



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 2012

No. 55

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 17, 2012.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HUNGER HITS HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday the Food Network premiered their first-ever documentary called "Hunger Hits Home." This powerful program showed the struggle that millions of Americans go through just to put food on their tables. I urge my colleagues, indeed, all Americans, to watch it by going to foodnetwork.com and searching for "Hunger Hits Home."

It's fitting that the Food Network, a cable network that focuses on cooking,

would choose to highlight the scourge of hunger with its first documentary. That's because food is at the heart of the problem.

While 435 Members of Congress and 100 Senators will never have to worry about going hungry, there are nearly 49 million people who struggle each year to put food on their table; 17 million kids each year go hungry in America, and those numbers are getting worse, not better.

The Food Network aired this documentary because of the hard work of good people at Share Our Strength. Led by my good friend, Billy Shore, Share Our Strength is a leader in the fight to end child hunger, and this effort wouldn't be where it is today without them.

We have more than enough food in America to feed everyone. We also have the delivery systems to ensure that food gets to those people who need it. The problem is politics. We have the means, the food, and the programs to ensure that not one person goes without food in this country.

What we lack, Mr. Speaker, is the political will to actually make it happen. We should remember that while there is a cost to ending hunger, the cost of doing nothing is so much more. According to a report from the Center for American Progress and Brandeis University, hunger costs America more than \$261 billion each year. That's billion with a "b."

Specifically, hunger costs "at least \$167.5 billion due to the combination of lost economic productivity per year, more expensive public education because of the rising costs of poor education outcomes, avoidable health care costs, and the cost of charity to keep families fed. This \$167.5 billion does not include the cost of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and the other key Federal nutrition programs, which run at about \$94 billion a year. We call this \$167.5 billion America's

hunger bill. In 2010 it cost every citizen \$542 due to the far-reaching consequences of hunger in our Nation. At the household level, the hunger bill came to at least \$1,410 in 2010. And because our \$167.5 billion estimate is based on a cautious methodology, the actual cost of hunger and food insecurity to our Nation is probably higher."

That's a lot of money—\$167.5 billion. It's a staggering amount. Yet, we continue to ignore those costs and allow hunger to grow in America.

We know that hunger would be even worse in this country if it weren't for programs like the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, or SNAP, the school meal programs and other Federal anti-hunger programs. These programs are literally a lifeline for millions of hungry children, parents, and seniors.

I believe that we can end hunger in America if we muster the political will to do so. Fighting hunger has traditionally been a bipartisan effort. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in this House is pushing an agenda that will actually make hunger worse in America.

Tomorrow the Agriculture Committee will mark up legislation that cuts \$33 billion from the most important anti-hunger program we have in this country. SNAP is a program that not only provides food to low-income parents, seniors, and children; it also provides a most effective form of economic stimulus, and it actually reduces poverty.

Yet, the Republican leadership continues to demagogue the program as wasteful, as fraudulent, and as something that is growing out of control. But nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, SNAP is among the most effective and efficient Federal programs. The truth is that the SNAP error rate is around 3 percent. That error rate includes people who do not receive the benefit that they're actually entitled to. I challenge anyone to

□ 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.

H1849

find me a Defense Department program with an error rate as low as 3 percent.

I look forward to the time when the Republican leadership stops using hunger as a wedge issue and lets this become a bipartisan issue once again.

I understand that we need to balance the budget, Mr. Speaker. But must it be on the backs of the poor and the most vulnerable in our country?

“Hunger Hits Home,” this wonderful film, shows us the problem facing this Nation. The challenge is presented to us. Are we going to end hunger once and for all or not?

So far the answer from the Republican leadership is a resounding “no,” and I regret very much that decision.

Mr. Speaker, hunger is a political condition. If we muster the political will, we can end it once and for all.

SECURING OUR BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to just say before I actually get started, we just saw the space shuttle fly over on the back of a 747, and I salute the end of an amazing era in space exploration, and I look forward to the next day of NASA being able to talk about space exploration and how we’re going to get out there so we won’t have to rely on Russians to get to space to continue to do what I think is a very important role of the Federal Government.

I was in Houston—I actually went through the NASA center there about 3 or 4 days ago—but I was in Houston for military duty. I am a pilot in the Air National Guard. I fly an airplane called a RC-26, which is a reconnaissance plane. I did 9 days of duty. And what we did is we were in Texas flying missions on the border of Mexico in order to help the Border Patrol secure that border, to ensure that those people that want to come in here come in here legally and, just as importantly, if not more importantly, to ensure that the drug trade is not being brought into our country, to reduce the amount of drugs being brought in from Mexico, as well as to ensure that terrorists are not making their way through the border by sneaking in through that border of Mexico.

Now, before I went, I expected to see a border that was basically secure because that’s what I’ve been hearing from the administration, that the border is basically secure. Yeah, there are examples of people coming across outside of that but, for the most part, it’s pretty good to go. Well, what I saw was something completely different.

I’m going to tell you just a quick story about somebody who’s on the border every day trying to protect this country against drugs and against terrorism coming through that border. This guy is a Border Patrol agent affectionately known as Uzi. Uzi is a former marine. He was a marine for about 5

years, started a small business when he got out of the Marine Corps, and made the decision that, you know what, he wants to go continue to serve and protect his country.

Now, I flew missions with Uzi. He was on board my aircraft as we went down and we assisted Border Patrol. And the one thing Uzi said to me is, Congressman, look, we’re out here every day in the heat and the sweltering sun trying to continue to protect this country. Make sure you give us what we need here.

And when you hear the stories about how hamstrung they are from actually enforcing the border, and how there are many tools available to them that they’re not allowed to use, it’s actually pretty sad.

Now, look. We want to be a Nation of immigration. We want to be a Nation of legal immigration. But one thing we don’t want to be is a Nation that wakes up one day and finds out that there was another terrorist attack in a major United States city and that, potentially, that weapon of mass destruction or those terrorists actually came in through an unsecure border with Mexico.

I went down there really believing that there was a fence along the line, and I saw nothing of the kind in southern Texas.

□ 1010

Let’s tell the American people the truth. The truth is, we want to be a Nation that respects immigration because most of us here actually are immigrants removed ourselves, but we want to be a Nation that has a legal process to do it. When we have an open border, we’re encouraging people to go around that legal process, and we’re opening ourselves up to attack.

Let’s stand together. Let’s say to respect the immigration and the immigrant history of this country, but let’s do it in a legal way. My eyes were opened, as I did military duty on the border, to the fact that we have a long way to go. This can be a bipartisan issue—it doesn’t need to be Republican versus Democrat—but it needs to be something that we actually finally do, and we stand together and we say we’ll be a Nation that is safe once and for all.

TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today is the deadline for filing tax returns. Even though we were given 2 extra days this year, we are running out of time for the Tax Code.

The tax system doesn’t generate enough money for what America needs and spends today. It’s getting more expensive every year to continue the huge array of tax breaks even as the code itself becomes more unfair, com-

plex, and inefficient. It costs over \$160 billion a year for Americans just to comply with the Tax Code.

The path forward should be simple. First, we should stop making the code more complex, which, sadly, the Republican plan working its way forward will do with \$50 billion of additional unfocused tax breaks. At least if we’re going to borrow another \$50 billion from the Chinese, we should use it to fund job-creating infrastructure. For instance, that \$50 billion would enable us to fund a multiyear transportation reauthorization.

We should also repeal the pernicious alternative minimum tax. It was once designed as a tax on very rich people who didn’t pay taxes. Today, no billionaire hedge fund manager pays the alternative minimum tax. Instead, it falls on upper middle-income families, especially those who pay a lot of taxes.

Every year we find some creative way to avoid the consequence of it not being indexed for inflation. Every year we find some way to have a fix, to have a patch to avoid the alternative minimum tax’s full impact. Unless somehow there is a complete breakdown in the political process, which, sadly, is not impossible, as we saw this last year with the FAA reauthorization. If that were to happen, then at least the full fury of 20 to 30 million of upper middle-income and middle-income households who would be forced to pay it—they would force it to be repealed.

We should combine the alternative minimum tax repeal with the imposition of the so-called “Buffett Rule,” where millionaires at least pay as much as the people who answer their phones and drive them to work. This will get back to the original intent of the alternative minimum tax but in a way that simplifies the Tax Code rather than further complicating it.

We should stop the dangerous practice of suspending some of the payroll tax in the name of economic stimulus. We are uncomfortably close to destabilizing the long-term funding mechanism for Social Security. Instead of the payroll tax cut, let’s target a tax credit for lower and middle-income families that will be fair, affordable, and help nurture our fragile economic recovery without threatening the long-term Social Security stability.

We should target for elimination tax breaks that are out of date, like the subsidy of oil that doesn’t reflect current production techniques or the reality of global petroleum markets. We should instead protect subsidies that are key for our future, especially expiring renewable energy tax credits. We should renew the section 1603 Treasury grant program, which reflects current market realities and would actually be less expensive than traditional tax credits.

On this tax day, we should look for some progress towards building momentum for real tax reform. The Romney-Republican House budget refuses to identify any of the massive tax increases that will be necessary to meet

their plan of even more tax cuts for the rich, and not increase the deficit.

With \$4 trillion in expiring tax provisions later this year, we should use some of that economic capacity to make the tax system more fair and simple while we reduce the debt.

The time to begin that process is now—not making the Tax Code more complex, not favoring those who need help the least, not risking long-term Social Security funding, and not borrowing for unfocused new tax relief. Instead, let's deal with investments like renewable energy and infrastructure. Let's use some of this budget capacity to reduce the overall corporate tax rate while broadening the base and closing loopholes.

Simpler, fairer, better for business. Let's eliminate the tyranny of the alternative minimum tax, protect our energy future, and support renewables. There is a path forward, and we should start on it now. What better way to honor American taxpayers on filing day than getting serious with an agenda that can actually be achieved, and should be.

IRS HARASSMENT OF TEA PARTY GROUPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, a defining aspect of the American tradition is that groups of citizens band together for a wide variety of civic purposes. They recruit volunteers, raise funds, and spend those funds to promote whatever project or cause brings them together.

For more than a century, our tax laws have recognized that such voluntary associations—nonprofits as we call them today—should not be taxed because their proceeds are devoted entirely to improve our communities through education, advocacy, and civic action. Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code recognizes them today, and civic groups as diverse as MoveOn.org, the League of Conservation Voters, the ACLU, the National Rifle Association, and various taxpayer groups have always been included in this definition.

We don't apply a political test to these civic groups. We recognize the fundamental right of Americans to organize and to pool their resources to promote whatever causes they believe in, left or right. Indeed, whatever their political persuasion, these civic groups perform an absolutely indispensable role in our democracy by raising public awareness, defining issues, educating voters, promoting reforms, holding officials accountable, and petitioning their government to redress grievances. Abolition, women's suffrage, the civil rights movement—all would have been impossible without them.

In order to be recognized as nonprofit groups, these organizations must register with the IRS—a purely ministe-

rial function that in the past has been applied evenly and without regard to their political views. At least until now. It seems that Tea Party groups are today being treated very differently than their counterparts on the political left. For the last 2 years, many have been stonewalled by the IRS when they sought to register as nonprofits. Most recently, they have been barraged with increasingly aggressive and threatening demands vastly outside the legal authority of the IRS. Indeed, the only conceivable purpose of some of these demands is to intimidate and harass.

A Tea Party group in my district is typical of the reports that we are now hearing across this country. This group submitted articles of incorporation as a nonprofit to the State of California, and they received approval within a month. But then they tried to register as a nonprofit with the IRS. Despite repeated and numerous inquiries, the IRS stonewalled this group for a year and a half, at which time it demanded thousands of pages of documentation and gave the group less than 3 weeks to produce it.

The IRS demanded the names of every participant at every meeting held over the last 2 years, transcripts of every speech given at those meetings, what positions they had taken on issues, the names of their volunteers and donors, and copies of communications they had with elected officials, and on and on. Perhaps most chilling of all, the organizer of this particular group soon found herself the object of a personal income tax audit by the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, these are groups of volunteers who pass the hat at meetings to pay for renting the hall. They give of their own time to research issues and pay out of their own pockets for printing flyers. The donations made to them aren't tax deductible, so there is no legitimate purpose in asking for the names of their donors, let alone of their volunteers, unless—and this is the fine point of it—unless the purpose is to harass and intimidate.

□ 1020

Ironically, the same tactics we now see used by the United States against tea parties were once used by the most abusive of the Southern States in the 1950s to intimidate civil rights groups like the NAACP.

No such tactics have been reported by similar civic groups on the political left, so the conclusion is inescapable—that this administration is very clearly, very pointedly, and very deliberately attempting to intimidate, harass, and threaten civic-minded groups with which they disagree, using one of the most feared and powerful agencies of the United States Government to do so.

Mr. Speaker, these facts speak for themselves. They need no embellishment or interpretation. They should alarm every American of goodwill regardless of political philosophy, for if

this precedent is allowed to stand, no one's freedom is safe. I bring these facts to the attention of the House today and ask that they be rigorously investigated and, if found accurate, that those officials responsible be exposed, disgraced, dismissed, and debarred from any further position of trust or power within our government.

STAFFORD LOAN INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in 74 days, this Congress may well hang a financial albatross around the necks of students and families across this country. That's because, on July 1, student interest rates are scheduled to go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, literally doubling the interest costs that our kids and their parents are going to have to pay on their education.

We have got to find a way, Republicans and Democrats, to work together and avoid this punishing interest rate increase on our students. This is not about Republicans or Democrats. It's not about red States or blue States. It's not about the 2012 elections. It's about the kids that we all represent. It's about the parents that we all represent.

In my case in the State of Vermont, it's about students like Michael McGurk, who is a freshman at the University of Vermont, and he literally doesn't know whether he's going to be able to go on in college if the interest rates double. It's about parents like Ben Truman and Jennifer Wallace Brodeur, who last month were sitting around the table with their son who was about to go to college and are trying to put the pieces together to be able to afford it.

What this is also about is ground zero for the middle class. This country faces a very fundamental question: Are we a country, are we a Congress that is going to remain committed to expanding and broadening the middle class, making it possible for low-income folks to climb their way into the middle class, making it possible for folks in the middle class to stay there? In order to do that, we have to invest in the future, and that means making it possible, making it affordable, for our kids to get the education they need to get that start.

Student debt in this country is at a crisis point. At \$900 billion, student debt outpaces that of credit cards, outpaces that of auto loans, and there is no end in sight. In Vermont—and again, this has nothing to do with what their political affiliation is—nearly 70 percent of our college students graduate with a debt of about \$30,000. That's real money. That's more than many of those students will make in their first years out of college. It's a tough job market, and entry level jobs don't pay a lot. Students are totally at the mercy of a system that is out of

control. The average tuitions at 4-year public universities rose by over 8 percent last year, so costs are going up even as student aid is going down.

A recent poll found that 75 percent of Americans viewed college as unaffordable. That can't be something that we allow to continue. People need to have confidence that that ticket to the middle class is there and that it's affordable. That's why we, together, have to find a way to avoid this doubling of interest rates. For over 8 million students in this country, Stafford loans are a very critical resource, helping them afford the cost of that college education we all want them to get.

With the Federal Government now borrowing money at close to 2 percent, why are we asking middle class families to pay 6.8 percent? These are not grants. These are loans. They'll be repaid. Let's find a way to help our kids and to help our parents.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues in the House, I was home for the last 2 weeks on our Easter break. It continues to amaze me why we in Congress do not listen to the American people.

I represent the Third Congressional District of North Carolina—the home of Camp Lejeune Marine Base, Cherry Point Marine Air Station, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, and over 60,000 retired veterans. Not one person has said to me that we need to stay in Afghanistan. I'm not exaggerating, Mr. Speaker. Everyone I saw and had a conversation with, when the issue of Afghanistan came up, said, Get out. Get out now.

That's why I wanted to be on the floor today, because the administration keeps saying, Well, in 2014, in 2014.

Yesterday, when driving back to D.C., I was listening to C-SPAN, and I heard an interview with Secretary Panetta and General Dempsey. I have a lot of respect for both men, but it was kind of vague when Secretary Panetta said to the reporter who asked him our plans for 2014, Well, you know, we're hoping that we can train the Afghans to stabilize their own country.

Mr. Speaker, I say this respectfully: That's an iffy proposition at best.

In a recent Washington Post-ABC News poll, only 30 percent of the American people say the war has been worth fighting. The citizens of this country are tired of sending their loved ones to die for a country we have not been able to change in a decade. I'll even go further and say this: It has never changed in the history of Afghanistan going back to Alexander the Great. So why are we still there? Again, people say, Well, we've got to stabilize the country.

We can't even stabilize America's economy.

Sometimes it gets a little bit ridiculous when I look at all the money being spent overseas, particularly in a country like Afghanistan, and we say to the people of eastern North Carolina and to the people in the 50 States, We don't have money to fix your infrastructure; but yet, Mr. Karzai, you corrupt leader, we are proud to keep sending you \$10 billion a month.

Talking about Mr. Karzai brings me to an editorial written by Eugene Robinson, a syndicated columnist, and it's titled, "Afghanistan and Indefensible Costs." I feel that Mr. Robinson, who wrote this in 2010, could be writing it right now in 2012, and it would have even more meaning. I quote from Mr. Karzai:

The time has come to reduce military operations. The time has come to reduce the presence of, you know, boots in Afghanistan . . . to reduce the intrusiveness into the daily Afghan life.

This is what President Karzai said to the Washington Post. In his column in 2010 that he could be writing today, in April 2012, this is what Mr. Robinson said in response to Karzai:

All right then. Let's save American lives and a ton of money. Let's oblige him.

Mr. Robinson, thank you.

I hope and pray that this Congress, when we debate the DOD bill in May—and we have amendments from both sides saying that we must have a more defined end to this involvement in Afghanistan—that we will pass some of these legislative amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I've got so many of these posters. I've brought with me today one of a tragic scene of a soldier, marine, airman, Navy, whatever it might be, in a coffin, going to his or her grave. That brings me to my last point: the "Body of War," which is a production by Phil Donahue and Ellen Spiro. I'm going to be talking more about this, because this young man is paralyzed from his breast down, and about what he has to go through to live. This Congress needs to meet its constitutional responsibility. Any other involvement by our country needs to be a declaration of war.

Mr. Robinson, thank you again.

And I close. God, please, God, please continue to bless our men and women in uniform, the families of our men and women in uniform, the wounded and their families. And God, please continue to bless America.

□ 1030

GOOD NEWS AND BAD NEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning with good news and bad news.

This news comes by way of my hometown newspaper, the Houston Chronicle, and I'm proud that they have printed and published the news that I'm about to share with the public. The

bad news is that Mr. Yondell Johnson was accosted and beaten on the streets of Houston, Texas, simply because of his race. This is bad news for anyone in our great country, a country that believes in liberty and justice for all.

The good news, however, is they were prosecuted and they were convicted in a Federal court pursuant to the James Byrd hate crime law, and I'm honored to tell you that that law passed here in this Congress in 2009 and was signed into law. It is properly styled as the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act. It was supported by many people and organizations expressing goodwill. The NAACP supported it, the ADL supported it, a good many Members of this Congress supported it, and many others supported this law. This law allowed the prosecution to take place in a Federal court, when these three men would have been charged in a State court, and if convicted, faced misdemeanor charges.

In this, the greatest country in the world, no one should have to fear for life or liberty simply because of who you are, simply because of your race, your ethnicity, your gender, your sexuality. It shouldn't happen in this country.

The truth is that in this case there was some testimony with reference to one of the defendants having dated a person of African ancestry. There was testimony that he did not appear to be the kind of person that would be considered a white supremacist. But here is another truth that we have to deal with. The truth is that there is confusion about the hate crime law. There's a misunderstanding. This law does not allow you to impose dastardly deeds upon persons simply because you are of the same race as the person that you are assaulting.

The truth is that if you assault and target a person because of race, it doesn't matter what your race is, and you are committing a hate crime. The truth is that you can be of the same race and commit a hate crime. The victim and the perpetrator can be of the same race and you will still have a hate crime. We need to rid ourselves of this foolish notion that this law was passed in some way to assault persons who are of an ethnicity or a race that we have traditionally, in this country, found to be engaged in some of these kinds of activities. It's not targeted at any given race; it's targeted at people who commit crimes against other people simply because of who these people are.

I remind you that an injustice against any one of us is a threat to justice for every one of us, and we all have a duty to make sure that we don't send out some silly notion that this law was designed for one race of people. This law was designed for every person who would commit a hate crime against another person.

So I'm saddened to say this morning that the bad news is Mr. Johnson had

to fight off several persons, stood his ground for 10 minutes, but indicated that he thought he was going to die as they assaulted him. That's the bad news. The good news is that the law has worked, that this law is bringing new meaning to the notion of justice for all. This law will not allow those who would commit dastardly deeds and be prosecuted in State courts for misdemeanors to go unchecked. They will now face felony charges in our Federal courts. This is the way it should be in the greatest country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, God bless all listening, and God bless the United States of America.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor again to continue to identify and educate you on the various locations where we store high-level nuclear waste around this country and the various positions that our colleagues in the other Chamber have voted either for or against, in hopes that eventually the public will become well informed and that they will take action through their elected officials to do even what the Blue Ribbon Commission suggested, which is decide and locate a long-term geological storage facility.

