case 2010-D026) (RIN: 0750-AG98)

received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3223. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Defense Cargo riding Gang Member (DFARS Case 2007-D002) (RIN: 0750-AG25) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3224. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B-1209] received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3225. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Privacy Act Implementation (RIN: 2590-AA46) received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3226. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Mortgage Acts and Practices — Advertising received August 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3227. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Suspension of the Duty to File Reports for Classes of Asset-Backed Securities Under Section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [Release No.: 34-65148; File No. S7-02-11] (RIN: 3235-AK89) received August 22, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3228. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Substantial Product Hazard List: Hand-Supported Hair Dryers received August 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3229. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Immunology and Microbiology Devices; Reclassification of the Herpes Simplex Virus Serological Assay Device [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0429] received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3230. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security or Foreign Policy Interests of the United States to the Entity List; and Implementation of Additional Changes from the Annual Review of the Entity List [Docket No.: 110502272-1391-01] (RIN: 0694-AF22) received August 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3231. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Northeastern Arizona and Southern Colorado Appropriated Fund Federal Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AM33) received August 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3232. A letter from the Senior Procurement Analyst, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acquisition Regulation Miscellaneous Changes (RIN: 1093-AA13) received August 29, 2011,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3233. A letter from the Senior Procurement Analyst, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acquisition Regulation Rewrite (RIN: 1093-AA11) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3234. A letter from the Senior Management Analyst, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 44 Marine and Anadromous Taxa: Adding 10 Taxa, Delisting 1 Taxon, Reclassifying 1 Taxon, and Updating 32 Taxa on the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2008-0125; 92100-1111-0000-B3] (RIN: 1018-AW09) received August 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3235. A letter from the Division of Policy and Programs, WSFR, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Assistance: Wildlife Restoration, Sport Fish Restoration, Hunter Education and Safety [Docket No.: FWS-R9-WSR-2009-0088] (RIN: 1018-AW65) received August 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3236. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Yakutat, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0244; Airspace Docket No. 11-AAL-05] received August 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3237. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Columbus Lawson AAF, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0012; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-44] received August 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3238. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Superior Air Parts and Lycoming Engines (Formerly Textron Lycoming) Fuel-Injected Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0547; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-16757; AD 2011-15-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3239. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Model FALCON 7X Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0631; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-16759; AD 2011-16-01] received August 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3240. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company (Cessna) Models 337, 337A (USAF 02B), 337B, 337C, 337D, 337E, T337E, 337F, T337F, 337G, T337G, M337B, F 337E, FT337E, F 337F, FT337F, F 337G, and FT337GP Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0450; Directorate Identifier 2011-CF-010-AD; Amendment 39-16758; AD 2011-15-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3241. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business HUBZone Program; Gov-

ernment Contracting Programs (RIN: 3245-AG45) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

3242. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Revisions to Conform to the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (RIN: 290-AN85/WP2010-044) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3243. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expansion of State Home Care for Parents of a Child Who Died While Serving in the Armed Forces (RIN: 2900-AN96/WP2010-071) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3244. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules Governing Hearings Before the Agency of Original Jurisdiction and Board of Veterans' Appeals; Clarification (RIN: 2900-AO06) received August 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3245. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Timely Mailing Treated as Timely Filing [TD 9543] (RIN: 1545-BA99) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3246. A letter from the Chief, Publication and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Interest and Penalty Suspension Provisions Under Section 6404(g) of the Internal Revenue Code [TD 9545] (RIN: 1545-BG75) received August 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 241. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the Los Padres National Forest in California, with an amendment (Rept. 112-216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 461. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 473. A bill to provide for the conveyance of approximately 140 acres of land in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma to the Indian Nations Council, Inc., of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 795. A bill to expand small-scale hydropower (Rept. 112-219, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.



Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1258. A bill to provide for the conveyance of parcels of land to Mantua, Box Elder County, Utah (Rept. 112-220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1421. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to clarify the role of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma with regard to the maintenance of the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam in Oklahoma (Rept. 112-221, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1560. A bill to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribe to determine blood quantum requirement for membership in that tribe (Rept. 112-222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2583. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3038. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to approve applications submitted by airport operators for participation in the security screening opt-out program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 3039. A bill to promote job creation in the United States by directing the Secretary of State to address inefficiencies in the visa processing system that discourage overseas business and leisure travel to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3040. A bill to help fulfill the Federal mandate to provide higher educational opportunities for Native American Indians; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3041. A bill to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, to limit the duration of Federal consent decrees to which State and local governments are a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MARINO, Mr.

KELLY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 3042. A bill to provide for low interest loans for small businesses in major disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 3043. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reduce the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2013 and 2014 to the fiscal year 2012 level; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. CANSECO (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BACHUS, and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 3044. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to repeal the Office of Financial Research; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CANSECO (for himself and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 3045. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Commodity Exchange Act, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to ensure that pension plans can use swaps to hedge risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 3046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3047. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow the United States Postal Service to provide nonpostal services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 3048. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a look back rule in the case of federally declared disasters for determining earned income for purposes of the child tax credit and the earned income credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3049. A bill to restore growth, spur job creation, build momentum toward economic recovery for border communities and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Small Business, Oversight and Government Reform, Foreign Affairs, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration

of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 3050. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that States spend a certain amount of their funds for transportation enhancement activities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 3051. A bill to abolish the death penalty under Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 3052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the exception to the treatment of consolidated groups under the personal holding company rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 3053. A bill to eliminate discrimination in the law for those who have tested positive for HIV, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 3054. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to eligible entities to prevent or alleviate community violence by providing education, mentoring, and counseling services to children, adolescents, teachers, families, and community leaders on the principles and practice of non-violence; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3055. A bill to establish a National Parents Corps Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 3056. A bill to authorize the Gandhi-King Scholarly Exchange Initiative focusing



on peace and nonviolence in global conflict resolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. NUNNELLEE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. AKIN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 3057. A bill to prevent the evasion of antidumping and countervailing duty orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3058. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to permit a class deviation to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to support domestic emergency operations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey):

H.R. 3059. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the priority review voucher incentive program relating to tropical and rare pediatric diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3060. A bill to make supplemental appropriations to provide additional funds to Americorps for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify payroll tax forgiveness; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 3061. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to extend the authorized time period for rebuilding of certain overfished fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3062. A bill to establish a program for dairy producers under which producers can offset reductions in producer income when the margin between milk prices and feed costs is less than a specified amount, to establish a dairy market stabilization program for producers participating in the margin protection program, to provide for the amendment of Federal milk marketing orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. FALCONE):

H.R. 3063. A bill to amend the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to pro-

vide for an additional allocation of funds to the insular areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 3064. A bill to provide for improvements in the Federal hiring process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SHULER (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BARROW, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HANNA, Ms. FOX, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KIND, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. LATTI, Mr. YODER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 3065. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3066. A bill to preserve the companionship services exemption for minimum wage and overtime pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHILLING:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution prohibiting the House or Senate from adjourning for a period of more than 3 days during a fiscal year unless the House involved has adopted a concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year and has approved legislation to provide funding for the operations of the government for the entire fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 415. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of October 2011 as National Principals Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H. Res. 416. A resolution condemning Communist China's discrimination, harassment, imprisonment, torture, and execution of its prisoners of conscience, and supporting the Tuidang movement whereby Chinese citizens renounce their ties to the Chinese Communist Party; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is submitted with the Constitutional authority granted in Article I, Section 8, "to provide for the Common Defense," and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the "Necessary and Proper Clause."

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 3039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 3040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 3041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1, Clause 1; Article III, Section 2, Clause 2.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to "Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution Clause 18."

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 and 2 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CANSECO:

H.R. 3044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CANSECO:

H.R. 3045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 3046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general

Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to interstate commerce).

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY:

H.R. 3050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I—Section 1—All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section. 8.

Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KUCINICH:

H.R. 3051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, as well as the 5th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 3052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, “the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States.” As described in Article 1, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.” I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has “the judicial power” that “shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States.” Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating “The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court.”