This is not new. We've been doing it for decades. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act was established in 1982. The amendments were passed through this Chamber and signed into law in 1987, which identified a long-term geological repository at a place called Yucca Mountain in the desert in Nevada.

What I've been attempting to do throughout this past year and a half—I chair a subcommittee that has direct responsibility for this—is identify different locations. So today we go to a place very close to here. In fact, I think it's only 43 miles from the District of Columbia, and that's a place called Calvert Cliffs. I like to compare and contrast it with where our nuclear waste should be stored, not in a decade or two from now, but at this very moment where it should be.

Calvert Cliffs is in Maryland, and at Calvert Cliffs there are 1,300 metric tons of uranium, of spent fuel, onsite versus Yucca Mountain, which is a mountain in a desert where we have no nuclear waste onsite. At Calvert Cliffs, this spent nuclear fuel is stored above the ground in pools and in casks above the ground. If it were stored at Yucca Mountain, it would be 1,000 feet underground. At Calvert Cliffs, the nuclear waste is stored 85 feet above the groundwater, and at Yucca Mountain, it would be 1,000 feet above the water table. Finally, at Yucca Mountain, the nearest body of water is the Colorado River, about 100 miles. As you can see here in this photo, Calvert Cliffs is right next to Chesapeake Bay.

Yucca Mountain is about 90 miles from Las Vegas, maybe 100 miles from Las Vegas. Calvert Cliffs is a straight line of 43 miles from Washington, D.C. The Senators from the surrounding areas, how did they vote? You would think they wouldn't want high-level nuclear waste next to Chesapeake Bay, 43 miles from the capital city. Well, Senator CARPER voted "no" in 2002. Senator COONS, a new Member, we don't know his position. That's part of coming down here. I'm pretty sure that if the majority leader of the Senate would call a vote and this issue was thoroughly debated, it would pass on the floor of the Senate because we have a lot of Senators who have yet to declare their position. Here is Senator CARDIN, a former Member of the House, who voted "yea" in 2002 for Yucca Mountain. Senator MIKULSKI, the same; different Chamber, voted "no."

How does our national tally go? Currently we have 47 U.S. Senators who have a stated position in support of Yucca Mountain. We have over 16 that have never cast a vote or declared their position on what we do with high-level nuclear waste, either spent fuel or nuclear waste, in the processing of nuclear energy or nuclear weapons.

□ 1040

We have 19 who have had a position of "no" at some time in their career. So it's very, very important to continue this debate, Mr. Speaker, to continue to come down on the floor to talk about the Federal law as it is to date.

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act was passed in 1982; the amendment was agreed to in 1987. The amendment identified Yucca Mountain as our long-term geological repository to store high-level nuclear waste. The time is well past since we should be doing this. In fact, we actually pay utilities to hold their nuclear waste since it's our responsibility to take the waste.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN AND BUFFETT RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. I'm here to talk about the Buffett bill, but I just cannot allow what Mr. SHIMKUS has just said to go unresponded to because it's such an important issue for the people of the State of Nevada.

The so-called nuclear act that he discussed that was passed in '82 and amended in '87 is known in Nevada as the "screw Nevada bill," and let me tell you what it is. It's a proposal that would ship 77,000 tons of toxic radioactive nuclear waste across 43 States to be buried in a hole in the Nevada desert, which is 90 miles from the major population center of Las Vegas, where we have groundwater issues, seismic activity, and volcanic activity. The EPA cannot come up with any radiation standards that would protect the people of the State of Nevada or anyone else in this country.

Let me tell you, originally, when they came up with this nonsensical plan, which is purely political, that it has nothing to do with science. They said that we could store the rods, the nuclear waste, in Yucca Mountain with no problem, leave it there. Then we realized that that wouldn't work because of the groundwater. So then we decided that they would put their nuclear waste in canisters. But what do you know, there are no canisters that currently exist that can safely store this stuff. Then they came up with shields that would go around the canisters that don't exist to be put into Yucca Mountain.

Then the last Republican Secretary of Energy talked about an army of robots that would walk down Yucca Mountain and be able to check on the nuclear waste while it's leaking and leaching into the groundwater. It's a ridiculous proposal, and it's time to go to Plan B because Plan A isn't going to happen. Seventy-seven percent of the people of the State of Nevada do not want nuclear waste stored at Yucca Mountain. End of that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep disappointment with yesterday's vote in the United States Senate. Once again, Senate Republicans sided with Wall Street millionaires against the interests of struggling middle class families throughout Nevada. The Buffett rule is simple, and it's common sense.

It means if you are a housekeeper, a nurse, a blackjack dealer, or a waitress, or any other middle class professional, you shouldn't pay higher tax rates than multi-millionaires who own yachts and travel in private jets. It means that if you are a Nevadan living paycheck to paycheck, you shouldn't be carrying the burden for Wall Street hedge fund managers and Big Oil company executives.

The Senators who voted against basic tax fairness yesterday need to spend a little more time prioritizing the needs of hardworking Nevadans. They're struggling. These are the people that are struggling to put food on the table, to fill up their cars with gas, and to pay their mortgage or their rent.

The fact that the wealthiest people in this country pay their taxes at a lower tax rate than their secretaries and their chauffeurs doesn't pass the smell test. It stinks, and that's why I'm proud to announce that I'm a co-sponsor of the Buffett rule in the House, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me and let's bring some fundamental tax fairness to the people of the United States of America. Seventy-two percent of the American people agree with me that the Buffett rule should be made into law.

STEM EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, just minutes ago I had an opportunity to be outside

and see the space shuttle flying around the United States Capitol on its way to Dulles, which brought back memories. Certainly those who study history realize that back in the '60s it was President Kennedy who said that the United States will take a man, deliver him to the Moon, and bring him safely back to the Earth. Consequently, the space race took off at that point in time and literally hundreds of thousands of people became more engaged in science and technology, engineering and mathematics, something that I think that we need to rekindle today.

Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the largest manufacturing districts in the United States; and when I tour small businesses throughout the 10th District of Illinois, employers continually tell me that they have got job openings available, yet they can't find people, individuals, workers, able to fill those roles, roles that need to be filled by those who have taken science and technology, engineering and mathematics courses, or the STEM fields.

In the depths of this recession that we have been going through, manufacturing associations have statistics that say 600,000 jobs across our Nation went unfilled. They went unfilled because not enough people were trained in the STEM fields. These are not low-paying jobs, Mr. Speaker. These jobs, on average, pay \$77,000 annually. We must empower our students and job-seekers to pursue STEM education so that they can fill these good high-paying jobs right here at home.

Certainly one of the pillars of my Main Street Jobs Agenda is that of STEM education. If we can prepare our students and those who are looking for work, we can help empower these people to find good-paying jobs and keep our manufacturing and innovation right here at home.

The College of Lake County, a college in my district, has teamed up with local manufacturers to help provide education, education that is necessary in the STEM fields for those who are unemployed or wanting to pursue a manufacturing career.

I am pleased to say that one of the local manufacturers actually went to the College of Lake County and said we're actually pulling students from Iowa and Ohio, is there any way you might be able to offer courses here at the College of Lake County so that we could start hiring people locally to fill these jobs. They were all too happy to oblige.

I recently held a STEM field trip where I took interested students from high schools all across the 10th District to different high-tech organizations in the region. These students learn how they can apply their education first-hand and pursue advanced careers in this field.

Just last week, I hosted the first-ever Manufacturing and Education Summit to bridge the gap between educators and manufacturers. We had folks from high schools and colleges. We had man-

ufacturers there trying to say what it was that they needed, what were they looking for in students who were going to be graduating from either high school or college. This is exactly what we need to be doing right now.

One of the success stories of bridging the gap between education and manufacturing is that of Wheeling High School principal Dr. Laz Lopez. He has worked with local businesses to find out what the actual needs are in the community and offering students options in pursuing a STEM education.

Today, Dr. Lopez has been recognized as starting one of the most successful STEM high schools in our country. Just this last Friday, I joined him and other STEM students from various high schools around the area while they competed in a STEM competition, focusing on nanotechnology and high-powered computing. These are extraordinarily bright students who are better prepared for the 21st-century workforce.

STEM education is and should be a bipartisan idea. I believe that this is an area of common ground and that we should be promoting local efforts all across our Nation to help manufacturers fill open jobs and better prepare our emerging workforce for 21st-century careers. We must not stand idly by and hope that this happens. Rather, we must be proactive and work to spur our local economy by demonstrating the success of STEM education.

Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics is one way we can help spur our economy to get our country back to work. I would encourage my colleagues to get involved in their local schools and communities, local colleges, to find out more on how they can better prepare students for a career in the 21st century through STEM education.

It was not too long ago that John Kennedy gave us a charge to bring a man to the Moon and safely back to this Earth, spurring on STEM education. We have to do it again today. We have to make sure that we have that pipeline of students to be able to make jobs right here at home.

□ 1050

ISSUES FACING THIS CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I join my colleague that just spoke on the vitality and the importance of STEM education. As a 12-year member of the Science Committee, I also had a sense of emotion as Discovery flew many times over this great democratic institution. That emotion compels me to continue to fight for a place for one of the shuttles in the hometown where it was born, the place where John F. Kennedy spoke at the Rice Hotel and inspired us to go into space, and that is Houston, Texas, NASA-Johnson. I look

forward to that continued bipartisan effort to have an appropriate representation of the four shuttles back in Houston, where they belong.

I rise today as well to speak about a number of things. I believe it's important for my colleagues to sort of look at a series of issues. I support the Buffett Rule, not because I believe in any kind of class warfare. I celebrate capitalism and applaud Mr. Buffett and others. But it is a good way to raise revenue and bring down the deficit.

We, of course, will be dealing with a bill proposed by my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle. The only thing that they will do is enhance the pocket money of people who don't need it. There is an unfairness in the Tax Code. I would join in a bipartisan way to look at it. In making the Tax Code fair, I would hope that we would be able to bring down the deficit. But the bill that we will see, as I said, will increase the pocket change of millionaires. It will be a job killer. And, of course, it will cut the Medicare guarantees of those who have worked hard for their children and grandchildren. I cannot support legislation that isn't fair and balanced. I would plead to my colleagues to find the middle ground—a fair Tax Code, bringing down the deficit.

I would encourage them to look at H.R. 3710, an energy bill. I have practiced oil and gas law for 15 years. It addresses the question of the wetlands, it uses exploration dollars to bring down the deficit, and it allows expanded exploration in the gulf region, a process that has been vetted by many energy organizations, energy companies, and they believe that is a bipartisan approach. H.R. 3710 is ready for the combined work of all of us.

I also believe it's important to speak about the value of education in several ways. And I'm here today to join in H.R. 3826, proudly so, that stands with students who now carry the bulk of the debt in America—credit debt. These are students who are simply trying to, as my colleague just said, study science, technology, engineering, and math. In about 74 days, the interest rates on Stafford loans will triple to 6.8 percent. You may have borrowed at 2 percent, and here we are talking about it going up to 6.8 percent. I, with every fiber in my body, stand against that. I'm going to stand with the students and parents who have children in school. We can win this thing. We must have a legislative action to stop that stealing of money from our children, who are simply trying to be in the best colleges, the State colleges, and to be educated.

Parents, wake up. In 74 days, the interest rate on your children's loans is going up to 6.8 percent. Call our offices, get on our Web sites, and beg us to pass H.R. 3826 by my good friend Mr. COURTNEY from Connecticut. Please, I beg of you. And I will be there with you. From Texas Southern University to the University of Houston to Houston Baptist to the Houston Community College, we're going to work on this.

Let me also move very quickly, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this is the fifth-year commemoration of the terrible killings at Texas Tech. This Congress has been charged with being fearful of dealing with gun legislation. Over the years, I have introduced the Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention bill. I have, in fact, supported bills dealing with gun checks and to close gun loopholes at gun shows. I have supported bills to stop the proliferation of assault weapons. Not bills against the Second Amendment, but bills that would have stopped Mr. Zimmerman from recklessly walking around with a 9 millimeter, and he was only supposed to be the eyes and ears of his neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, I join in a bipartisan manner, even to the extent of saying we must clean up the Secret Service—I support Mr. SULLIVAN—and even clean up the GSA, because Gilbane, which has received stimulus dollars from the GSA, has refused to be diverse. To the CEO of Gilbane, this Congressperson you need to call. You are an unfair company, and you're using Federal dollars from the GSA in an inappropriate way. No diverse workforce, and no small businesses.

STAFF SERGEANT JOSEPH D'AUGUSTINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today with heavy heart and sadness as we honor another fallen soldier and the life and legacy of Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine, a young man from Waldwick, New Jersey. Staff Sergeant D'Augustine was killed on March 27, 2012, while conducting combat operations in Afghanistan.

It was just 1 day after graduating from Waldwick High School in 2001 that this young man enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. He was assigned to the 8th Engineer Support Battalion, 2nd Marine Logistics Group, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force. He served two tours of duty in Iraq, and was just 2 weeks away from completing his second tour of duty in Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant D'Augustine worked as an explosive ordnance disposal tech. What does that mean? That means that he went ahead of the other soldiers, marines, and airmen and was the one that cleared the way for them so they could go on and do their work. And so it was with this greatest act of sacrifice possible that Staff Sergeant D'Augustine gave his life while protecting his fellow men and women in uniform. He was just 29 years old.

We're never going to know the number of lives that he was able to save in his work. But the tremendous outpouring of love and support that we have seen for his family in the days since his death perhaps provided a glimpse into the number of people that he touched in his short life.

To those people who knew him best—his parents, Anthony and Patricia; his three sisters, Nicole, Jennifer, and Michele; and to his brother-in-law, Len—he will be remembered as a loving son and brother. To his many friends that he grew up with in high school, he will be remembered as a good guy and friend by the nickname “Daggo.” To his fellow marines, he will be remembered as a faithful brother in arms. And to all of us here who just may be hearing his name for the first time—to America—he will be remembered as a patriot who loved his country, the Marine Corps, and as a man who gave his life for all of us by protecting our freedoms and our liberties in this country. Let us remember this young man.

The Marine Corps motto is *Semper Fidelis*—always faithful. Staff Sergeant D'Augustine lived this motto. He was faithful to his country; he was faithful to the mission; he was faithful to the Corps, and he was faithful to his fellow Marines.

In times such as this, words fail to provide adequate comfort to his family and friends. But it is my hope that they know that the prayers and gratitude of a nation are with them.

We will always remember the price of freedom paid by Staff Sergeant D'Augustine, and may we determine to live our lives worthy of his sacrifice.

□ 1100

POVERTY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. As cofounder and cochair of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus, I rise today to continue talking about the tide of poverty that impacts every single district all across our country. I rise to call on all of my colleagues to come together to reignite the American Dream for all Americans by helping to create the millions of new jobs that they so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security, Medicare and the critical benefits to feed hungry children in America did not cause our deficits. Our Nation's debt is a direct result of the Republicans' two unfunded wars, their failed economic policies, and the totally failed oversight of the financial services sector by the Bush administration regulators. And giving more tax cuts to the super-rich and their corporations will only make the deficits worse and will do nothing to grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, let's not pass another \$46 billion loophole for the wealthy 1 percent. Mr. CANTOR's H.R. 9 is yet another tax holiday that would only increase the deficit and will fail to create new jobs. We should be passing laws that protect the health and safety of our Nation's most vulnerable, like our children and our seniors. And we must pass laws that provide some relief for the millions of Americans still struggling to find a good job. Mr. Speaker, any so-called “jobless recovery” where

you and your family are still out of work is really no recovery at all. That is why we simply cannot seek to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, our seniors, and struggling families across America.

The Republican budget, the Ryan budget, seeks to do just that. Actually, the Republican budget really is not serious about balancing the budget at all. Their budget guts, mind you, guts food stamps for our families in a time of such desperate need, it cripples Medicaid and ends Medicare as we know it today. Their budgets make these draconian cuts not to balance the budget but to create even more tax giveaways to millionaires and to massive corporations.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than blame the poor and the powerless for the greed and the corruption of the rich and powerful. We can do better, and we must do better for all of the American people. We can protect the most vulnerable Americans, grow our economy, and reduce our deficits. Critical programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, better known as SNAP, not only feeds hungry children and families, but it supports the overall economy. Every dollar of SNAP benefits generates \$1.84 in our economic activity. SNAP benefits reduce long-term health care costs, improve the educational performance of children, and help to stabilize and improve the long-term economic outcomes of the families who receive these benefits. All of those positive outcomes help boost the entire economy from top to bottom.

If people are able to buy a little more in the grocery store, someone has to grow it, pack it, and ship it. All of those things lead directly to more jobs. So making cuts on struggling families during hard times is not only heartless, mean and immoral, but it also makes no sense because it doesn't reduce the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, there is a proposal to get our fiscal house in order even while we protect American families and invest in a stronger and more prosperous future. The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, the Budget for All, would do just that. This budget makes smart and targeted cuts that preserve our national security, protect Social Security and Medicare, and extends and expands critical unemployment benefits for millions of Americans, including those who have hit 99 weeks where they are no longer eligible. These are the people who are still struggling to find a good job.

The Budget for All would ask that the wealthiest 1 percent and the world's biggest corporations pay their fair share so that we can afford to invest in our children's future and grow our economy.

America cannot afford another year of inaction and bills that pander to narrow special interests. Let's pass the President's American Jobs Act and pass a robust transportation bill that

will fund our Nation's critical infrastructure priorities, fund green public transportation projects, and create real jobs. It's time that we all come together to put Americans back to work.

HONORING TOM HEBEL, RECIPIENT OF THE HERITAGE CONSERVANCY'S 2012 BUSINESS LEADER CONSERVATION AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tom Hebel, who on April 19 will receive the Heritage Conservancy's 2012 Business Leader Conservation Award. Tom has been a supporter of the Heritage Conservancy's land and historic preservation mission for over 10 years, and all in Bucks County appreciate his efforts.

Upon graduating from Penn State University, Tom worked his way up to become the manager of a small landscaping contracting company called Royer Nurseries in 1981. With hard work and dedication, Tom helped the little Doylestown-based company expand by adding a garden shop, two hoop-style greenhouses, a plant sales yard, and a gravel parking lot. Tom acquired ownership of the business in 1993 and changed the name to Bucks Country Gardens. With innovative craftsmanship, the business rapidly expanded, and many claimed it to be "the best garden center and landscape design firm in Bucks County."

Today, the garden center totals approximately 24,000 square feet of enclosed space, and it occupies nearly 7 acres. It is home to a full-service lifestyle center and a landscape design firm. The company has provided top-of-the-line service to its customers and will continue to strive to achieve the best for its employees, all because of the work of Tom Hebel.

For the past 10 years, Tom has managed to use the wealth of his knowledge and resources to better the Bucks County community as a strong supporter and advocate of land preservation. Tom is a distinguished small business owner and a lifelong contributor to the beautification of Bucks County.

I congratulate Tom Hebel today on this well-deserved recognition, and I wish him many years of continued success.

GUN LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, and I being one of them, hope for justice in the Trayvon Martin case; but I stand here today because we must stop stacking the deck against all innocent Americans.

Over 10,000 Americans died a preventable death by gun violence last year—10,000. And over 2,000 of those, Mr.

Speaker, were children. Many of those children were inner-city youth, and many of the victims died at the hands of inner-city perpetrators.

Trayvon Martin's case is a little different, but it is another sad addition to these statistics which are very tragic. But his case caught the attention of the American people and it illuminates problems in our society. This is indeed, ladies and gentlemen, a teachable moment. The Martin family's fight for basic justice has been delayed by Florida's "shoot first and ask questions later" law which, incidentally, is misnamed as the "stand your ground law," and it grants criminal and civil immunity regardless of the facts when individuals take the law into their own hands. We call this "vigilante-ism" or "vigilantism."

Florida's law, like so many similar laws in 25, ladies and gentlemen, of the 50 States, was the result of collusion by some of the Nation's wealthiest corporations in conjunction with the National Rifle Association through a secretive networking organization called the American Legislative Exchange Council, also known as ALEC.

ALEC promotes model legislation written by its corporate members and disseminated to conservative State lawmakers around the country. The public whose votes elect these lawmakers to represent them are kept in the dark about the fact that their Representative is a member of this network of special interest groups and of corporate interest that wine, dine, and support these lawmakers' campaigns with campaign contributions. Any lawmaker who is a member of the group can log on to its Web site—and I would encourage you to do so, too—and if you're a member, you can find hundreds of model bills to copy and introduce in your legislature.

The public, however, is not able to access that information because you must be a member; and in order to be a member, you've got to go through some kind of a screening process so they can make sure that you are of like mind because they don't want any infiltrators in there. They want to keep the business secret.

□ 1110

Membership fees for legislators are very small, \$50 a year, whereas the corporate members have to pay tens of thousands of dollars per year for their memberships. These memberships are mostly big-lobby interest groups, big corporate-lobby interest groups, and what they do when they get into these meetings that they hold at exclusive resort locations, luxurious amenities, wining and dining these legislators, they spoon-feed them legislation which supports their, the businesses, interests.

Now, 60 percent of the legislators in the United States of America, on a State level, secretly belong to ALEC. They are members of that network. Thousands of these ALEC bills have

been introduced around the country and many of them have passed. This gives the ALEC members secret and persuasive influence over our legislators, whom we elect to represent us.

The Florida Shoot First, or, in other words, Stand Your Ground is what it's called, but it's actually the Shoot First law, was written by an NRA, National Rifle Association, lobbyist in one of those committees that the bought-and-paid-for legislators are members of.

I will have further comment on this as the days go by. But the American public needs to be educated about this, and so we will talk further about it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You for this proud day for all Americans and for the human race, when the space shuttle Discovery passed through the Capital's restricted air space for so many to appreciate, with awe, the symbol of our Nation's ability to achieve great things when our will is harnessed.

May that national will once again coalesce within the walls of this great Assembly. We are humbled by the enormity of this task and know well the difficulty of its attainment. Bless abundantly the Members of this people's House, with wisdom and grace, and perhaps heroism, that what is most needed by our Nation would emerge in the business of the House, and the energies that divide would be dissipated.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF BETTY ROSE STAIR PATCHELL

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Betty Rose Stair Patchell. Betty's memory will continue to live on with her beloved family and friends.

Betty was married to Jack Daves Patchell for over 45 years. Together they had three children: George, Jacque, and Mark. Betty was a devoted mother, grandmother of four, and great-grandmother of 10.

Betty began her 50-year career as organist, at the age of 15, for the First Baptist Church of Heber Springs, Arkansas. She was an accomplished pianist and a member of the National Guild of Piano Teachers. Over the years, Betty served countless organizations as an accompanist.

Betty had a love for the arts, as well, as an oil and water color painter. She also loved to garden. Betty was an avid golfer, and for over 20 years she assisted pro golfers in the annual Shell Open Golf Tournament.

My thoughts and prayers are with Betty's family. While her presence here on Earth will be missed, her example will be a guide for her family and friends.

God bless Betty Rose Stair Patchell, and God bless her family.

TAX DAY

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

Mr. KUCINICH. On tax day, remember the ramifications of waging wars abroad.

In 2011, 39 percent of our income tax dollars went to the Pentagon and war, only 9 percent for trade, commerce, education, and employment programs. The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation estimates the war in Iraq and Afghanistan cost the average American family of four almost \$13,000 in 2011 alone.

National unemployment rates continue to be between 9 and 10 percent, while our families struggle to pay their mortgages, send their kids to school, and feed their families. Compared to the approximately \$159 billion budgeted in fiscal year 2011 for wars, the \$6

billion Congress budgeted for the Workforce Investment Act, primary Federal programs supporting workforce development, is paltry.

We have nearly 23 million Americans either unemployed or underemployed and about 5.5 million who have been unemployed for 27 weeks or more. Wake up, America. Wars are ruining our economy. On tax day, remember our government has a responsibility to use our money wisely, not to waste hard-earned tax dollars on unnecessary wars.

The answer to war and economic decline is peace and prosperity.

DOMESTIC OIL PRODUCTION

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

Mr. BUCSHON. I recently conducted a survey on my Web site regarding gas prices because I wanted to hear directly from my constituents how higher gas prices are affecting their lives, and I received over 880 responses.

Henry, from Odon, Indiana, told me he owned a car wash, and when people are paying \$40 extra for gas, they aren't paying for a car wash, affecting his small business and his employees.

Rob, from Lynnville, Indiana, lives in a rural part of the State. He and his wife are forced to drive over 30 miles to get to work. A \$1 increase per gallon of gas can cost them up to \$2,000 extra per year.

An overwhelming majority of responders believe we should expand our domestic oil production and become more energy independent. After paying \$3.91 per gallon in Evansville, Indiana, last week, I agree.

Since President Obama has taken office in January 2009, domestic oil production has decreased by 7 percent on Federal lands. In January 2009, gas was \$1.83 per gallon. It's an average of \$3.86 per gallon today. Under this administration, they have risen over 100 percent, the highest for any President.

I urge the President and the Senate to act on the nine bills the House has passed to reduce energy costs and help reduce gas prices for all Americans.

BUDGET

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, before we left 2 weeks ago, my Republican friends attempted to enact their budget, a budget that would have ended Medicare as we know it, shifting costs to seniors and raising their health care costs by \$6,000 a year; a budget that would cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans and multinational corporations by \$4.6 trillion; a budget that would slash Medicaid, food stamps, and Pell Grants for students. Thankfully, the Senate has said "no."

Now, instead of reaching across the aisle and instead of working with us to

pass bipartisan transportation and jobs legislation, Republicans are pushing legislation to allow the importation of animal remains. Yes, that's how we're spending our valuable time today, considering laws to allow hunters to bring back polar bear heads. Really?

I will vote, again, against this budget, and I ask my Republican friends to let go of their tricks, concentrate on what's important, and work with us to create jobs.

BUFFETT RULE TARGETS SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal of the Buffett rule tax increase is just another political gimmick, rejected by the Senate, which is targeted at small business owners. With our Nation's record unemployment rate of over 8 percent throughout the last 3 years, it is clear the President's policies are destroying jobs and chilling economic growth.

In last week's Washington Post, Charles Krauthammer wrote:

The Buffett Rule is nothing but a form of redistributionism that has vanishingly little to do with debt reduction and everything to do with reelection.

The President is using the Buffett rule tax increase as a way to distract Americans from focusing on his failure to implement policies that will create jobs. House Republicans remain focused on reducing barriers that are discouraging job creation.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate and the President to put party politics aside and work with House Republicans to enact policies that will help create jobs for American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1210

GOP BUDGET AND MEDICARE

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on a rule that once again moves forward the misguided Republican budget. The American people cannot afford this misguided budget which devastates seniors and working families. The Republican budget ends Medicare guarantee, shifting health costs to our seniors. That's a no-no. It turns Medicare into a private voucher system. That's a no-no. It increases prescription drugs for America's seniors.

The American people deserve better than to be left out in the cold with cuts to Medicare, SNAP, and our educational programs. After a long life of service to our Nation, our seniors deserve a strong safety net. Let's stop

and ask ourselves: Who actually benefits from this misguided budget? Millionaires and billionaires and oil companies who would receive \$3 trillion in new tax breaks. That should be a no-no.

Let's stop this shameful budget and work together on a plan that does not favor the rich over seniors and the middle class.

COMMONSENSE ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. PENCE. As I travel across Indiana, it's clear that Hoosier families are hurting: 8.4 percent unemployment and nearly \$4 per gallon gasoline at the pump when they go to fill up their cars and trucks. It's time for this Congress to come together in a bipartisan way and adopt an all-of-the-above energy policy that will include more access to America's energy reserves, more alternative energy sources, and greater conservation.

The encouraging news is that this House has passed bipartisan legislation to do just that. We voted to streamline the energy permitting process; lift the administration's ban on new offshore drilling in the gulf and the east coast; rein in the EPA's attempt to impose a national energy tax; and even require the administration to approve and complete the entire Keystone XL natural gas pipeline. Unfortunately, the Senate and the administration have not embraced these bipartisan, commonsense measures to advance our energy independence.

The reality is the price at the pump has more than doubled from the \$1.79 a gallon when the President took office to the price it is today. Hoosiers know what all Americans know: we can do better than \$4 a gallon, but we must embrace a commonsense, bipartisan, all-of-the-above energy policy to do it.

PASS THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Instead of being called the "Road to Prosperity," the Ryan Republican budget should have been named the "Road to Austerity," because it is a plan that is most noteworthy for the harsh austerity it demands of the many and the lavish benefits it extends to the few.

Nobel Laureate in Economics Paul Krugman has called this budget proposal the most fraudulent budget in U.S. history, calling its priorities inconceivably cruel. Our recent economic history has shown that while Republican budgets might poll well, they do not perform well. The Bush budgets produced stagnant income growth for the middle class, a jobless recovery, and a huge deficit. The Ryan Republican plan is the Bush budget plan on steroids.

If we look at what actually worked in the past, the single best model for growing jobs, sustaining economic growth, and reducing the deficit can be found in the 8 years of the Clinton administration, which created 22 million jobs, erased the deficit, and left this country with a huge surplus. A more balanced approach to deficit reduction will work for everyone. Let's pass a budget based on facts, not on fictions. Pass the Democratic budget.

HONORING OUR COMMITMENT TO VETERANS WITH SHORT CHANGE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 2006, then-Senator Barack Obama gave a speech where he mentioned that a number of our veterans had been apparently "shortchanged." He went on to say:

When a young man and woman goes off and serves the country in the military, they should be treated with the utmost dignity and respect when they come home.

Unfortunately, the President's budget proposal seeks to further increase the cost for health care for our military retirees and all of our veterans. On October 1, 2011, TRICARE Prime annual enrollment fees were increased dramatically for new family enrollments and dramatically for new individual enrollments. In fiscal year 2013, the administration proposes additional fees and cost-sharing increases, a new annual enrollment fee for TRICARE for Life, increases in pharmacy copayments, and a catastrophic cap of \$3,000 per family.

Mr. Speaker, when our President promised our servicemembers change, I'm sure they didn't expect it would be "shortchanged."

WHERE'S THE FAIRNESS?

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Many of us were back in our districts for 2 weeks. I had town halls, like I'm sure many of my colleagues did, and I'm sure they probably heard what I heard. We call them kupuna in Hawaii. That means our elderly. They're concerned about their Medicare. They're concerned about their safety nets, which we provide. And the reason is because they've done everything on their part to make us the great Nation that we are today.

Today's space shuttle flying over the Capitol was a great statement. That shows you what an amazing country that we are. So we should ask ourselves, Why can't we keep our word to our elders? Why can't we keep our promises? Why can't we in our greatness ensure that they will be comforted in their senior years? Why? These are fundamental questions. Just show the compassion and fairness. That should

make us the greatest country in the world.

WHERE'S OUR SENSE OF JUSTICE?

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we pick up the Politico today, and the headline is: "Republicans Ax Aid to the Poor." It goes on to explain that there's a \$33 billion cut in food stamps in the Romney-Ryan Republican budget that passed the House so that the average family of four gets an 11 percent cut in their monthly benefits after September 1, and it requires that households exhaust most of their liquid assets before qualifying for help. This hits hardest among the long-term unemployed, who will be forced off the rolls until they've spent down their savings to less than \$2,000, in many cases.

Then, we read we're going to do another tax cut this week. Majority Leader CANTOR wants to cut taxes by another \$46 billion. In fact, the majority of it goes to less than 3 percent of all taxpayers and less than 8 percent of business owners. It's available to highly paid professionals, longtime lobby firms, professional sports teams, and entertainers like Paris Hilton, Kim Kardashian and the like. They all get another tax cut.

Where is our sense of justice? Where are our priorities? Where is our commonsense?

TAX CUTS TO THE WEALTHIEST

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012 and its provision to deem the reconciliation of the Republican budget. In fact, it was the Republican leadership that stood right here on the House floor and emphatically claimed that they were committed to not using deeming resolutions when they were in the majority. But here we are today, and that's exactly what they're doing.

I guess it's not terribly surprising that they would break their commitments, especially when we consider the budget that they've presented. The GOP budget breaks many of the basic commitments that Congress has to all Americans. The Republican budget is an all-out assault on Medicare and the middle class. Instead of a budget that protects the middle class, the Republican budget creates tax cuts and giveaways to millionaires and the super-rich, providing income tax cuts for millionaires averaging at least \$187,000 in 2014.

How do the Republicans propose that they'll pay for these savings to the wealthiest Americans and the big corporations? Well, they end Medicare as we know it, and they balance their

budget on the backs of seniors and the middle class.

It's really outrageous what they're doing, Mr. Speaker. I just want to call them to task for saying they were committed to not doing the deeming, and now doing it.

□ 1220

TAX DAY

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge everyone's least favorite day of the year, tax day.

In 1935, the 1040 Form was accompanied by a two-page instruction booklet. Today, taxpayers must wade through over 200 pages of instructions and a code that extends 4 million words in length and grows daily like an ever expanding blob entangling itself and attaching its burdens to the hopes and dreams of every American.

Yet as millions of Americans pay their taxes today, some in this town believe that Washington should actually tax and spend even more of the hard-earned dollars of the American people.

Instead, I believe we should first reform the Tax Code and work to control reckless and wasteful spending in the Federal budget. As it's been said: It's not that Washington taxes too little; it's that Washington spends too much.

Mr. Speaker, we must focus on reducing the tax burden on the American people, cutting spending here in Washington and working towards a bipartisan plan to reform the Tax Code and simplify it for the millions of tax-paying Americans that are counting on us.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET IS UNFAIR

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, later today, the House will consider legislation to make it easier to pass the Republican budget and to make it easier to pass a budget that is very unfair in its makeup. It's unfair because it continues to lavish tax breaks on the wealthiest people in this country while asking that the elderly in the Medicare program and that our poorest children in our elementary schools and young people struggling to pay for their college education all pay more to make room for a tax cut for millionaires that averages \$187,000 a year in a tax cut to the wealthiest people in this country.

It's not about wanting to tax more; it's about wanting tax fairness. It's about recognizing the economic disparity that exists in this country and how the Tax Code continues to lavish the benefits of the taxes that people do

pay back to the richest people in this country. And yet later this week, the Republicans are bringing yet another tax bill that will benefit the top 3 percent of the taxpayers in this country and add \$48 billion to the deficit this year and a half a trillion dollars to the deficit over 10 years.

That's not fair, it's not right, it's not equitable, and it needs to be rejected.

CONGRATULATING CENTER ON HALSTED

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Center on Halsted on its 5-year anniversary of building and strengthening the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community in Chicago.

On June 1 of 2007, I was proud to join residents from my district and across Illinois on the corner of Halsted and Waveland as Chicago's first permanent LGBT community center opened its doors. Since that time, Center on Halsted has become the Midwest's largest LGBT community center and a model for similar organizations across our Nation.

Patrons of all ages, backgrounds, and economic status participate in the wide assortment of public programs and social services offered at the center. Its youth program provides leadership training and professional development to more than 1,800 young people across Chicago. Social service programs include rapid HIV testing, group and individual psychotherapy, legal help, job training, and the Anti-Violence Project advocating for victims of hate crimes and domestic violence.

Under the leadership of CEO Modesto Tico Valle and the great efforts of so many people, Center on Halsted has grown into the phenomenal organization that it is today, welcoming the LGBT community and making our entire community a better place.

THE HUMPHREY-HAWKINS FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT

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

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it's time for a real jobs plan to get our Americans back to work in every district. And since the conservatives have taken over the House more than a year ago, they have refused to move forward with a real plan to create jobs to get our people back to work—a whole year and no comprehensive jobs plan when Americans needed it most.

Now, in my bill, H.R. 870, the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act, revised, is a way to bring unemployment down to zero percent. There is no reason why everybody that wants a job in America can't be put in a position or trained for a position.

Yet, although most of the people in the country treat jobs as the number one priority, we still haven't got movement in the House. It is a shame, and I think somebody is going to pay for it.

HONESTY ABOUT HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle like to say they support small business owners, but other than keeping fact-checkers employed, Republican leaders are holding back those businesses by continuing to make false claims about the Affordable Care Act.

In my Louisville district, more than 15,000 small businesses could qualify for tax credits to help offset the cost of providing health insurance for their employees. A small business with 24 employees paying average health care costs could receive almost \$40,000 a year in tax credits right now under the Affordable Care Act, but only 530 out of those 15,000 businesses have taken advantage of it. The situation is like that across the country.

Why is that? Could it be that the people they elected to represent them in Congress have repeatedly told them that this law is bad for business?

As Members of Congress, I believe it is our responsibility to give our constituents an honest and accurate picture of what Federal laws and policies will do to affect their lives. And yet more than 2 years after the Affordable Care Act became law, Republican leaders continue to make false claims about it.

Mr. Speaker, the small business owners in my district appreciate knowing the truth about how Federal laws can benefit them.

THE RYAN BUDGET IS UNFAIR, UNBALANCED, AND UNWISE

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I was so happy this week when I learned from our Presidential candidate, Mitt Romney, that the Republicans are now prepared to realize that women are a very important part of the economy. And that is why I'm wondering why Romney has embraced the Republican budget which would fix Medicare by cutting out \$30 billion in 10 years when 56 percent of all Medicare beneficiaries are women, and the oldest of old, 85 and older, 70 percent are women. Two-thirds of Medicaid recipients who are adults are women; and of the SNAP program—formerly known as food stamps—cut of \$134 billion, of the adult recipients, two-thirds of them are women.

So, in an environment where he claims that 92, 93 percent of all job losses have occurred among women, why would we snatch the safety net out

from under women with this cruel Republican budget?

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4089, SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE ACT OF 2012, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 614 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 624

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4089) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution (with the modifications specified in subsection (b)).

(b) In section 201(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, the following amounts shall apply:

(1) \$7,710,000,000 (in lieu of \$8,200,000,000) for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013 with

respect to the Committee on Agriculture; and

(2) \$3,490,000,000 (in lieu of \$3,000,000,000) for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013 with respect to the Committee on Financial Services.

□ 1230

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 614 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentlewoman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order not necessarily out of concern for unfunded mandates, although there are likely some in the underlying bill, H.R. 4089.

But before I begin, Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state the inquiry.

Ms. MOORE. The rule clearly states, "Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, shall have the force and effect in the House as though Congress had adopted such concurrent resolution."

Does this mean that the rule deems that the Senate will have passed H. Con. Res. 112?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the resolution during its pendency. That is a matter for debate.

Ms. MOORE. Okay. We will have to debate this. The language, as I have construed it, says it shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress, which would include the Senate, had adopted such concurrent resolution. That is subject to debate.

So I want the House to be really clear here that, given this language, there is a real—it seems probable and likely that if we vote "yes" for House Concurrent Resolution 112, the Republican budget, which ends Medicare for a voucher system, ends the entitlement under Medicaid, cuts food support, cuts funds by \$134 billion over 10 years, that we could be deeming this to be passed.

I am raising again, Mr. Speaker, the question about that use of "Congress

has adopted such concurrent resolution," meaning also the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would reiterate that the issue is a matter for debate, and the Chair will not interpret the language of the resolution during its pendency.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your lack of clarity.

I raise this point of order because it's important to uncover whether or not the underlying rule for this Natural Resources bill—it's a Natural Resources bill—also deems the Republican budget plan to end Medicare as we know it, slash funding for SNAP.

When it comes to the Republican budget, my Democratic colleagues are most definitely not asleep at the wheel. And we want to take this moment to shed light on what's going on here.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a member of that prestigious committee, the House Committee on the Budget, and a long-time advocate for sound budgetary policy. I recognize the importance of tackling our deficit and debt head-on, carefully balancing both the spending and revenue-raising sides of our ledger.

But House Republicans, led by my dear colleague from Wisconsin, have put out a budget that is neither sound nor balanced. This budget finds a jaw-dropping 62 percent of its \$5.3 trillion in nondefense budget cuts over 10 years from programs that serve the most vulnerable of our society, the poor, and I might add in the most vulnerable, women and children, since we've just recently established in this last week that women were very important in our economy.

In addition to the sheer magnitude of these raw numbers, I want to make it clear that the Republican budget contains major departures from current policy. This budget heralds welfare reform as a vital victory and plots the next chapter of so-called "reforms" for other areas of the safety net.

Our core programs are not spared by this budgetary trick. This budget takes an aim at Medicare. We're told that by stripping Medicare of its entitled status, cutting \$30 billion out of Medicare, that we're going to save it. We're going to save Medicare by subtracting \$30 billion. That's not the kind of math I learned at North Division High.

And we're going to set seniors adrift in the private market. Now, this budget does nothing to cut the cost of health care in the private market. It only passes those costs on to seniors.

The cuts to the SNAP program have not gotten as much attention as the Medicare cuts, even though they are cause for collective alarm. As we know, over half of our citizens in the United States, working people, many of them, found themselves with no other income. They had no job. We played phony baloney with the unemployment insurance. They had nothing except SNAP, formerly known as food stamps.

□ 1240

And so they had no other income other than the food stamp program,

SNAP, but yet we're going to cut \$134 million out of this program and convert it again to a block grant and handcuff SNAP's ability to respond to its increased need.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask you how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and neighbor from the great State of Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise in support of her point of order.

All this talk of "deeming and passing," those words mean nothing to the American people, but the vote we are about to take means a lot.

What Republicans are trying to do is to jam through the Republican budget and pretend that it's the law of the land. They have to play these games because last year the American people rejected this budget the first time around. But instead of doing some soul-searching and offering a bill that reflects the true priorities of this Nation, the Republicans have doubled down, and the results are truly astonishing.

As has been mentioned, this budget ends the Medicare guarantee while raising health costs for seniors who have an average income of just \$19,000 a year. It increases defense spending while placing a cap on food assistance and cutting Medicaid. It gives the average multi-millionaire—listen to this—a tax break of \$394,000 while raising taxes on the middle class. It protects subsidies for oil companies and corporations that ship jobs overseas while slashing investments that create jobs and rebuild the middle class. The cuts are so severe that if their policies are carried out, by 2050 there is almost nothing left of discretionary spending but defense. As the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has said, most of the rest of the government will simply "cease to exist."