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in *Marbury v Madison* in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can de-

termine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 3056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 1

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 1

Article I Section 8 Clause 14

Article I Section 8 Clause 15

Article I Section 8 Clause 16

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by the United States Constitution under Article I, Section 8, “Congress shall have the power To . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States” and “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers.”

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 3062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general

welfare of the United States), clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce), and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 3063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, section 8, clause 3 and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 3065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 23: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 104: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 306: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 374: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 539: Mr. NADLER and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 605: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 640: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 664: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 711: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 812: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 854: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 860: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MACK, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 890: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 912: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1116: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1179: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 1195: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1219: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1236: Mr. PETRI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 1297: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 1327: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1340: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1351: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1370: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1426: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1471: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1546: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr.

- AUSTRIA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mrs. CAPITO.  
 H.R. 1623: Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 1633: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 1653: Mr. CHANDLER.  
 H.R. 1697: Mr. COSTA.  
 H.R. 1744: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 1754: Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 1755: Mr. COSTA.  
 H.R. 1756: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H.R. 1845: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 1848: Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
 H.R. 1905: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. WEBSTER.  
 H.R. 1910: Mr. DOGGETT.  
 H.R. 1916: Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 H.R. 1971: Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 2016: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.  
 H.R. 2033: Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H.R. 2040: Mr. HERGER.  
 H.R. 2059: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
 H.R. 2068: Mrs. BIGGERT.  
 H.R. 2104: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2106: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2139: Mr. HALL, Mr. COLE, Mr. LONG, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 2159: Mr. FARR, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. HOLDEN.  
 H.R. 2182: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2183: Ms. BUERKLE.  
 H.R. 2207: Mr. POLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 2223: Ms. SUTTON.  
 H.R. 2273: Mrs. ADAMS.  
 H.R. 2299: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. LANDRY.  
 H.R. 2337: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. KUCINICH.  
 H.R. 2358: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 2369: Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. WAXMAN.  
 H.R. 2397: Mr. KISSELL.  
 H.R. 2433: Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. LAMBORN.  
 H.R. 2471: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.  
 H.R. 2478: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 2479: Mr. REICHERT.  
 H.R. 2487: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 2499: Ms. SPEIER.  
 H.R. 2505: Mr. GALLEGLY.  
 H.R. 2507: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 2528: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 2559: Ms. CHU and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 2563: Mr. HANNA, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, and Mr. CARTER.  
 H.R. 2569: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. WHITFIELD.  
 H.R. 2595: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. LOEBACK.  
 H.R. 2629: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 2655: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. STARK, and Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 2674: Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 2679: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 2697: Mr. LONG.  
 H.R. 2698: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. SIMPSON.  
 H.R. 2705: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
 H.R. 2718: Mr. HANNA and Mrs. ELLMERS.  
 H.R. 2746: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BACA, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 2757: Mr. FILNER and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 2797: Ms. GRANGER.  
 H.R. 2820: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 2829: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 2833: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. LANKFORD.  
 H.R. 2888: Mrs. MYRICK.  
 H.R. 2918: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.  
 H.R. 2925: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. SCHRAEDER.  
 H.R. 2934: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 2941: Mr. LONG.  
 H.R. 2951: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 2952: Mrs. MYRICK.  
 H.R. 2960: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BOSWELL.  
 H.R. 2961: Mr. PAUL.  
 H.R. 2977: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 2985: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3023: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. CRITZ.  
 H.R. 3032: Mr. SCHOCK.  
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. TURNER of New York.  
 H.J. Res. 69: Ms. HAHN.  
 H.J. Res. 71: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.  
 H. Res. 60: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H. Res. 387: Mr. HOLT, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
 H. Res. 401: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H. Res. 407: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. GERLACH.  
 H. Res. 413: Mr. OWENS.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 639: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

---

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 2 by Mr. GOHMERT on H.R. 1297: Justin Amash, Paul A. Gosar, Martha Roby, Vicky Hartzler, Tom Graves, Michael H. Michaud, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Mick Mulvaney, Jeffrey M. Landry, Jeff Duncan.