But it doesn't have to be this way. Yesterday, Republicans in the Senate rejected a perfectly reasonable proposal—that millionaires and billionaires shouldn't pay a lower tax rate than a middle class family does. They should have passed the Buffett rule in the Senate, which would have been an important first step toward addressing our fiscal challenges in a fair way—a way that cuts waste, not opportunity; protects Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid; creates jobs and builds the economy; and asks more from those who can afford it.

This Republican budget is not a serious effort. It's a radical proposal. But I'll give them credit for one thing: at least they're honest in proposing this irresponsible budget.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time. I would love to hear what the

opponents to my point of order have to say.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to be down here for this procedural issue that is before us. The question before the House is: Should the House now consider House Resolution 614? While the resolution waives all point of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any points of order.

The waiver is prophylactic in nature. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that H.R. 4089 contains no inter-governmental or private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments. Again, Mr. Speaker, this waiver is prophylactic, and the motion from the gentlelady from Wisconsin is dilatory.

In order for the House to continue our scheduled business for today, we need to continue on with this proposal and dealing with the rule that is before us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he would yield to a question.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, I would be happy to, but I don't control the time.

Ms. MOORE. I would yield my time for the purpose of your answering my question.

The Speaker has declined to answer my parliamentary query and said that that would be settled during the debate. So is it your understanding that passage of this resolution will or will not deem the Republican budget to have been passed in all of the Congress? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I would not dare to try and supersede my interpretation over the Speaker's interpretation. That is his responsibility. However—

Ms. MOORE. No, no, no. He said it would be determined during debate.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Would you allow me to answer the question?

Ms. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That is still the Speaker's responsibility. However, what deeming applies to is that these are for procedural considerations allowed to go forward until such time as an actual budget has indeed passed. So the answer to your question is actually both: Temporarily, yes; long term, obviously no.

Ms. MOORE. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. At some time, the Senate has to do their work. Hopefully, they will do it soon and then this issue would be moot.

Ms. MOORE. Reclaiming my time from the point at which I said I was reclaiming my time. And I ask that he be taxed for that extra time because he al-

ready gave me his answer—that, yes, it would be deemed to be passed.

I just want to remind people, in this week when we have learned how important it is to have a stable, good budget for women, that this program slashes funding for Medicaid—two-thirds of adults are women who depend on it. It slashes Medicare—two-thirds of the recipients are women. And 85 percent of Medicare recipients that are older than 85 depend on it.

It cuts support for key programs like childcare, which are important to women, and job training. It cuts core programs like food stamps. Our Presidential candidate said that 93 percent of women lost jobs during the recession. Why would we want to take away the safety net of food stamps when women put food on the table every day trying to feed their babies?

Mr. Speaker, this program—which will be deemed to be passed—needs more review, and I would ask you to find my point of order in time.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Ms. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. MOORE. I want to thank the gentleman for a vigorous debate—at least on my part—and I would ask my colleagues to take a closer look.

This is the Congress of the United States of America. We are supposed to do things very carefully. This is the budget that we're setting out, the moral document for how this country is to be run, and we should not be deeming it as passed, as this resolution calls for.

I would ask all my colleagues to support my point of order and ask them to vote against this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, once again, I wish to remind the body that we are dealing with a procedural issue. We've heard a great deal of policy debate here, but what we are dealing with is a procedural issue.

The policy of the debate has been debated on this floor and will be debated in the future as well under two criteria: one, either allowing our committees to move forward with its authorization, appropriations, and reconciliation efforts, in which case certain procedural techniques must take place; or, two, actually allowing the Senate to do their work and pass a budget, going to a conference, and then moving forward in that manner. One way or the other, the procedure must go forward. This is not policy we're debating here, it's procedure.

There is precedence for what we are doing. Indeed, in the last Congress, H.R. 1500, the opposition party, the minority party, also deemed resolutions and brought them forward—actually, it's happened six times in our history. The only difference between the deeming that we have here and the deeming

that happened in the last session of Congress is that this particular budget—which will be debated again—actually went through a committee and had a vote on the floor. Unfortunately, when the Democrat Party did that a couple years ago, they had not gone through a committee, they did not have a debate on the floor or in committee or a vote on anything. Actually, the numbers that were deemed at that time were less than 1-day's notice before they were actually voted on the floor. And everyone who has spoken against this procedure voted for that particular deeming a couple of years ago in the last Congress.

□ 1250

There is precedence for this, and the precedence is solely a procedural issue. This is not the time to talk about the policy. There was a time before, and there will be time in the future. This is a procedural precedent, and we can only move forward in doing the work of this Congress—and I appreciate the other side for at least admitting that the Republicans are trying to move forward in the work of this Congress—if we have certain procedural issues done in advance. That's what we are attempting to do.

So, in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business of this day, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of the consideration of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 175, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—234

Adams	Burgess	Emerson
Aderholt	Calvert	Farenthold
Akin	Camp	Fitzpatrick
Alexander	Campbell	Flake
Amash	Canseco	Fleischmann
Amodel	Cantor	Fleming
Bachmann	Capito	Flores
Bachus	Carter	Forbes
Barletta	Cassidy	Fortenberry
Bartlett	Chabot	Fox
Barton (TX)	Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)
Bass (NH)	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Benishke	Coffman (CO)	Gallely
Berg	Cole	Gardner
Biggert	Conaway	Garrett
Bilbray	Cravaack	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gibson
Black	Culberson	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Gingrey (GA)
Bonner	Dent	Goodlatte
Bono Mack	DesJarlais	Gosar
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Gowdy
Brady (TX)	Dold	Granger
Brooks	Dreier	Graves (GA)
Broun (GA)	Duffy	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Griffin (AR)
Bueshon	Duncan (TN)	Griffith (VA)
Buerkle	Ellmers	Grimm

Guinta	McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen
Guthrie	McClintock	Roskam
Hall	McCotter	Ross (FL)
Hanna	McHenry	Royce
Harper	McKeon	Runyan
Harris	McKinley	Ryan (WI)
Hartzler	McMorris	Scalise
Hastings (WA)	Rodgers	Schilling
Hayworth	Meehan	Schmidt
Heck	Mica	Schock
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Herger	Miller (MI)	Scott (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary	Scott, Austin
Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Sensenbrenner
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Sessions
Hultgren	Myrick	Shimkus
Hunter	Neugebauer	Shuler
Hurt	Noem	Shuster
Issa	Nugent	Simpson
Jenkins	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Johnson (OH)	Nunnelee	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Olson	Smith (TX)
Jones	Palazzo	Southerland
Jordan	Paul	Stearns
Kelly	Paulsen	Stivers
King (IA)	Pearce	Stutzman
King (NY)	Pence	Sullivan
Kingston	Petri	Terry
Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
Kline	Platts	Thornberry
Labrador	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Lamborn	Pompeo	Tipton
Lance	Posey	Turner (NY)
Landry	Price (GA)	Turner (OH)
Lankford	Quayle	Upton
Latham	Reed	Walden
LaTourette	Rehberg	Walsh (IL)
Latta	Reichert	Webster
Lewis (CA)	Renacci	West
LoBiondo	Ribble	Westmoreland
Long	Rigell	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Rivera	Wittman
Luetkemeyer	Roby	Wolf
Lummis	Roe (TN)	Womack
Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (AL)	Woodall
E.	Rogers (KY)	Yoder
Mack	Rogers (MD)	Young (AK)
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Marchant	Rokita	Young (IN)
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	

NAYS—175

Ackerman	Dingell	Lewis (GA)
Altmire	Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski
Baca	Doyle	Loeb
Baldwin	Edwards	Loeb
Barrow	Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe
Bass (CA)	Engel	Lowey
Becerra	Eshoo	Lujan
Berkley	Farr	Lynch
Berman	Fattah	Maloney
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	Markey
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	Matheson
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Matsui
Bonamici	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Boren	Green, Al	McCollum
Boswell	Green, Gene	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	McNerney
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Meeks
Butterfield	Hanabusa	Michaud
Capps	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Capuano	Heinrich	Miller, George
Carnahan	Higgins	Moore
Carson (IN)	Himes	Moran
Castor (FL)	Hinche	Murphy (CT)
Chandler	Hinojosa	Nadler
Chu	Hochul	Neal
Ciциlline	Holden	Olver
Clarke (MI)	Holt	Owens
Clarke (NY)	Honda	Pallone
Clay	Hoyer	Pascarell
Cleaver	Israel	Pastor (AZ)
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Connolly (VA)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Conyers	(TX)	Peters
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)
Courtney	Kaptur	Polis
Critz	Keating	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kildee	Quigley
Cuellar	Kind	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Richardson
DeFazio	Langevin	Richmond
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ross (AR)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Levin	Ruppersberger
		Rush

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

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Denham	Napolitano
Austria	Doggett	Rangel
Burton (IN)	Filner	Scott (VA)
Cardoza	Fincher	Slaughter
Carney	Hirono	Walberg
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Whitfield
Costello	Marino	
Cummings	McIntyre	

Ms. CHU, Messrs. OLIVER and GARAMENDI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SHIMKUS and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

□ 1317

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 154, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 154 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Question of Consideration of H. Res. 614, the resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4089, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, to continue on, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1320

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 4089, a bill to protect the traditional rights of American sportsmen to fish and hunt on public lands free from undue and illogical bureaucratic restrictions and unwarranted and irrational limitations, and

provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am actually pleased to stand before this House today and support this rule, as well as the underlying legislation. Far too often decisions are made to placate certain political special interest groups who are headquartered far away from the locations they seek to dominate and control, and too often the needs of local citizens and local taxpayers who live in those areas in which the impact will occur are ignored. This asks for our consideration.

Too often local and State considerations are not taken into account. Too often there are inconsistencies within the public domain where the BLM, Fish and Wildlife, and the National Park Service will have different rules. And the difficulty, obviously, for a citizen is not knowing where one starts and where one ends. This bill tries to bring some consistency. And though I don't know how much of the debate will occur on this particular issue, it is about hunting and fishing on public lands.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, technically, this rule allows for consideration of H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act, a patchwork quilt of four different bills that ease restrictions on guns and hunting. This bill, a sop to the gun lobby, deserves to be defeated by the House.

But that's not the most important part or most egregious part of this rule. That's because of the language slipped into this rule at the last minute by the Rules Committee—language that sets the budget numbers for the next fiscal year, and language that, Mr. Speaker, once again ends the Medicare guarantee for America's seniors.

That's right, Mr. Speaker. Last night, the Republicans on the Rules Committee pulled a switcheroo just before our vote on the rule. Now, these weren't just harmless, innocuous provisions. No, Mr. Speaker. These provisions would effectively enact the Ryan budget and require that Congress use it as a framework for the rest of the year.

The irony is that by adopting this language now, the Republican leadership is admitting that their awful budget resolution isn't going anywhere and that this so-called "deeming resolution" is the only way forward. It's ironic because they are using parliamentary tricks and sleight-of-hand to pretend that their budget has the force of law. Where are the Tea Party

folks who used to be so outraged at this kind of abuse of regular order? Why aren't they yelling and screaming?

There hasn't been a single committee debate or markup on this language. These provisions undercut the bipartisan budget floor negotiated by President Obama and Speaker BOEHNER in the Budget Control Act. And worst of all, these provisions end the Medicare guarantee again.

The American people get it. They said "no" to the Ryan budget last year. They don't want Medicare to turn into a voucher program. They don't want to see their health care rationed or cut. They don't want Washington politicians trying to pull the rug out from underneath them after years of contributing to this important program.

We made a promise to America's seniors, Mr. Speaker. And once again, the Republican leadership is breaking their promise.

Mr. Speaker, it's bad enough that the Republican leadership doesn't want to focus on getting Americans back to work. It's bad enough that they're pushing cuts that will make hunger in America worse. That's evidenced by the fact that tomorrow in the Agriculture Committee we're going to be asked to vote on a package to cut \$33 billion out of the SNAP program, increasing hunger in America if that would succeed. But their insistence on continuing to push for an end to Medicare is indescribable.

Now, I'm sure my Republican friends will deny that they want to end Medicare for America's seniors. They'll say their idea is bipartisan, even though it's not. They'll say that the detractors are exaggerating. But the truth hurts. This is not bipartisan. Yes, Senator RON WYDEN cosponsored health care legislation with Congressman PAUL RYAN, but Senator WYDEN has also said that he does not support the Medicare provisions in the Ryan budget. Once again, he said he does not support the provisions in the Ryan budget with regard to Medicare. I'm sure someone will, once again, try to twist his words around, but they are very clear to me, Mr. Speaker.

This plan is not bipartisan. This is wholly owned by the Republicans and the Republican leadership, and I know my friends will say that this doesn't change Medicare. That, too, is a misrepresentation of their plan. But don't take my word for it. Let me read directly from the AARP's letter opposing the Ryan budget:

By creating a "premium support" system for future Medicare beneficiaries, the proposal is likely to simply increase costs for beneficiaries while removing Medicare's promise of secure health coverage.

AARP goes on to say:

The premium support method described in the proposal—unlike private plan options that currently exist in Medicare—would likely "price out" traditional Medicare as a viable option, thus rendering the choice of traditional Medicare as a false promise. The proposal also leaves open the possibility for

private plans to tailor their plans to healthy beneficiaries—again, putting traditional Medicare at risk.

Finally, AARP says:

Converting Medicare to a series of private options would undermine the market power of Medicare and could lead to higher costs for seniors.

That's a hard-hitting analysis from a nonpartisan group, and it shatters the myth that the Ryan Medicare plan wouldn't harm current or future seniors.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats oppose the Ryan budget because it's the wrong plan for America, and the deeming language included in this rule would force the Ryan budget on this House without a direct vote. That's right: there's no up-or-down vote on this plan. No, the rule simply "deems" that the Ryan budget takes effect, despite the lack of a budget resolution conference report.

Americans want us to focus on jobs and the economy, not on partisan games designed to throw red meat to the right wing of the right wing. Reject this rule and reject the Ryan Medicare plan.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. As was stated on the point of order, when we talk about deeming—a term that, obviously, most Americans have never heard—a procedural issue, we have had the policy debate, and we will have in the future the policy debate. But this point is about procedure.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me, I'd actually like to go back to the topic of the debate we have today and the topic of the rule and, indeed, the topic of the bill, which deals with hunting and fishing. That ought to be what we are talking about in here, because that is the issue before us in the underlying bill—hunting and fishing. And it is significant because what this bill asks for those who are sportsmen in America is that hunting and fishing be recognized as a historic and traditional recreation activity and that our bureaucracy back here in Washington will support and protect those hunting and fishing rights, although we do not insist that they prioritize them.

What that means in simple language is if the agencies back here in the bureaucracies of Washington decide that some area of public land should be closed to public recreation, they have to have a darn good reason to do it. In fact, the bill lists some reasons to do it—fire safety, public safety, national security, or compliance with State laws or regulations, and only then and there. Indeed, in addition to having that criteria, unlike other elements when we deal with public-lands issues, there is a specific time limit on when these decisions have to be made; and if, indeed, the agency will not make those decisions in a timely fashion, it reverts back to what it was and these activities may go forward.

Do we need to do this? Of course we do. One Bureau of Land Management official implied that recreational hunting should be eliminated on public

lands because, in his words: The urbanites freak out when they hear the sound of shots being done on public lands.

I suggest to you that is not a logical reason on why hunting and fishing rights should be prohibited; and, therefore, you need this language in here to make sure those hunting and fishing rights are indeed protected.

There will be one amendment that will come forward later on that talks about recreational shooting. I want to remind this body that under the rules that we have, that includes such things as reenactments. If ever the Bureau of Land Management or the National Park Service has a reenactment, if that amendment were to be passed, you couldn't actually shoot a flintlock because it would violate some of the proposed rules here.

□ 1330

It also goes on to say that Congress has, for a long time, banned EPA from making rules or regulations dealing with lead ammunition or flying equipment. And yet, once again, we have a nuisance lawsuit that was filed on March of this particular year petitioning the EPA to make a decision to try and ban this particular process. There is no scientific evidence for that petition.

But we don't know necessarily what some of the agencies in here making bureaucratic regulations—in effect, making a legislative decision within the body of an executive agency—will do. Therefore, this legislation, once again, makes it crystal clear that Congress has spoken on this issue, that Congress has primacy on this issue, and that Congress' decision on this issue should, indeed, be respected.

This bill stops red tape by the bureaucracies that has stopped legal hunting trophies from coming into this country. I emphasize the word "legal" hunting trophies.

This bill is supported by every sportsmen's group imaginable.

Some people would say this is a Second Amendment issue. I don't necessarily want to go that far because our Second Amendment is about an individual right to self-defense. Hunting was not the purview of the Second Amendment when it was adopted. But, indeed, the ability of people to bear weapons on public lands to do hunting and fishing when it is allowable is important, and it is important for us to step forward and say that it should be protected.

In essence, what this bill does is say to those who like to recreate on public lands, and that recreation includes hunting and fishing, that is a traditional, that is a historic activity and that should be maintained, and any of those efforts by special interest groups to try and curtail that will be rejected by this Congress. That's why this bill is here, that's why this bill is significant, that's why this bill is important, and that's why this bill should be passed,

including the rule to start forward in that process.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we will talk about other elements, I'm sure, that will come up, but we can do that at a later time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I can see why my good friend from Utah is so desperate not to talk about the deem-and-pass language which is included in this rule. I would remind him, and I remind others on the other side, that back in March of 2010, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said that the deem-and-pass strategy was "one of the most outrageous things I have seen since I have been in Congress." That's what the current Speaker of the House said back in March of 2010. And now, astonishingly, everybody on the other side of the aisle is quiet about that.

Let me just say this, Mr. Speaker. This place is becoming an institution where trivial matters get debated passionately and important ones not at all. My friend from Utah is saying this is all about the guns, the gun issue. Well, that's the least important part of what this rule does.

This rule deems the Ryan budget. It basically says that we're going to operate under those very difficult numbers that Congressman RYAN and the Republicans' Budget Committee have passed. And what it means is that we're going to end Medicare as we know it. That's more important to talk about than guns. What it means is that we're going to force more people into food insecurity and hunger because it's going to result in drastic cuts in food and nutrition programs. That's more important to talk about than guns.

The fact of the matter is this rule undercuts the social safety net in this country. This rule, if it is passed and these numbers become what the House operates under, I think will destroy the middle class and will force more people in the middle into poverty. It undercuts programs in education, and it undercuts programs in environmental protection and investments in our infrastructure and aid to cities and towns helping our police, helping our firefighters.

As I said—I cannot say this enough—this ends Medicare as we know it. If people want to end Medicare, then vote for this rule, because that's exactly what this rule will require. And I think that's outrageous. There are some things worth fighting for; and the protection of Medicare is one of those things, at least on our side of the aisle, we think is worth fighting for.

So please do not be fooled that this is some innocuous rule that would merely bring up a bill dealing with guns. This bill deems the Ryan budget as basically passed, as if it has gone through the House and the Senate, and the numbers that we're going to operate under in all of our committees.

I think that as the American people pay closer attention to what is hap-

pening here, they get more and more outraged by the activities of the Republican leadership. This is not what the American people want. They rejected this attempt to undercut Medicare last year, and they're going to reject it again.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule. Vote "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the concerns of some people who do not live in areas that have a vast amount of public lands owned and controlled by the Federal Government, who don't see the need for some of those situations to be modified, rectified, and secured.

For those of us who have the joy of the Federal Government as an absentee landlord, this bill is actually of significance. It's not just another gun bill; it's dealing with ways of life and recreation opportunities that should and ought to be maintained at all times.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is the deeming portion of this that happens to be there. Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota, that name that goes back to my childhood, once gave a wonderful article in which he told people that if you were a Senator not to worry about the rules of the Senate because none of the Senators know what they are, so just go ahead and try what you want to. He also said that if you're a House Member, rules of the House are too complex, so just ask the Parliamentarians; don't try to learn them. There's a load of wisdom in that, because what we have in here, in this particular deeming section, is a procedural issue, something that must take place according to our rules if we, indeed, are to go forward with the work of what Congress is supposed to be.

Unlike the rhetoric that we have heard so far, this is not the debate on the policy issue. That has happened in the past. That will come again in the future. This rule is simply about the procedure if we allow Congress to move forward with our work.

I have said there is precedent for this. Six times in the history of the House these kind of deeming provisions have been written into the budget. Is it good? Of course not. No one wants to do it this way. But it has to go forward simply because of the dynamics of the two Houses that we have here right now.

As I said, this has precedent for it.

In 2010, indeed, there was another deeming motion that was made here on the floor in House Resolution 1500 of that particular year. The gentleman from Massachusetts was the sponsor of that on the floor, as well, in which, at that time, under Democratic control, we also deemed. There was a difference, though, in that deeming of that time. Under this time, there has been a budget that has gone through the Budget Committee and that was voted on in the Budget Committee and was debated on the floor and passed on the floor.

In 2010, there was no budget that went through a Budget Committee and did not have a vote. Indeed, the numbers were only given a day before the actual vote took place under martial law. At that time, in 2010, this House resolution was hereby adopted. We're not doing that this time. What we are simply doing is allowing the process to go forward.

Now, there are two ways of doing this: either we can pass this deeming concept for the House so that the appropriation bills and the authorization bills and the reconciliation bills within their committee can go forward with some kind of standard on what they are doing. To do so without that is like playing a baseball game without any umpires where no one is there to say what is a ball and what is a strike and if there is an out or a safe. That's what this concept would do.

There's another way of solving that same problem, and that's asking our good friends on the other side of this Chamber, the Senate, to finally pass a budget so that we can work together and move forward.

Look, the Senate has refused to pass a budget in, now, 1,081 days; 1,081 days the Senate has refused to do a budget on their side. And we should not be paralyzed because of their inaction. In 1,081 days, Henry VIII married, divorced, and beheaded his wife in less time than that.

The Senate should be willing to move forward, and if they did, if they passed the budget and we have this conference committee, we could actually move forward in that time. But without that, we have to do something else procedural so that our committees can actually pass authorization bills, appropriation bills, and reconciliation bills and bring them here to the floor in some kind of order.

We have to have a budget if you don't want to have a government shutdown. You have to have a budget if you want a reconciliation that will solve what Secretary Panetta says is that sequester meat ax that would happen to the defense of this country.

□ 1340

You have to have a budget because the Senate refuses to do a budget. I find it surprising that some on the other side are basically arguing not to do anything, which would actually lead to shutting down the government or draconian cuts, or basically telling us we're not supposed to do our work. That is ridiculous.

This is not a great concept. I'm not happy that we're doing this. It would be much better if the Senate would do their work and let us work together.

Or maybe there's a third option. Congressman Berger of Wisconsin, back in the 1920s, suggested that a constitutional amendment would be passed to dissolve the U.S. Senate and leave only the House. That is a third option that would solve our problems, and perhaps our friends on the other side would like that option better.

Sans that opportunity, we've got to move forward. This is a procedural issue to move us forward with precedents, having been done in the last Congress, precedents. I ask that you consider that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that if this were nothing, my friends on the other side of the aisle would not be hiding this deeming language in a rule dealing with guns. We'd have a straight up-or-down-vote on the floor on the deeming provision.

The fact of the matter is that this rule magically puts the Ryan budget into effect, and what that means is an end to Medicare as we know it. And we're going to fight my friends on the other side of the aisle who want to destroy one of the most important social programs that we have in this country.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving us all this opportunity to speak about what is happening on the floor today. It's happening just as we have returned from 2 weeks with our constituents, listening to them talk about core challenges facing the American people and the key priorities our families, businesses, and workers are facing.

Americans have made it clear over and over again. It is their constant message. We must work together to create jobs and grow our economy. We must preserve the economic security of our seniors, the middle class, and small business owners. This is all the backbone of the middle class, the backbone of our democracy.

We must protect Medicare and not dismantle it. And yet, Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues are at it again. Not once, not twice, not three times, but now four times are they voting to cut the Medicare guarantee. We must protect Medicare.

We must enact a budget that reflects our Nation's values of fairness and opportunity and puts the American Dream in reach for every American. Yet, House Republicans simply refuse to listen to what the American people are saying to us. Instead, they have decided to pull a stunt here today and "deem and pass" their devastating budget. They know their budget cannot stand the scrutiny of the House, the Senate and the rest, so they want to deem and pass it using a procedural trick to pretend that both the House and the Senate have signed off on their radical agenda.

But the American people know better. They know that the Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee, making seniors pay more to get less on the way to severing the Medicare guarantee completely; that this budget destroys more than 4 million jobs in the next 2 years, destroys jobs. And three, gives a tax cut of nearly \$400,000 to people making more than \$1 million per

year, protects tax breaks for special interests and Big Oil, and forces the middle class to foot the bill. Ends the Medicare guarantee, is a job killer to the tune of 4 million jobs, gives over \$400,000 in tax cuts to people making over \$1 million a year. How can that be a statement of our national values?

We also know that the Republican budget will undermine Medicaid for the elderly and people with disabilities, slash critical investments in education—education, where all innovation springs from, education, the source of America's competitiveness internationally, education, the source of people reaching their aspirations in life. Education, jobs, and health care would be slashed.

And we know that cuts have to be made, and important spending decisions must be made. But you just can't say let seniors pay more for Medicare, let's not invest in education and the rest, while we give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country.

So this bill, called a budget bill, breaks the deal. It breaks the debt agreement. It makes matters worse for the deficit. It breaks the deal struck last summer, abandoning a firm bipartisan promise to the American people.

Americans already rejected the Republican budget plan last year, and this year is no different, except the Republicans think so—by bringing it up over and over again, and this time by saying we know it can't pass the Senate, so we'll just deem it passed in the House.

Rather than trying to fool the American people, the Republicans are being called upon to join us today in opposing today's previous question and simply allowing the House to vote. And our measure would say, if the Republicans contend—and they do—that their bill does not hurt Medicare, then let the House go on record and say that our measure would prohibit any plan to eliminate Medicare, raise costs, ration care, or reduce the benefits for seniors and people with disabilities.

By supporting our proposal we can keep the bedrock promise to our seniors that, after a lifetime of work, all Americans should be able to retire with dignity and security.

As Members of Congress, we each have a responsibility to protect Medicare for our seniors, to create jobs for our workers, to grow our economy, to build a strong, all-inclusive, and thriving middle class.

As Democrats, we are committed to reigniting the American Dream, to building ladders of opportunity for all who want to work hard, play by the rules, and take responsibility. And we want them all to succeed. We just don't want people that make over \$1 million to climb up their ladder, make over \$1 million a year, and then pull up the ladder so that no one else can even reach some level of success.

We ask our House Republican friends, please let us work together to reach

our shared goals to strengthen families, to secure a future of prosperity for all people in our country.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question to stop the drive to deem and pass a measure that will end the Medicare guarantee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the former Speaker’s visit to the floor, and I have a comment to make about the verbiage of deem and pass.

But first, before we get there, I’d like to actually have someone talk about the resolution itself. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) to actually go back to what it’s supposed to be about, hunting and fishing.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the legislation and the rule as well.

Our Nation has been blessed with such magnificent natural wonders that provide great enjoyment for those who hunt and fish, and today, our sportsmen continue a wonderful and a great tradition that has defined our Nation.

Unfortunately, far too often sportsmen are stymied in their efforts to build upon this great American tradition and heritage because of overzealous bureaucrats and activists who seem to want to go to almost any means, really, to stop hunting and fishing.

Today, by passing the Sportsmen’s Heritage Act of 2012, we will make a statement of support for our Nation’s sportsmen and -women. This bill states clearly that fishing and hunting and shooting are important activities that create jobs and must continue on public land, and it requires those that manage the land to make it accessible and holds them accountable.

It takes away the power from the bureaucrats to limit types of ammunition and fishing tackle that they’ve been trying to limit that can be used on public lands. And it removes red tape that keeps hunters from bringing home a limited number of legally-taken trophies from Canada as well.

□ 1350

And today, Mr. Speaker, we will send a very clear message to American sportsmen and American sportswomen that we are on your side. We value the important role that you play in upholding our national heritage and its great tradition of America, and the jobs that you create through your activities as well.

I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important legislation and this rule as well.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just repeat, this rule has very little to do with sportsmen, but it has an awful lot to do with ending the Medicare guarantee as we know it.

At this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the opportunity to join in this debate.

First of all, I would like to strongly agree with the previous speakers on our side of the aisle that this is trying to shield the public from the full consequences of the Republican budget.

We just left the Budget Committee, where we had an opportunity for people to start looking at what is going to happen were their budget to move forward. And make no mistake, if our friends on the other side of the aisle thought that this “deem and pass” was just a little modest procedural thing to do and it was a good idea, we would be having the budget discussion here with trumpets blaring. The reason we’re not is what you saw in a moment of candor by the Presidential nominee—evidently—Romney talking about what’s going to happen. About Departments like Housing and Education that are going to be shrunk or eliminated, talking about the massive tax increases that are going to be necessary on middle America if they’re going to give these additional tax reductions for people who need it least.

There’s a reason why this is being shuffled through without a full, honest debate about the consequences. I’m hopeful that this falls short. But make no mistake, this is a sad effort to back away from assertions from the Republicans that they were going to try and open up the process, be inclusive, engage people in a broad discussion. Instead we get legislation like this.

I listened to my good friend from Michigan just sort of passing over, for example, the little item about being able to bring in trophies animals that have been hunted in Canada. Back up and look at what’s happening here. This encourages people to hunt for trophies the polar bears, which are threatened and endangered. They know that they’re not supposed to import it back into the United States, but now these people go out and kill these animals for trophy, for sport. Now they’re going to be able to bring them here to the United States even though for years it’s been inappropriate to do so. What sort of incentive is this to respect our efforts to protect threatened and endangered species like the polar bear?

Opening up public lands? We’re all in favor of being able to use public lands. I come from the West. I’m one of those States where the Federal stewardship is over half the land. I represent Federal areas in my district, and I represent a lot of people who hunt and fish. I also represent a lot of people who like to hike, people who like the wilderness experience, people who respect efforts to try and manage our forests.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This legislation, if it were enacted—and mercifully it won’t be—would enable some bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. to trump the decisions of local land managers to try and protect, for example, in condition

of high fire hazard. We saw forest fires in Colorado started by recreational target shooting.

Now, of course our friends on the other side of the aisle aren’t concerned about increased global warming, increased drought, extreme weather conditions; but for heavens sakes, taking away the ability of the local managers to be good stewards of the land, to take away the authority of the EPA to ever deal with appropriate regulations on things like lead is just silly. It’s not appropriate, it’s not good policy, and it’s part of an effort to obscure the real efforts that are under way, and that has to do with being able to weasel this Republican budget legislation through with as little public scrutiny as possible.

I strongly urge rejection of the rule.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for being here. It was exhilarating to hear someone actually talking about the bill before us. Unfortunately, it was slightly inaccurate as well, so if I could make a couple of corrections.

The trophy concept that is there is not opening it up for new elements. It is simply saying those trophies that were already legally hunted and have been denied access to this country can be accessed into this country. It doesn’t expand anything. Indeed, rather than actually taking away State and local control, one of the provisions of this bill is that the rules will be attuned to State and local laws, which means State and local authorities actually have a great deal of authority under this particular bill. They have more authority than a bureaucrat sitting here in Washington.

But let me go back to what the other people wish to talk about, and that is this deeming concept again—even though that is one of the provisions and is still not the basis of the bill.

I taught debate for almost a dozen years, and I had a debate coach when I was younger who used to say when you’re totally lost on an issue and you don’t know what to do, just find an argument and keep drilling it in over and over again and just maybe the judge will vote for you. You’ve heard that happening today. No decision is being made on this procedural vote. We did actually have a debate and vote 3 weeks ago. That debate would have been appropriate, was appropriate 3 weeks ago, and will be appropriate in the future, but not necessarily. This is a procedural vote on how we move forward; it is not a policy vote on how we move forward.

Words do have consequences and meaning. The Speaker was kind enough to come in here and talk about how we are deeming and passing something. I have to take umbrage of that slightly. We are not deeming something and passing something. That actually took place in 2010 when Speaker PELOSI presided over House Resolution 1500 that, indeed, deemed and then passed something—passed something that had not

gone through committee, had not been discussed or voted by anybody. And with less than a day of actually looking at the numbers, that was deemed and then passed.

What we are talking about here is passing something which happened 3 weeks ago and now, so that we can go forward with the discussion in our committees, deeming it simply because the Senate, once again, in over 1,000 days has failed to allow us, in a traditional way, to move forward. That's why this is a procedural vote. This is not about policy. This is not an effort where you have to pass something to find out what's in it. This is the procedure in which we will go forward on something we have already passed out of committee, on something which is in the nature of what is going forward, which has been debated here on the floor, and now allow it to be debated further. This is procedural. This is procedural.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Isn't it the case that, in passing this rule, we provide the process by which the budget will be implemented in the House of Representatives? Isn't that the case?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate that. And reclaiming the time very briefly because I know you're the next speaker and you're going to go over this issue one more time, yeah, that's exactly what—there has to be a procedure to go forward. But, once again, unlike what happened in 2010, we're not pulling the numbers out of thin air. You actually had the chance to debate that earlier in your Budget Committee and will have the chance to debate that again on the floor as well as in the committee. That's process; it's a process. If you want to, again, go across the rotunda and talk to your friends over on the other side, maybe we wouldn't have to do that. But until they're willing to do something, we have a procedural problem here.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time and look forward to hearing the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, again, I want to make it clear to everybody who's watching this that this rule is about a lot more than a gun bill. This rule is about how we're going to proceed with the appropriations for the various committees. So, again, if this wasn't so controversial, my Republican friends would have brought up this deeming language on its own; but instead, they're hiding it in this gun bill, and they're trying not to talk about what this means. What this means is an end to the Medicare guarantee, among other things. It means an end to the social safety net in this country.

I think this is a horrible, horrible way to proceed. I think the budget that was passed by the House is horrible.

But to move forward in this manner I think is very, very disruptive.

People need to understand that this is not just a rule that allows a gun bill to come to the floor and, oh, by the way, there's a few little minor procedural things that are contained in this rule. This is a big deal, this is a huge deal, and my colleagues need to know that.

At this point, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1400

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN. He is absolutely right. The next vote will be a vote to double down on the Republican budget.

I appreciate the answer from my colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). What the next vote will allow, the vote on the rule, is for the House to proceed with the implementation of the Republican budget. Therefore, if you think that budget is the wrong direction for this country, you should vote against the rule and not give the House the authority to move forward, because that's what the next vote is all about.

Mr. Speaker, let's just remember what that budget does. I would just remind my colleagues that the issue in the debate was not whether or not we reduce the long-term deficit in this country. We've got to do that. The issue was how we do that. The Republican budget did not follow the advice of every bipartisan group that has looked at the challenge of deficit reduction, because those bipartisan groups have said that we need to take a balanced approach—meaning, we've got to make some tough cuts.

We passed some of the Budget Control Act, and we needed to do more. They also said that we needed to deal with the revenue side of the equation, but the Republican budget doesn't ask for one penny—one penny—from millionaires for the purposes of deficit reduction. It doesn't close one single tax loophole for the purposes of deficit reduction—not one. In fact, the overwhelming majority of our Republican colleagues have signed a pledge saying they won't do that, that they won't close one tax loophole for the purpose of deficit reduction. Now, the American people understand the math of the budget. If you say that we're not going to ask the wealthiest to do a little more as part of reducing the deficit, it means you've got to sock it to everybody else even harder.

Just this week, we saw this play out. Yesterday, in the Senate, they had a vote on the Buffett rule. It is a very simple proposition: let's ask millionaires to pay the same effective tax rate as their secretaries. Every Democratic Senator but one voted for it. Every Republican Senator but one voted against it.

Contrast that to what's going to happen in the House on Thursday. Here in

the House on Thursday, they're going to do another tax break. Look at the Joint Tax Committee, a nonpartisan group. Where did the bulk of those funds go—to hedge funds? to Washington law firms? There was \$50 billion added to the deficit in 1 year, and it would be \$500 billion over 10 years. When you give tax cuts like that and if you also want to reduce the deficit, it means you cut into everything else. So what do you cut? You do cut the Medicare guarantee. You hit seniors on Medicare. I'll just show you a chart that shows exactly what they do here.

If you look at this chart, it shows the current support that seniors receive under the Medicare program. That's the blue line. This is the percentage of support they get from the Medicare program. As you can see, if you continue the Medicare program at the current levels of support, it maintains that at that level. This green line is the level of support that Members of Congress get as part of the Federal employees' health benefit plan. Members of Congress get a fixed percentage of the premium costs as part of their plan. When the costs go up, Members of Congress' support for the plan goes up accordingly, and that's why the level of support from Members of Congress—that's the green line—stays constant over time. As for the Medicare voucher plan, huh-uh. Under the Medicare voucher plan, as costs for health care rise, the amount of the vouchers seniors get will not keep pace. That's how they reduce the deficit.

In other words, it's another round of tax cuts for millionaires; but for seniors who have a median income today of under \$22,000, they're going to give them a voucher that doesn't keep pace with health care costs. For Members of Congress, your plan keeps pace with rising health care costs; not so for seniors on Medicare. Why? Again, it's not a balanced approach.

What else does it do? We just had a hearing today in the Budget Committee on what it does to Medicaid. It shreds the social safety net. It cuts Medicaid by \$800 billion over the next 10 years. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, by the year 2022, Medicaid will be cut by 30 percent and, by the year 2050, by 75 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I would remind my colleagues that two-thirds of Medicaid funding goes to seniors in nursing homes and to care for disabled individuals, and another 20 percent goes to kids from low-income families. They would whack that in their budgets, in the Republican budget, by \$800 billion. At the same time, if you'd just take the portion of the tax cut in the Republican budget that extends the Bush tax cuts for the folks at the very top, that's \$961 billion, but they don't want

to ask those Americans to go back to paying the same rates that they were paying during the Clinton administration—the same rates. The economy was booming and 20 million jobs were created—but no, they want to give the folks at the very high end a tax break and cut Medicaid by \$810 billion.

Those are the choices that are made in the Republican budget, and that's what this vote on this rule is all about: whether we should allow this body to go forward and implement that budget. It's wrong for the country. It's displaced priorities.

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

My old debate coach is looking down on our actions and is smiling, saying his advice was right. Just keep making the same arguments over and over again, and maybe someone will actually believe those. This, actually, still is about a sportsmen bill and about hunting and fishing rights on public property.

What the gentleman from Maryland just said is 99 percent accurate. There is one slight difference in what he said, and that is that this would be deemed until such time as there is a conference report. If there, indeed, is another avenue to go, ask the Senate to do its work, to do its job, to have a conference committee, and to actually move forward in that manner. Otherwise, we have to either do it in an improvised way, which is this, or you have to simply not do it at all.

Actually, one of the end results of what the other side is telling us to do is to simply not do anything. Do not go forward with any ideas. Do not go forward with reconciliation, and have a defense sequestration go into effect that would devastate the military that Secretary Panetta is begging you not to do. You have to do something procedurally to move forward. This vote does not implement anything. This vote allows our committees to go back and do the work that we were supposed to do. You defeat this, and we go back to a policy of doing nothing.

As I said before, there is precedent for what we are doing. I don't know why we say we are burying this in a hunting bill; but in 2010 when we did this deeming practice over another administration, it was buried in section 4 of House Resolution 1500. Once again, in going through a different process back then because no committee had ever looked at those numbers before, they were deemed and passed. This time, we actually passed a bill. We debated it in committee. We debated it on the floor. Now we are going to deem those numbers until such time as the Senate is responsible enough to do its work and have a conference committee report so that the House at least does what we are charged to do, and that is the work of the American people.

This is a procedural resolution that allows our committees to go forward to find solutions and to do it with some

order to it. It doesn't presuppose what the final decision will be. That's the argument that's being made here. It does not presuppose the final decision. It is the procedure to go forward, Madam Speaker, and that is why we so desperately need to do this—so the House can do its work when the Senate refuses to do its work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just remind my colleagues that, by deeming these numbers, what my colleagues will be doing if they vote for this rule will be to give the Republican leadership the green light to go ahead and dismantle Medicare, to end the Medicare guarantee for our senior citizens.

□ 1410

It will be a green light to go after anti-hunger and nutrition programs. It's the green light to go after education programs. As the ranking member on the Budget Committee said very clearly, we all want to balance the budget, we all understand we need to deal with our debt. But the way my friends on the other side of the aisle have outlined their plan, it is so one-sided. The burden is all on middle-income families, all on those who are poor.

Their way of balancing the budget is to lower the quality of life for the middle class in this country. And there are other choices to be made. For example, making sure that Donald Trump pays his fair share or that we close some of these corporate tax loopholes or go after some of these subsidies for the big oil companies. Instead, all of the plans that have been put forward by my Republican friends are all aimed at those in the middle and those struggling to get into the middle. That is why we are so outraged here today. We believe in Medicare. We don't want to end the Medicare guarantee for our senior citizens.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, our good friend from the State of Utah posed the question: What do the American people want?

I suppose that most of us would like to hunt on public land and fish, and the underlying bill does that. Unfortunately, tacked on to that bill—should this rule actually pass the House—will be something that I'm sure the American people do not want. And that is the crux of this current debate. The debate here is really about what will be added to the hunting and fishing legislation.

Let's consider for a moment exactly what it is. It is the end of Medicare as we know it. It sets up a program that will, as surely as we are here on the floor at this moment, terminate Medicare. It's also a bill that will immediately double the interest rate on

every student loan taken out here in the United States. It's also a bill that will put 200,000 students out of school, out of college because the Pell Grants are reduced. It's also a bill that will take \$80 billion a year out of Medicaid, some 62 percent, 63 percent of which goes to nursing homes. So seniors will not be able to get into nursing homes and those who are there may not be able to stay.

What is being tacked onto the hunting and fishing bill here is something that the American public does not want. The American public does not want to see students thrown out of school, does not want to see Medicare end for seniors, does not want to see seniors no longer able to go to a nursing home, does not want to see the food stamps terminated as unemployment increases and as we find some 20 percent of American children in poverty unable to get a decent meal 7 days a week. That's what the American public does not want, but what the Republicans are offering with this rule is precisely that.

We ought to vote "no" on this rule. If you must deem, put it in a separate bill and let's have an up-and-down vote on that.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished ranking member from the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

The Republican budget reads like the legislative version of the "Hunger Games," pitting American families in an unfair and losing battle against billionaires and Big Oil.

One, the Republican budget doles out tax breaks that the wealthiest don't need and we can't afford; two, gives away \$4 billion in annual tax breaks for oil companies; three, abandons grandma and grandpa, forcing them to pay more for health care or forgo coverage altogether; four, takes food out of the mouths of hungry children all across our country.

Just yesterday, Senate Republicans refused to fix a broken system that allows CEOs to pay a lower tax rate than their secretaries. Here in the House, the Republican leadership has called the Buffett rule a hoax. The real hoax is the Republican budget. The GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party. Now it stands for Guaranteed Oil Profits; now it stands for Gut and Get Old People; now it stands for Greed Over Principle. One hundred years after the Titanic sank, the Republican budget throws working Americans overboard while saving the lifeboats for the wealthiest.

The "Hunger Games," that's what the Republicans are playing. For the entertainment of the billionaires and the oil companies, we—that is the Republicans—are now going to sacrifice

the programs that help the neediest children in our country. It is a budget that does not deserve the support of any Member of this institution.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I would urge the gentleman to pay particular attention to some of the amendments that are proposed under this rule, one of which would actually probably prohibit those Hollywood people from making movies on public lands again if any kind of hunting and fishing action were to be required.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would just like to say to my friend that as the lone Republican who represents Hollywood, I don't like aspersions being cast at my very distinguished constituents, as my friend has just chosen to do.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, Madam Speaker, let me yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Rules Committee, who is here to clean up the mess I have made so far.

Mr. DREIER. Well, it's going to take more than 5 minutes to clean up that mess.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that while I am here to clean up Mr. BISHOP's mess, I've got to say I never in my wildest dreams believed that the ship that my grandmother almost rode on, but didn't quite get on, the Titanic, would be brought into this debate. I'm very impressed that my friend from Massachusetts has proceeded to do that.

But I will say that another of his lines, Madam Speaker, was just absolutely incredible: taking food from the mouths of hungry children. Come on, give me a break. Madam Speaker, the notion that anyone—Democrat or Republican alike—would in any way embrace the notion of taking food from the mouths of hungry children is one of the most preposterous things imaginable. We want to ensure that every single child in this country has opportunity, as well as food. We want to make sure that we're able to get our fiscal house in order. And frankly, as I listened to all of the complaints being leveled about the action that we will take with passage of this rule, it is simply unhappiness over the fact that our friends on the other side of the aisle have lost the budget debate.

Madam Speaker, what we're doing is very simply doing the work that this body has charged us with doing. The work that we've been charged with doing is to put into place a reconciliation package, getting the authorizing committees to work on the charge of a budget.

One of the words that we regularly hear the American people use to malign all of Washington, D.C., is the word "gridlock." I'm not one of those. I subscribe to the George Will view that sometimes the notion of having a President of one party and a Congress of a different party is not necessarily a

bad thing. But we know that the term "gridlock" is used as a pejorative.

Madam Speaker, I can think of not much that would exacerbate gridlock more than our saying the House passed its budget and we all know that the Senate has failed in more than 3 years and 100-some-odd days since they've passed a budget, that the Senate has failed to pass a budget. So we have the responsibility, since we have been able to pass a budget here, to do our work.

This notion of calling it deem and pass and somehow likening it to the outrageous proposal that—fortunately the American people stood up and said it was not acceptable, and finally the House responded by not deeming and passing that incredible health care bill, which is potentially unconstitutional. We'll see what the Supreme Court says sometime this summer. But the idea of characterizing that with our doing exactly what Democrats did when it came to the budget in the past and that is that since the work hadn't been done, the reconciliation process had to begin, we had to do the work that follows the passage of a budget. That's exactly what we're doing.

□ 1420

To somehow describe this as extraordinary is, again, a gross mischaracterization of what it is that we have before us.

Madam Speaker, I will say that for us to proceed with this rule and consideration of this very important measure, we have a \$15.5 trillion national debt. We have budget deficits as far as the eye can see. The so-called Buffett rule, I mean its author in the Senate acknowledged yesterday that it would do nothing—Senator WHITEHOUSE said it would do nothing to create jobs, and he threw out there, he said, it's not going to solve all the ailments of society. It's not going to cure all the ailments of society.

The fact is we need to focus on job creation, on economic growth, and that's exactly what we're trying to do with this budget. This budget is designed to get our economy growing, and at the same time it's designed to, yes, ensure, with the social safety net, that those who are truly in need are able to benefit from those programs. But it's designed to make sure that those programs will not go into extinction completely. And it's designed to ensure that we create opportunity for every man and women in this country, as many people have been discouraged, as many people are struggling to have the opportunity to find a job. The budget that we have is designed to encourage the kind of government structure which will make it possible for that to happen.

Madam Speaker, let me just say with that, I encourage an "aye" vote on this rule. Let's get down to work. That's what the American people want us to do.

And I hope and pray that I have cleaned up for Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I just want to respond to something that my distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said. You know, he implied that when my colleague from Massachusetts said that the Republican budget plans would literally take the food out of the mouths of children, that somehow we were engaged in hyperbole or some kind of empty rhetoric.

I don't know whether my chairman knows that tomorrow in the House Agriculture Committee, under the direction of the Republican leadership, that they are going to cut \$33 billion out of the SNAP program.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I would say to my friend, obviously we have to deal with very, very serious fiscal challenges that exist here, and I know that these State-run programs are designed to ensure that those who are truly in need are able to benefit, and so no one has the desire to take food from the mouths of hungry children.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. But \$33 billion in cuts will reduce benefits to people. It will take, literally, food off the table for many families and a lot of working families, too.

Under the Republican leadership's direction, the Agriculture Committee is not going after excessive subsidies and big agri-businesses. It's going after SNAP, food stamps. I am going to have an amendment in the Rules Committee today, when we bring up the transportation bill I think for, like, the 15th time I have offered it, to go after the billions of dollars that we give to oil companies in subsidies. Taxpayers subsidize these programs. We never get an opportunity to vote on the House floor.

But the Republican leadership is not only not allowing me to do that, they are not saying we should go after and trim this corporate welfare. What they are saying is \$33 billion in cuts to SNAP. That is outrageous.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I will yield to the gentleman in 1 second.

I know these are difficult budgetary times. I mean, you know, to not ask the Donald Trumps of the world to pay a little bit more and rather, instead, to cut \$33 billion in SNAP, or to not insist that we pay for these wars that seem to go on forever, and let that add to our debt, but go after poor people who are on SNAP, that's where the outrage is. I can't believe that that's the first place we are turning.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. Let me just say that I agree with part of his statement here, that being that we need to look at overall tax reform. I concur with the notion of

reducing any kind of subsidies. I don't like the idea of engaging in social planning through tax policy, and so I hope in the context of overall tax reform that we will be able to do exactly what my friend is arguing when it comes to the issue of subsidization. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire of the gentleman from Utah how many more speakers he has?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. How many would you like me to have?

Mr. MCGOVERN. As many as you want.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Then we will have that many, but I hope I will be the last.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I will close for our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for up to 1½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that Republicans can't use so-called reconciliation procedures to force through the elimination of Medicare as we know it or force through cuts to Medicare benefits for seniors or people with disabilities.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, we have a choice here. We can either balance our budget and deal with our deficit and our debt in a fair and balanced manner, or we can do it in the way that the Republican leadership has proposed, which is to basically put the burden on middle-income families and those struggling to get into the middle, and to put an added burden on our senior citizens.

Make no mistake about it: if you vote for this rule, you are voting to end the Medicare guarantee. That is their plan, and that is what they have said. There is no question about it.

I think it is outrageous. I think when Warren Buffett pays a lower tax rate than his secretary there is something wrong with our tax system. When corporations get all these special loopholes so they don't have to pay taxes but middle-income families have to, there is something wrong with this system. We need some balance.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, there is, as I finish this, a couple of areas I want to talk about. There are children who are preparing to go to preschool today who have lived their entire lives without seeing the Senate actually pass a budget. Were that not

the case, we would not be here with this particular issue, and if they actually were to pass a budget, we would go forward without this particular issue.

Once again, the merits of the budget notwithstanding, this vote does not implement anything; it allows us the procedure to go forward to implement something. The underlying bill still does talk about the ability of those of us who live in public land States to have hunting and fishing rights guaranteed and protected without the heavy hand of Washington bureaucrats stopping that concept. Indeed, State law will have to be considered before they do any kind of concept.

I also want to put one other concept before you, just in closing, that illustrates the problem we have with the American people on how we waste money and, indeed, that needs to be one of the first things of our consideration.

CBO has scored this bill as potentially costing \$12 million. It doesn't make a difference. There is nothing mandated in here that needs to have a review under the NEPA process of these bills. The administration said that we might have to go through this process, therefore, you should score it at \$12 million.

Let's make an assumption that you actually had to go through the reprocessing of going through all of the land management plans. And I would ask the people the question: Does it make sense that it would take \$12 million for the Park Service and the BLM to decide whether hunting would or would not be allowed? Could that not be done with the Secretary and a cell phone within a week if we actually were decent about what we were attempting to do?

When, indeed, we have bills like this in which the administration and the government is trying to say, well, it will cost \$12 million to make the decision of whether hunting is allowed or not, it puts all of our efforts into question. It does not make sense. And it may be one of the reasons why we need to look at what we are doing internally first, and that would be an appropriate thing to take place.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate that this is still a procedural vote on a rule that is extremely fair, and it is appropriate to the underlying legislation of H.R. 4089, which does talk about fishing and hunting rights, preserving that time-honored tradition and, indeed, allowing those of us in the West to make sure that we are not precluded from those traditional areas of activity. It's a good bill and, more importantly, this is a fair rule, and I urge you to adopt it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 614 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING USE OF RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES FOR ELIMINATION OF MEDICARE PROGRAM AND INCREASED COSTS OR REDUCED BENEFITS TO SENIORS AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) No measure reported by a committee pursuant to reconciliation directives in House Concurrent Resolution 112 shall be considered a reconciliation bill for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if it contains a provision that, with respect to the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, furthers, promotes, provides for, or implements any of the following:

(1) Eliminating guaranteed health insurance benefits for seniors or people with disabilities under such program.

(2) Establishing a Medicare voucher plan that provides limited payments to seniors or people with disabilities to purchase health care in the private health insurance market or otherwise increasing Medicare beneficiary costs.

(b) No measure reported by a committee pursuant to reconciliation directives in House Concurrent Resolution 112 shall be considered a reconciliation bill for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if it contains a provision that, with respect to seniors or people with disabilities, furthers, promotes, provides for, or implements any of the following:

(1) Rationing health care.

(2) Raising revenues or premiums for seniors or people with disabilities under section 1818 of the Social Security Act, section 1818A of such Act, or section 1839A of such Act.

(3) Increasing cost-sharing (including deductibles, coinsurance, and copayments) under the Medicare program for seniors or people with disabilities.

(4) Otherwise restricting benefits or modifying eligibility criteria under such program for seniors or people with disabilities.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the

vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minutes votes on adopting House Resolution 614, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1815.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 179, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—235

Adams Biggert Buerkle
Aderholt Bilbray Burgess
Alexander Bilirakis Burton (IN)
Amash Bishop (UT) Calvert
Amodoi Black Camp
Austria Blackburn Campbell
Bachmann Bonner Canseco
Bachus Bono Mack Cantor
Barletta Boustany Capito
Bartlett Brady (TX) Carter
Barton (TX) Brooks Cassidy
Bass (NH) Broun (GA) Chabot
Benishek Buchanan Chaffetz
Berg Bucshon Coble

Coffman (CO) Jenkins
Cole Johnson (IL)
Conaway Johnson (OH)
Cravaack Johnson, Sam
Crawford Jordan
Crenshaw Kelly
Culberson King (IA)
Davis (KY) King (NY)
Denham Kingston
Dent Kinzinger (IL)
DesJarlais Kline
Diaz-Balart Labrador
Dold Lamborn
Dreier Lance
Duffy Landry
Duncan (SC) Lankford
Duncan (TN) Latham
Ellmers LaTourette
Emerson Latta
Farenthold Lewis (CA)
Fitzpatrick LoBiondo
Flake Long
Fleischmann Lucas
Fleming Luetkemeyer
Flores Lummis
Forbes Lungren, Daniel
Fortenberry E.
Foxy Mack
Franks (AZ) Manullo
Frelinghuysen Marchant
Gardner McCarthy (CA)
Garrett McCaul
Gerlach McClintock
Gibbs McCotter
Gibson McHenry
Gingrey (GA) McKeon
Gohmert McKinley
Goodlatte McMorris
Gosar Rodgers
Gowdy Meehan
Granger Mica
Graves (GA) Miller (FL)
Graves (MO) Miller (MI)
Griffin (AR) Miller, Gary
Griffith (VA) Mulvaney
Grimm Murphy (PA)
Guinta Myrick
Guthrie Neugebauer
Hall Noem
Hanna Nugent
Harper Nunes
Harris Nunnelee
Hartzler Olson
Hastings (WA) Palazzo
Hayworth Paul
Heck Paulsen
Hensarling Pearce
Herger Pence
Herrera Beutler Petri
Huelskamp Platts
Huizenga (MI) Poe (TX)
Hultgren Pompeo
Hunter Posey
Hurt Price (GA)
Issa Quayle

NAYS—179

Ackerman Clyburn
Altmire Connolly (VA)
Baca Conyers
Baldwin Cooper
Barrow Costa
Bass (CA) Courtney
Becerra Critz
Berkley Crowley
Berman Cuellar
Bishop (GA) Cummings
Bishop (NY) Davis (CA)
Blumenauer DeFazio
Bonamici DeGette
Boren DeLauro
Boswell Deutch
Brady (PA) Dicks
Braley (IA) Dingell
Brown (FL) Doggett
Butterfield Donnelly (IN)
Capps Doyle
Edwards
Capuano Ellison
Carnahan Engel
Carney Eshoo
Carson (IN) Farr
Castor (FL) Fattah
Chandler Frank (MA)
Chu Fudge
Cicilline Garamendi
Clarke (MI) Gonzalez
Clarke (NY) Green, Al
Clay Green, Gene
Cleaver Larson (CT)

Reed Lee (CA)
Rehberg Levin
Reichert Lipinski
Renacci Loebsock
Ribble Lofgren, Zoe
Rigell Lowey
Rivera Lujan
Roby Lynch
Roe (TN) Maloney
Rogers (AL) McDermott
Rogers (KY) McGovern
Rogers (MI) McNamee
Rohrabacher Meeks
Rokita Michaud
Rooney Runyan
Ros-Lehtinen Ryan (WI)
Roskam Scalise
Ross (FL) Schilling
Royce Schmitt
Runyan Schmidt
Ryan (WI) Schock
Scalise Schweikert
Schilling Scott (SC)
Schmidt Scott, Austin
Schock Sensenbrenner
Schweikert Sessions
Scott (SC) Shimkus
Scott, Austin Shuler
Sensenbrenner Shuster
Sessions Simpson
Shimkus Smith (NE)
Shuler Smith (NJ)
Simpson Smith (TX)
Smith (NE) Southernland
Smith (NJ) Stearns
Smith (TX) Stivers
Southernland Stutzman
Stearns Sullivan
Stivers Terry
Terry Thompson (PA)
Thornberry Thornberry
Tiberi Tipton
Tipton Turner (NY)
Turner (NY) Turner (OH)
Turner (OH) Upton
Upton Walberg
Walberg Walden
Walden Webster
Webster West
West Westmoreland
Whitfield Whitfield
Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
Wittman Wittman
Wittman Wolf
Wolf Womack
Womack Woodall
Woodall Yoder
Yoder Young (AK)
Young (AK) Young (FL)
Young (FL) Young (IN)

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

NOT VOTING—17

Akin Filner Napolitano
Andrews Fincher Pitts
Cardoza Gallegly Rangel
Cohen Lewis (GA) Slaughter
Costello Marino Walsh (IL)
Davis (IL) McIntyre

□ 1455

Messrs. SCOTT of Virginia, CLYBURN, and Ms. BERKLEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 155, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 155 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on Ordering the Previous Question of H. Res. 614, the resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4089, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, and for other purposes.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 184, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—228

Adams Benishek Brady (TX)
Aderholt Berg Brooks
Alexander Biggert Broun (GA)
Amash Bilbray Buchanan
Amodoi Bilirakis Bucshon
Austria Bishop (UT) Buerkle
Bachmann Black Burgess
Bachus Blackburn Canseco
Barletta Bonner Cantor
Bartlett Boustany Capito
Barton (TX) Brady (TX) Carter
Bass (NH) Brooks Cassidy
Benishek Broun (GA) Chabot
Berg Buchanan Chaffetz
Bucshon Bucshon Coble

Cantor Huizenga (MI) Posey Kind Oliver Scott, David
 Capito Hultgren Price (GA) Kissell Owens Serrano
 Carter Hunter Quayle Kucinich Pallone Sewell
 Cassidy Reed Langevin Pascrell Sherman
 Chabot Issa Rehberg Larsen (WA) Pastor (AZ) Shuler
 Chaffetz Jenkins Reichert Larson (CT) Pelosi Shires
 Coble Johnson (IL) Renacci Lee (CA) Perlmutter Sires
 Coffman (CO) Johnson (OH) Ribble Levin Peters Smith (WA)
 Cole Johnson, Sam Rigell Lipinski Peterson Speier
 Conaway Jordan Rivera Loeb sack Pingree (ME) Stark
 Cravaack Kelly Roby Lofgren, Zoe Polis Sutton
 Crawford King (IA) Roe (TN) Price (NC) Thompson (CA)
 Crenshaw King (NY) Rogers (AL) Quigley Tierney Thompson (MS)
 Culberson Kingston Rogers (KY) Rahall Tierney
 Davis (KY) Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (MI) Reynolds Tonko
 Denham Kline Rohrabacher Markey Richardson Towns
 Dent Labrador Rokita Matheson Richmond Tsongas
 DesJarlais Lamborn Rooney Matsui Ross (AR) Van Hollen
 Diaz-Balart Lance Ros-Lehtinen McCarthy (NY) Rothman (NJ) Velázquez
 Dold Landry Roskam McCollum Roybal-Allard Visclosky
 Dreier Lankford Roskam McDermott Ruppertsberger Walz (MN)
 Duffy Latham Ross (FL) McGovern Rush Wasserman
 Duncan (SC) LaTourette Royce McNeerney Ryan (OH) Schultz
 Duncan (TN) Latta Meeks Sánchez, Linda Waters
 Ellmers LoBiondo Ryan (WI) Michaud T. Watt
 Emerson Long Schillise Miller (NC) Sanchez, Loretta Waxman
 Farenthold Lucas Schilling Miller, George Sarbanes Webster
 Fitzpatrick Luetkemeyer Schmitt Moore Schakowsky Welch
 Flake Lummis Schmidt Moran Schiff Wilson (FL)
 Fleischmann Lungren, Daniel Schweikert Murphy (CT) Schrader
 Fleming E. Scott (SC) Nadler Schwartz Woolsey
 Flores Mack Scott, Austin Yoder Yarmuth
 Forbes Sensenbrenner Sessions Neal Scott (VA)
 Fortenberry Manzullo Akin Fincher Pitts
 Foxx Marchant Andrews Gallegly Pitts
 Franks (AZ) McCaul Burton (IN) Lewis (CA) Rangel
 Frelinghuysen McClintock Cardoza Lewis (GA) Slaughter
 Gardner McCotter Smith (NE) Lewis (GA) Terry
 Garrett McHenry Smith (NJ) Marino Young (AK)
 Gerlach McKeon Smith (TX) Costello McIntyre
 Gibbs McKinley Southerland Filner Napolitano

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]
 YEAS—410

Ackerman Davis (KY) Israel
 Adams DeFazio Issa
 Aderholt DeGette Jackson (IL)
 Alexander DeLauro Jackson Lee
 Altmire Denham (TX)
 Amodei Dent Jenkens
 Austria DesJarlais Johnson (GA)
 Baca Deutch Johnson (IL)
 Bachmann Diaz-Balart Johnson (OH)
 Bachus Dicks Johnson, E. B.
 Baldwin Dingell Johnson, Sam
 Barletta Doggett Jones
 Barrow Jordan
 Bartlett Donnelly (IN) Kaptur
 Barton (TX) Doyle Keating
 Bass (CA) Kelly
 Bass (NH) Duffy Kildee
 Becerra Duncan (TN) Kind
 Benishek Edwards King (IA)
 Berg Ellison King (NY)
 Berkley Ellmers Kingston
 Berman Emerson Kinzinger (IL)
 Biggert Engel Kissell
 Bilbray Eshoo Kline
 Bilirakis Farenthold Kucinich
 Bishop (GA) Farr Labrador
 Bishop (NY) Fattah Lamborn
 Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick Lance
 Black Flake Landry
 Blackburn Fleischmann Langevin
 Blumenauer Fleming Lankford
 Bonamici Flores Larsen (WA)
 Bonner Forbes Larson (CT)
 Bono Mack Fortenberry LaTourette
 Boren Boren Foxx Latta
 Boswell Frank (MA) Lee (CA)
 Boustany Franks (AZ) Levin
 Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen Lewis (CA)
 Brady (TX) Fudge Lipinski
 Braley (IA) Garamendi LoBiondo
 Brooks Gardner Loeb sack
 Broun (GA) Garrett Lofgren, Zoe
 Brown (FL) Gerlach Long
 Buchanan Gibbs Lowey
 Bucshon Gibson Lucas
 Buerkle Gingrey (GA) Luetkemeyer
 Burgess Gohmert Luján
 Burton (IN) Gonzalez Lummis
 Butterfield Goodlatte Lungren, Daniel
 Calvert Gosar E.
 Camp Granger Lynch
 Campbell Mack
 Canseco Graves (GA)
 Cantor Graves (MO) Mack
 Capito Green, Al Manzullo
 Capps Green, Gene Markey
 Capuano Griffin (AR) Matheson
 Carnahan Griffith (VA) Matsui
 Carney Grijalva McCarthy (CA)
 Carson (IN) Grimm McCarthy (NY)
 Carter Guinta McCaul
 Cassidy Guthrie McClintock
 Castor (FL) Gutierrez McCollum
 Chabot Hahn McCotter
 Chaffetz Hall McDermott
 Chandler Hanna McGovern
 Chu Harper McHenry
 Cicilline Harris McKeon
 Clarke (MI) Hartzler McKinley
 Clarke (NY) Hartzler McMorris
 Clay Hastings (FL) Rodgers
 Clay Hastings (WA) McNeerney
 Cleaver Hayworth Meehan
 Clyburn Heck Meeks
 Coble Heinrich Mica
 Coffman (CO) Hensarling Michaud
 Cole Herger Miller (FL)
 Conaway Herrera Beutler Miller (MI)
 Connolly (VA) Higgins Miller (NC)
 Conyers Himes Miller, Gary
 Cooper Hinchey Miller, George
 Costa Hinojosa Moore
 Courtney Hirono Moran
 Cravaack Houchul Mulvaney
 Crawford Holden Murphy (CT)
 Crenshaw Holt Murphy (PA)
 Critz Hoyer Myrick
 Crowley Cuellar Neal
 Culberson Huizenga (MI) Neugebauer
 Cummings Hultgren Noem
 Davis (CA) Hunter Nugent
 Davis (IL) Hurt Nunes

NOT VOTING—19

Akin Fincher Pitts
 Andrews Gallegly Rangel
 Burton (IN) Lewis (CA) Slaughter
 Cardoza Lewis (GA) Terry
 Cohen Marino Young (AK)
 Costello McIntyre
 Filner Napolitano

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1505

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 156, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 156 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on agreeing to the resolution of H. Res. 614, the resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4089, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, and for other purposes.

LENA HORNE RECOGNITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1815) to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lena Horne in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

NOES—184

Ackerman Clay Garamendi
 Altmire Cleaver Gibson
 Baca Clyburn Gonzalez
 Baldwin Connolly (VA) Green, Al
 Barrow Conyers Green, Gene
 Barton (TX) Cooper Grijalva
 Bass (CA) Costa Gutierrez
 Becerra Courtney Hahn
 Berkley Critz Hanabusa
 Berman Crowley Hastings (FL)
 Bishop (GA) Cuellar Heinrich
 Bishop (NY) Cummings Higgins
 Blumenauer Davis (CA) Himes
 Bonamici Davis (IL) Hinchey
 Boren DeFazio Hinojosa
 Boswell DeGette Hirono
 Brady (PA) DeLauro Houchul
 Braley (IA) Deutch Holden
 Brown (FL) Dicks Holt
 Butterfield Dingell Honda
 Capps Doggett Hoyer
 Capuano Donnelly (IN) Israel
 Carnahan Doyle Jackson (IL)
 Carney Edwards Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Ellison (TX)
 Castor (FL) Engel Johnson (GA)
 Chandler Eshoo Johnson, E. B.
 Chu Farr Jones
 Cicilline Fattah Kaptur
 Clarke (MI) Frank (MA) Keating
 Clarke (NY) Fudge Kildee

Nunnelee	Ross (AR)	Sullivan
Olson	Ross (FL)	Sutton
Olver	Rothman (NJ)	Terry
Owens	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Palazzo	Royce	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Runyan	Thompson (PA)
Pascrell	Ruppersberger	Thornberry
Pastor (AZ)	Rush	Tiberi
Paulsen	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Pelosi	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko
Pence	T.	Towns
Perlmutter	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Peters	Sarbanes	Turner (NY)
Peterson	Scalise	Turner (OH)
Petri	Schakowsky	Upton
Pingree (ME)	Schiff	Van Hollen
Platts	Schilling	Velázquez
Poe (TX)	Schmidt	Visclosky
Polis	Schock	Walberg
Pompeo	Schrader	Walden
Posey	Schwartz	Walsh (IL)
Price (GA)	Schweikert	Walz (MN)
Price (NC)	Scott (SC)	Wasserman
Quayle	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Quigley	Scott, Austin	Waters
Rahall	Scott, David	Watt
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Rehberg	Serrano	Webster
Reichert	Sessions	Welch
Renacci	Sewell	West
Reyes	Sherman	Westmoreland
Ribble	Shimkus	Whitfield
Richardson	Shuler	Wilson (FL)
Richmond	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Rigell	Simpson	Wittman
Rivera	Sires	Wolf
Roby	Smith (NE)	Womack
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Woolsey
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Rogers (MI)	Southerland	Yoder
Rohrabacher	Speier	Young (AK)
Rokita	Stark	Young (FL)
Rooney	Stearns	Young (IN)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	
Roskam	Stutzman	

NAYS—2

Amash Paul

NOT VOTING—19

Akin	Fincher	McIntyre
Andrews	Gallegly	Napolitano
Cardoza	Gowdy	Pitts
Cohen	Latham	Rangel
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	
Filner	Marino	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 1½ minutes remaining.

□ 1512

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 157, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 157 I was meeting with students from Clemson University concerning Pell Grant funding during the vote for the Lena Horne Recognition Act. I support recognizing the achievements of Ms. Horne and would have voted in favor of this Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 157 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the Motion to Suspend the

Rules and Pass H.R. 1815, the Lena Horne Recognition Act.

SPORTSMEN’S HERITAGE ACT OF 2012

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 4089.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 614 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4089.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1515

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 4089) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, with Mrs. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen’s Heritage Act of 2012.

This legislation protects the traditional right of American sportsmen to hunt and fish from arbitrary and unjustified bureaucratic restrictions and limitations. It will remove government roadblocks to these activities on certain public lands and guard against new regulations that threaten hunting and fishing.

This is a bipartisan bill, Madam Chairman. It has the bipartisan sponsorship of the Republican and Democrat chairs of the Congressional Sportsmen’s Caucus, Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, as well as the caucus’ vice chairs, Mr. LATTA of Ohio and Mr. SHULER of North Carolina. This bill also has the broad support of America’s recreational fishing, hunting, shooting, and wildlife conservation community.

At the appropriate time, I will include two letters, one from over 35 sportsmen’s organizations and one from the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, for the RECORD.

There are four titles to this legislation, and each reflects stand-alone bills sponsored by individual Members of the House. Mr. BENISHEK of Michigan, Mr. FLAKE of Arizona, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. MILLER of Florida all deserve credit for leadership on these important sportsmen issues. Their four bills were assembled in this package to be among the first pro-sportsmen bills considered and, I hope, passed by the House this year. I expect and anticipate further action on additional legislation in the months ahead.

This legislation is an affirmative declaration that Americans’ ability to fish and hunt is not arbitrarily subject to limitation by the whim of Federal bureaucrats. It makes clear that public lands are “open until closed” to such recreational activities, and it makes absolutely clear, Madam Chairman, that the EPA does not have the authority to regulate ammunition and fishing tackle. This bill is not a solution in search of a problem, but regrettably, bureaucratic threats to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting are very real, thus the need for this legislation.

Title I of this bill protects sportsmen from arbitrary Federal efforts to block hunting and fishing on public lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, or the BLM.

□ 1520

It requires that these activities be supported and facilitated, but—this is very important, Madam Chairman—it does not prioritize hunting and fishing over other multiple uses.

The vast majority of our Nation’s public lands are to be open and available for multiple uses, but, regrettably, there are agency personnel and land managers who attempt to control these lands as personal fiefdoms and prevent legitimate uses and activities, including hunting and fishing. In addition, activist groups bring lawsuits to limit these activities; and in the worst situations, bureaucrats willingly roll over to such lawsuits as a convenient way to limit the use of these facilities. This bill will protect against such lawsuits and the ensuing costly paperwork associated with them.

Title II of the bill directly addresses the sudden attempt last year by the Obama administration’s Bureau of Land Management to limit target shooting on certain lands. An agency spokesman was cited in a news article saying that their proposed ban was being enacted in response to urbanites who “freak out” when they hear shooting and that the restriction wasn’t rooted in public safety but, rather, to reduce “social conflict.” This proposed ban echos the Obama administration’s attempt to impose a new classification of wildlands on Federal property in an attempt to unilaterally establish de facto wilderness.

Madam Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues once again that only Congress has the authority to establish wilderness areas.

Just as with the wildlands proposal, public outcry against the BLM's attempt to limit target and recreational shooting forced Interior Secretary Salazar to retreat from this effort, and rightfully so. However, at any point—say, right after the November election—the administration could again attempt such a ban on such activities. This is exactly why this legislation is necessary, because it would clearly provide that any closure must be specifically and publicly justified and be for reasons of national security, public safety, or to comply with Federal or State laws.

Title III of the bill would allow for the importation of certain legally taken hunting trophies from Canada that, through no fault of the sportsmen, have become trapped in a bureaucratic limbo. This is focused squarely on resolving existing situations ensnared in red tape and does not open the door to unlimited future imports.

Finally, title IV of the bill is in response to perhaps the greatest bureaucratic threat posed, and that threat comes in the form of the Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA. In 1976, Congress barred the EPA from regulating firearms and ammunition. However, this has not stopped attempts to try and circumvent the law with the argument that EPA may not be able to regulate ammunition, but it can regulate components of ammunition and components of fishing tackle.

Regulating components of ammunition and fishing tackle would be a massive power grab by the EPA despite a clear lack of legal authority. Has that stopped the EPA under this administration? Sadly, it hasn't.

The EPA is an unfettered agency with an appetite for greater regulations that result in a greater stranglehold of our economy and how Americans are allowed to live their lives. But, unfortunately, the EPA is not without its allies.

In March, over 100 activist antihunting and environmental groups petitioned the EPA to ban the use of lead in hunting and fishing components. This is an overt attempt to end-run a law that has been on the books for nearly 40 years.

This legislation that the House will vote on today reiterates and clarifies existing law, leaving no question that the EPA does not have the authority to regulate ammunition and fishing tackle.

Madam Chairman, hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting are longstanding American traditions that deserve protection, which is exactly what this underlying legislation does, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012. This is why the bill has received strong bipartisan support and the endorsement of dozens of sporting and wildlife organizations.

I again want to commend the sponsors for their work and encourage all of my colleagues to support and vote for this legislation. I also want to thank Chairman UPTON of the Energy and Commerce Committee and Chairman

LUCAS of the Agriculture Committee for their cooperation and assistance in helping to expedite consideration of this bill. At the appropriate time, I will again insert into the RECORD an exchange of letters between me and those chairmen regarding this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2012.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: I am writing concerning H.R. 4089, the "Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012," which was ordered reported from your committee on February 29, 2012. I wanted to notify you that, although it received a referral on the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 4089 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, and the Committee will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4089, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2012.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources reported the bill by a bipartisan vote of 27 to 16 on February 29, 2012. I recognize and appreciate your desire to facilitate the consideration of this legislation by the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by forgoing consideration of H.R. 4089 at this time, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive any jurisdiction over Title IV of the bill or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 4089, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2012.

Hon. FRANK LUCAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On February 29, 2012, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered

reported H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012, by a bipartisan vote of 27 to 16. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

I ask that you allow the Committee on Agriculture to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Agriculture represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, April 10, 2012.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman on Natural Resources,
Longworth HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter dated March 8, 2012, I am writing regarding H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012, which contains provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

Our two Committees have a history of working cooperatively on matters that generally concern the jurisdiction of both Committees. In order to permit floor consideration of this bill, the Committee on Agriculture will forgo action with the understanding that it does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. LUCAS
Chairman.

ASSOCIATION OF FISH &
WILDLIFE AGENCIES,
Washington, DC, April 16, 2012.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: I write to reflect the support of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies for HR 4089 with the changes as reflected in the Manager's Amendment to the Rules Committee Print from Mr. Hastings of Washington. As you know, the Association represents the collective perspectives of the state fish and wildlife agencies, and all 50 state agencies are members. We appreciate the work of Committee Members and staff in concluding the perfecting language as reflected in the Manager's Amendment. We also appreciate the enhanced opportunities for recreational fishing, hunting and shooting that will be realized as a result of the bill upon enactment.

We respectfully urge you to oppose any potential floor amendments that would threaten either state fish and wildlife agency authority, or jeopardize the Pittman-Robertson

and Dingell-Johnson laws, the most successful conservation funding models of user-pay/public benefits for fish and wildlife conservation and hunting, fishing and shooting sports.

As we celebrate the 75th Anniversary of the Wildlife and Sportfish Restoration Funds (Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson), it reminds us of the need to recommit ourselves to protecting the integrity of these funds and the conservation decisions using these funds that are best made at the state and local levels with the input of the hunting, angling and shooting community. State/local decision making is one of the foundational tenets of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation, and the sportsmen's funding of fish and wildlife conservation through license dollars and Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson excise taxes apportioned to the states is the most successful conservation program in the world.

Thank you for your consideration of the Association's perspectives.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN W. GASSETT,
PH.D.,
President, Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies and Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Fish & Wildlife Resources.

APRIL 12, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, Longworth H.O.B., Washington, DC.

Hon. ERIC CANTOR,
House Majority Leader, Cannon Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House Minority Leader, Cannon H.O.B., Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER CANTOR, AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned organizations from the recreational fishing, hunting, shooting, and wildlife conservation community would like to bring to your attention our support for H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012. This legislation is basically comprised of several of the approximately eight sportsmen's priority bills being championed by the bipartisan Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. Additionally, in these fiscal times, none of the provisions of H.R. 4089 score or contain any authorization for funding. We understand that not all of the eight sportsmen's priority bills are included within this Act; however, we appreciate the need to quickly move this legislation as it currently stands.

H.R. 4089 is essential to recognizing the importance of and facilitating the expansion and enhancement of hunting and recreational fishing and shooting. H.R. 4089 is a compilation of four different bills (H.R. 2834, H.R. 3440, H.R. 991, and H.R. 1558) that promote and advance our hunting and recreational fishing and shooting heritage. Summarily, the bill includes language that: Requires hunting and recreational shooting and fishing to be recognized activities on all Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands;

Protects recreational shooting on National Monuments under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management;

Amends the Marine Mammal Protection Act to allow hunters who legally harvested polar bears in Canada prior to its listing under the Endangered Species Act to purchase permits in order to transport their trophies into the U.S.; and

Clarifies that the Environmental Protection Agency does not have the jurisdiction to

regulate traditional ammunition with lead components and lead fishing tackle.

Specifically, H.R. 4089 is composed of the following titles:

TITLE I—RECREATIONAL FISHING AND HUNTING HERITAGE AND OPPORTUNITIES. After acknowledging that "recreational anglers and hunters have been and continue to be among the foremost supporters of sound fish and wildlife management and conservation in the United States" and defining hunting and recreational fishing as "environmentally acceptable and beneficial activities," Title I would require the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service to keep their lands open to hunting, recreational fishing, and shooting and facilitate the use of and access to Federal public lands and waters for these activities, pursuant to reasonable exceptions. Access to areas to participate in these activities is one of the top reasons cited as to why sportsmen stop participating in their sports. We support and endorse the perfecting language designed to address potential unintended consequences, as reflected in the amended H.R. 2834 as reported out of the House Natural Resources Committee.

TITLE II—RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION. This portion of the bill protects the ability of Americans to enjoy recreational shooting on public lands. Specifically, this portion of the bill says, "Subject to valid existing rights, National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management shall be open to access and use for recreational shooting." Therefore, if a Federal land agency needs to close a portion of land to recreational shooting they are required to "submit to Congress a report detailing the location and extent of, and evidence justifying, such a closure or restriction" and to meet other criteria designed to keep all available lands open to sportsmen and recreational shooters. This portion of H.R. 4089 also instructs Federal land managers to manage lands "in a manner that supports, promotes and enhances recreational shooting opportunities. . . ."

TITLE III—POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION AND FAIRNESS. This portion of the legislation permits the importation of polar bear trophies taken legally by hunters in Canada through an amendment to the Marine Mammal Protection Act. If this bill were to be enacted, up to \$41,000 would be generated for polar bear conservation and research which would aid in future polar bear conservation efforts.

TITLE IV—HUNTING, FISHING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION. This portion of the legislation amends the Toxic Substances Control Act to exclude traditional ammunition with lead components and lead fishing tackle from regulation by the Environmental Protection Agency. Title IV covers a variety of hunting and fishing components that will be exempt because they are subject to a Federal excise tax which serves as a revenue source for conservation efforts at the state level. There is no scientific evidence to suggest the lead contained in ammunition and fishing tackle is having an adverse impact at the population or ecosystem level, and a ban on lead in sporting equipment would unduly burden both industry and sportsmen alike.

The enactment of H.R. 4089 is an important step in the advancement of America's sporting heritage. We urge you to support H.R. 4089. With your support, we can help overcome the obstacles facing sportsmen and women today and further the sportsmen tradition so that it can be handed down for generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to working with you to enact H.R. 4089.

Sincerely,

American Sportfishing Association, Archery Trade Association, Boone and Crockett Club, Bowhunting Preservation Alliance, Campfire Club of America, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Center for Coastal Conservation, Coastal Conservation Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Conservation Force, Dallas Safari Club, Delta Waterfowl Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Houston Safari Club, International Game Fish Association, International Hunter Education Association, Masters of Foxhounds Association, Mule Deer Foundation, National Rifle Association.

National Shooting Sports Foundation, National Trappers Association, National Wild Turkey Federation, North American Bear Foundation, North American Grouse Partnership, Pheasants Forever, Pope and Young Club, Quail Forever, Quality Deer Management Association, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Ruffed Grouse Society, Safari Club International, Shimano, Texas Wildlife Association, The Bass Federation, U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance, Wild Sheep Foundation, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4089 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation is completely unnecessary. If enacted, it would actually harm hunting and fishing on our public lands.

Today, April 17, 2012, nearly 85 percent of Federal lands are open for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting. These activities have always been an essential part of Federal land management, and they always will be.

Yes, hunting and shooting are facing ever increasing pressures from development, from pollution and habitat destruction. Areas that were once fertile and open hunting grounds are now condominiums or strip malls.

The reality is that Federal public lands and Federal land managers are the last bastion of a hunting tradition many have enjoyed for generations. While so much private property is closed to hunters, the Federal lands remain open.

But instead of recognizing the value of these lands and the expertise of these dedicated land managers, instead of recognizing the complexity of balancing the competing demands of our public lands, supporters of this bill accuse local land management professionals of opposing hunting and claim that officials here in Washington and we here in the Capitol know best how to manage wildlife thousands and thousands of miles away. The legislation and its supporters are wrong on every count.

As part of the analysis of H.R. 4089 by the Congressional Budget Office, CBO found that hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting are allowed on most Federal lands under current law. The problem this bill claims to solve actually does not exist. What's worse, this

bill is not designed to improve the quality of our public lands or our public recreation, rather, it is another in a string of legislative proposals put forth by the majority intended to devalue and degrade our public resources.

Since the beginning of this Congress, Republicans have pushed for unlimited oil and gas development on Federal lands, even waiving important environmental assessments designed to make sure energy development doesn't destroy wildlife and surrounding communities.

Republicans have rejected efforts to put safeguards on offshore drilling to protect important coastal ecosystems.

Republicans have fought to sell Federal lands on the cheap or just give them away.

Republicans have tried to cut off funding for new habitat through the Land and Water Conservation Fund; they support dams and other development in and along wild and scenic recoveries; they even push for uranium mining near the Grand Canyon in my beloved State of Arizona.

Supporters of this bill will claim to love wildlife, but they attack wildlife habitats every chance they get.

At every turn, we've argued that our parks, forests, and monuments are important for recreation, for wildlife, and for water. We have argued against these development proposals because we believe that these lands provide economic benefits to the surrounding communities.

For supporters of this legislation to come to this floor and claim they have seen the light, that all of a sudden they realize Federal public lands are valuable, is not credible.

This bill is not intended to save Federal lands or to support Federal land managers. This bill is designed to wrap them in red tape, place obstacles in their path, and intimidate them by making them seek permission from agency heads in Washington before they can do their jobs.

This bill is about scoring political points with outside groups, even if it means harming our precious public resources.

Not only is H.R. 4089 bad policy, it is an expensive piece of legislation. Again, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, forcing the Federal land management agencies to scrap decades of careful planning and then forcing them to redraft all of these current plans according to the dictates of politicians here in Washington will ultimately cost \$12 million.

□ 1530

On a day when the majority has voted to deem the Ryan budget in place, a budget we are told is necessary, even though it will devastate our seniors, our students, our families, our environment, the majority is asking the House to vote for \$12 million in new spending that is both unnecessary and harmful.

Hunting and fishing and recreational shooting are commonplace on Federal

lands. The only step this Congress could take to endanger these activities is to pass H.R. 4089.

With that, Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the author of one of those pieces of legislation, the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for yielding, Subcommittee Chairman BISHOP and all the members of the Natural Resources Committee for their help and support in bringing this piece of legislation to the floor.

I also want to take this time to say thank you to the entire sportsmen's community, which has worked very hard to solidify the support here in Congress, including Congressmen BENISHEK, FLAKE, YOUNG, and BROUN, and my counterparts in the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus leadership, Congressmen ROSS, LATTA, and SHULER.

I would be remiss not to recognize the efforts of the individuals who have diligently worked together with the sportsmen's community to help advance this very bipartisan package of legislation.

I agree with my friends on the other side of the aisle that hunting, fishing, and other wildlife-dependent activities have always and should be continued on our public lands. What this legislation does is protects sportsmen's rights. It protects sportsmen's rights that preserves our Nation's heritage; and among the provisions in this legislation, it prevents the EPA from expanding TSCA to regulate traditional ammunition and fishing tackle.

Those in opposition may suggest it is the majority's belief that lead shot, bullets, and other projectiles, propellants, and primers should not be regulated by anyone at all. But as you heard just a moment ago by the chairman of the full committee, State fish and wildlife agencies are authorized to manage most of the States' fish and wildlife activities and, therefore, closely monitor and address any local concerns about lead-based ammunition.

Some will also falsely claim that there is significant danger to wildlife populations. With very limited exceptions, there is simply no sound evidence that the use of traditional ammunition is causing harm to wildlife or their populations. Others incorrectly claim that traditional ammunition was a threat to human health. In fact, according to the CDC, there has never, never been a case where lead poisoning has been traced to wild-game meat.

Succumbing to the anti-hunting and anti-fishing groups at the expense of the taxpayer and sportsmen, it will be detrimental to the countless manufacturing facilities of sportsmen and recreational industry. It will destroy thousands of jobs and hurt wildlife conservation funding and efforts.

It is the very ammunition, the firearms and the fishing tackle, along with sportsmen and -women that are footing the bill to manage, to protect, and create the habitat for the species that the very anti-hunting and -angling interests claim that they are trying to save. That is why the sportsmen's conservation organizations and the State fish and game agencies have united with industry and Second Amendment interests to get behind this piece of legislation.

While there is still much work to be done to ensure that sportsmen's rights continue to be protected, H.R. 4089 addresses some of the sportsmen's communities' most pressing concerns, and I urge passage of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN), who is a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012, a bill that will protect hunting and fishing on public lands and preserve the use of traditional ammunition and fishing tackle.

I am an avid hunter and sportsman. In fact, I'm a life member of Safari Club International and my life member number is 17. I began coming to Washington, D.C., as a volunteer advocate for hunting and fishing rights and for gun owners' rights and responsible conservation. I'm also honored to be a life member of the National Rifle Association. I know the importance of ensuring that our hunters' and our anglers' rights are protected, as well as ensuring the sustainability of wildlife.

This legislation is a compilation of four pro-hunting, -shooting, and -fishing bills offered by my friends JEFF MILLER of Florida, DON YOUNG of Alaska, JEFF FLAKE of Arizona, and Dr. DAN BENISHEK of Michigan. I commend all of them for their great work on this issue. I am also pleased to say that I cosponsored all of their legislation.

Of note, I would like to personally thank Dr. BENISHEK for allowing me to amend his portion of the bill, the Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage Opportunities Act, that we marked up in our Natural Resources Committee.

In this Congress, as I have done in the past two Congresses, I introduced H.R. 1444, legislation that would require that hunting activities be considered as a land use in all management plans for Federal land. My amendment was complementary to Mr. BENISHEK's legislation, and it is included in this legislation that we are voting on today.

Sportsmen devote their time, their money, and their efforts towards ensuring that our Nation's fish and wildlife are sustainable for all Americans to

enjoy. In return, I urge my colleagues to support the Sportsmen's Heritage Act so that future generations can continue to hunt, fish, and enjoy God-given natural resources.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I urge my colleagues to support the Sportsmen's Heritage Act so that future generations can continue to hunt, fish, and enjoy the God-given natural resources that were bestowed upon this country.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Dr. BENISHEK, who is also a sponsor of one of the pieces of legislation that's part of this legislation.

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Chairman, I come before the House today as a cosponsor and a strong supporter of the Sportsmen's Heritage Act.

I thank my good friend, Chairman MILLER, for introducing it, and I'm particularly pleased that title I of the bill contains the Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage Opportunities Act, a bill I introduced last September.

Madam Chairman, my northern Michigan district is blessed with abundant natural resources, including three Federal forests. Like many in the First District, I have enjoyed hunting and fishing since I was a child. These are memories I have cherished for a lifetime, and I want to ensure that northern Michigan's children and grandchildren will be able to enjoy the same.

Today's bipartisan bill is not some sweeping or radical piece of legislation. It simply confirms that sportsmen will be able to access Federal lands to enjoy fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting. These pursuits are part of the tradition of American public land use, but regrettably they are threatened by animal rights and environmental groups that seek to end that tradition.

Like many in this House, I believe these traditions are something to be celebrated and protected. Whether it's trout fishing in May, deer hunting in November, or just shooting clays with some friends, every person in this country has a right to enjoy these lands.

Madam Chairman, let us make clear today that hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting on Federal lands must be protected. Let us make sure that when our grandchildren pick up their fishing rod or firearm for their first time and head out into America's great outdoors, they have the same rights and privileges that we have always known.

I invite all my colleagues to visit northern Michigan this summer for some of the best trout fishing in America or visit this October or November for some grouse and deer hunting.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, just to make sure that the record is clear, as I mentioned, much of our public lands—and CBO mentioned that as well—are open to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting.

□ 1540

I think it's important to see how that translates into acreage:

BLM lands, 245 million acres, 95 percent open;

Park Service, 84 million acres, 70 percent open;

Fish and Wildlife, 150 million acres, 57 percent open;

Forest Service, 193 million acres, 95 percent open.

The real threat to access to our public lands for hunters, anglers, and recreational shooting is the privatization of these very important public resources, degraded habitat due to lack of funding, and development that disrupts habitat and water quality.

The majority frequently laments that Federal lands dominate the West and are robbing local communities of important resources. They have promoted taking these same lands and giving it to the States, liquidating others, and intensely developing what is left. If that is the pattern of land management that the majority seeks for our public lands, then hunters, anglers, recreational and people that enjoy our open spaces and public lands will be more endangered by that public policy than by a problem that this bill attempts to address that doesn't exist.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona, somebody who has worked on this legislation, Mr. GOSAR.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012. I have lived in rural America my entire life, where hunting, fishing, and sport shooting are more than just hobbies—they are a way of life.

Unfortunately, in Arizona, where the Federal Government administers nearly 50 percent of our land, recreational activities are being restricted by ill-advised land management decisions. BLM has shut down nearly 72,000 acres in Agua Fria and is targeting 600,000 more at the Sonoran Desert and the Ironwood Forest National Monument.

The bill we are considering today removes government roadblocks to these activities and guards against new regulations that threaten to block or limit access to hunting and fishing. Our way of life should not be infringed upon because of the prejudices of bureaucrats who do not understand the lifestyles of sportsmen in rural America.

I urge my colleagues to protect jobs, economic growth, and the traditional right of American sportsmen to hunt and fish. Vote "yes" on H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act.

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

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

Let me touch a bit on an issue that was brought up as to the cost of this legislation—cost that I acknowledge was scored by the Congressional Budget Office. I have to say, sometimes we have differences with those agencies. I guess that's understandable. But they suggest that there is a cost associated with this bill. Let me kind of walk through some points of this bill that I hope will point out: How can there be a cost associated with it?

Because, first of all, this bill does not create a new program. New programs would be associated with cost. This does not create a new program. It does not authorize any new spending. So because it doesn't authorize spending, how can there be a cost associated with it? It does not authorize any new personnel. So if we don't add any new personnel, how can there be a cost associated with it? Further, the bill restricts the ability of Federal land managers to oppose restrictions. Well, if they do less, one would say, logically, how could there be a cost associated with it?

I think what the reason is—and sometimes we point fingers here too much, but I mentioned in my opening statement that the Department of the Interior had some problems with this legislation, and maybe they had some problems and said that there would be new activities for people that work for them and, therefore, there would be a cost.

Let me reiterate: it doesn't create a new program. It does not authorize new spending, doesn't hire anybody. Under current law, they are required to do what they are required to do. How could that possibly cost more money? But yet that is what the CBO scored, and there's absolutely nothing we can do because that's their score.

But I will tell you, Madam Chairman, for the record, I highly doubt that if one were to walk their way through the restrictions that I have here and apply it to any other legislation, I would have to think that there would be no costs associated with that legislation. And I think that is probably the case, when you really get down to it, on this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 23 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to another gentleman that has authored legislation that is part of the title of this legislation, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act.

I have appreciated the opportunity and have helped with the introduction of legislation that will protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting. I am proud that the Recreational Shooting Protection Act, legislation that I introduced earlier this year, is a critical measure towards protecting the rights of recreational shooters and is included in the bill that we're debating today.

As I stand here, the Bureau of Land Management is actively working to ban recreational shooting in both the Sonoran Desert and Ironwood Forest National Monument in Arizona. That's more than 600,000 acres of taxpayer-supported public lands that, if the administration had its druthers, would be closed to recreational shooting in my State of Arizona alone.

Don't be confused; this isn't just an Arizona issue. In 2010 alone, the agency unilaterally closed more than 400,000 acres across three States to recreational shooting. Just as troubling as the closures themselves is the process by which they're coming about. The mechanism for these closures is just bureaucratic fiat.

Too often, the BLM seems quick to point to the action of some bad actors and just as quick to ignore that many recreational shooting enthusiasts responsibly use their Federal lands and the existing laws already on the books that make disreputable actions illegal already. Whether it's closing a million acres of Federal lands to do mining, investigating costly pollution controls for a new power plant, trying to require costly modifications to pools, or locking up recreational shooting areas, you would think that the administration's arms at some point would get tired from overreaching.

As a remedy in the shooting areas, the Recreational Shooting Protection Act portion of the bill would require congressional approval for existing and future recreational shooting restrictions on BLM-managed national monument lands. It would also direct the BLM to manage national monument lands in a manner that enhances recreational shooting opportunities. I should say that that really is the instructions that the agencies are under now, yet they're continuing to carry forward with these actions.

For generations, the Federal Government has recognized recreational shooting as a traditional and legitimate activity on public lands. Nowhere is this more relevant than in the Western States, like Arizona, where communities are often and literally surrounded by Federal lands.

To be clear, all this provision advocates is an additional layer of supervision and oversight of the process. It does not prevent the closure of BLM lands to recreational shooting, it does not unconditionally reverse existing closures, and it does not grant recreational shooters carte blanche on na-

tional monument lands. It also does not authorize any new spending.

I believe the Recreational Shooting Protection Act affords Congress the necessary oversight to prevent unnecessary recreational shooting bans, and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you.

I should mention that as a diverse package of critical natural resource bills, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act is poised to protect and enhance opportunities for sportsmen across the Nation. I urge its passage.

Again, I thank the chairman for bringing this forward, and those who've worked on the broader piece of legislation. It's a good piece of legislation. It ought to be passed.

□ 1550

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, my State and my colleague's, Congressman FLAKE's, State, and my district are both blessed with Federal lands, both Forest Service Bureau of Land Management areas. The debate over access for shooting has been fierce for many, many years. We've had closures of some areas because shooting activities, in particular, using saguaro cactuses as targets, was impacting the lands, and the ironwood, which is an endangered bosque that is one of the few left in our Nation and certainly in the Southwest.

These processes by which communities go through an arbitrary, cookie-cutter approach at the national level in terms of recreational shooting robs the local community of their ability to impact and their ability to be able to negotiate compromise and draw consensus on appropriate shooting ranges and sites.

I would suggest that here in Washington, D.C., whether it's Congress or the officials here in Washington making those decisions for Arizona, for our respective districts, that the reaction from the public will not be a good one insofar as they have been robbed of the opportunity to find a workable solution for all the parties involved.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a vice chairman of the bipartisan Sportsmen's Caucus, Mr. LATTA, from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012. This important legislation for sportsmen and -women protect their rights to hunt and fish while limiting restrictions in regards to these activities. As a lifelong hunter and Ohio hunter education instructor and current vice chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, these issues are not only important to me

but to my constituents, as well as individuals across this Nation.

I strongly support H.R. 4089 and will discuss a provision of the bill relating to the importance of having access to public lands for our sportsmen and -women. This portion of the bill would ensure that Federal land management agencies, primarily the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, act to protect and foster hunting, fishing, and shooting traditions on Federal public lands by directing these Federal agencies to exercise their land management discretion to facilitate sportsmen's and -women's activities.

One of my priorities has been to ensure our youth have the opportunities to access to become involved in hunting, fishing, and other shooting sports. One of the main reasons cited as to why sportsmen and -women stop participating in these activities is the limitation and access of land. By having more access to Federal lands, it helps current users and facilitates that next generation of hunters, anglers, and shooters.

In my home State of Ohio, only 3 percent of the land is publicly owned, whereas in some of our Western States, the majority of the land is publicly owned, as just mentioned by my friend. For example, in Nevada, approximately 80 percent of the land is Federal land, and in Wyoming, it's almost 50 percent. Again, if these lands in these States with large tracts of Federal lands are restricted, hunters and recreational fishermen and -women will not be able to participate in those outdoor activities. And, again, it will impede our youth from being able to participate in the future because, again, they rely on those adults to get them out.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4089, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIJALVA. If I may, if I could inquire from Chairman HASTINGS as to anymore speakers. I am prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman. I am prepared to close, and so if he wishes to close, then I will close on my side.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dams, derricks, distress sales—that has been the agenda of the majority until today regarding our public lands. Today, an epiphany. We need to protect wildlife habitat, water quality and access for hunters, fishermen, anglers, and recreational shooting. Promoting more hunting and fishing activities on Federal land involves ensuring the habitat is protected, acquiring new lands to expand existing habitats, funding wildlife and habitat management and continuing to ensure that our parks, forests, monuments, and wildlife areas remain in public hands.

So if we're going to have a discussion about access for a very wide and broad issue of hunting and fishing on our public lands, we should do that, have a

serious discussion. I invite the majority to enter into that, a serious discussion about the funding for fish and wildlife habitat, a serious discussion of land acquisition to increase access and availability for hunters and fishermen and clean water programs that would ensure that that habitat is protected.

Hunting and fishing are under attack, but they're under attack from privatization and development, not from Federal land managers.

This bill says that top-down Washington knows best, knows the best management and that that is the way to go. We support letting local land managers and local communities do their job. You can't say you trust CBO when you like the score and don't trust CBO when you don't like the score. A vote for this bill is a vote to spend \$12 million. It's that simple. A vote for this bill is to continue the philosophy of dams, derricks, and distress sales of our public lands under the guise—under the guise—of solving a problem for hunters and fishermen in this country that does not exist on the public lands.

Four out of five acres is available for hunting and fishing on our public lands. I would suggest that that is not just a question of being enough; that is about access and opportunity on our public lands for those activities. Let's not jeopardize them.

Vote "no" on H.R. 4089, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for up to 6 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Let's go back and set the stage for why this legislation is needed, and let's understand that public lands were designated for multiple use which, of course, means recreation and, of course, commercial activity, unless Congress says otherwise. And the most obvious example of where Congress says otherwise is in wilderness designations. But even then, in wilderness designations, there are certain activities. But Federal lands were designed to be multiple use.

The reason for this legislation is because we are finding arbitrary decisions on the ground not for the exceptions that Congress looked at that would restrict land activity. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) pointed that out very well with his portion of this bill.

Some of the restrictions make perfectly good sense if one were to look at it hopefully logically, and sometimes we miss that point when we debate here on the floor. One of the reasons is for reasons of national security. If there should be restrictions on public lands for national security, nobody, I think, would argue with that. If there should be restrictions on public lands for public health, nobody would argue with that. Forest fires or wildfires come to mind in that situation—or if they are contrary to applicable Federal statutes. All of those things make sense.

But let's not lose the underlying principle of public lands, that they should be for multiple use. And what this legislation simply does is reiterates, reiterates that hunting and fishing have their portion—not higher, not lower—but have their portion on use for public lands. That's what the whole intent of this legislation is.

We hear my friends on the other side of the aisle saying this is becoming top down; and yet when you look at the concerns that Members have had trying to offer amendments where they're trying to get more flexibility, you can't have it both ways. This simply reiterates what are the national standards. It should be multiple use, but particularly in this case as it relates to hunting and fishing.

With that, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, this so-called "Sportsmen's Heritage Act" is an amalgam of four separate bills that have more to do with undermining conservation laws than hunting, fishing or recreational shooting.

Like many Americans and most Members of this House, I don't have a problem with hunting, fishing or recreational shooting on federal land where appropriate. As a practical matter, over 75% of all federal lands are already open to hunting and fishing—and more than 85% of all national monuments are open for recreational shooting. But as a matter of common sense, these recreational activities need to be balanced against the health and safety of other park users and uses, as well as the proper management of wildlife and wildfire risk. And at the end of the day, these kinds of decisions are best made by local land managers, not an agency head in Washington, D.C.

This legislation is further encumbered by a regulatory earmark benefitting an estimated 41 trophy hunters at the expense of our endangered species laws, and a provision banning the EPA from doing something it has already publicly said it isn't going to do.

Accordingly, I urge a no vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, as an avid outdoorsman and member of the bipartisan Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I am grateful for the opportunity to voice my support for H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act. This legislation clarifies federal policies for the management of sporting activities on public lands and protects opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting. I commend the House Committee on Natural Resources for their commitment to preserving the legacy of conservation and upholding Second Amendment rights, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the na-

ture of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 4089

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. *Short title; table of contents.*

TITLE I—RECREATIONAL FISHING AND HUNTING HERITAGE AND OPPORTUNITIES

Sec. 101. *Short title.*

Sec. 102. *Findings.*

Sec. 103. *Definition.*

Sec. 104. *Recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting.*

TITLE II—RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION

Sec. 201. *Short title.*

Sec. 202. *Definitions.*

Sec. 203. *Recreational shooting.*

TITLE III—POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION AND FAIRNESS

Sec. 301. *Short title.*

Sec. 302. *Permits for importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada.*

TITLE IV—HUNTING, FISHING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION

Sec. 401. *Short title.*

Sec. 402. *Modification of definition.*

TITLE I—RECREATIONAL FISHING AND HUNTING HERITAGE AND OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act".

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) *recreational fishing and hunting are important and traditional activities in which millions of Americans participate;*

(2) *recreational anglers and hunters have been and continue to be among the foremost supporters of sound fish and wildlife management and conservation in the United States;*

(3) *recreational fishing and hunting are environmentally acceptable and beneficial activities that occur and can be provided on Federal public lands and waters without adverse effects on other uses or users;*

(4) *recreational anglers, hunters, and sporting organizations provide direct assistance to fish and wildlife managers and enforcement officers of the Federal Government as well as State and local governments by investing volunteer time and effort to fish and wildlife conservation;*

(5) *recreational anglers, hunters, and the associated industries have generated billions of dollars of critical funding for fish and wildlife conservation, research, and management by providing revenues from purchases of fishing and hunting licenses, permits, and stamps, as well as excise taxes on fishing, hunting, and shooting equipment that have generated billions of dollars of critical funding for fish and wildlife conservation, research, and management;*

(6) *recreational shooting is also an important and traditional activity in which millions of Americans participate, safe recreational shooting is a valid use of Federal public lands, and participation in recreational shooting helps recruit and retain hunters and contributes to wildlife conservation;*

(7) *opportunities to recreationally fish, hunt, and shoot are declining, which depresses participation in these traditional activities, and depressed participation adversely impacts fish and*

wildlife conservation and funding for important conservation efforts; and

(8) the public interest would be served, and our citizens' fish and wildlife resources benefited, by action to ensure that opportunities are facilitated to engage in fishing and hunting on Federal public land as recognized by Executive Order 12962, relating to recreational fisheries, and Executive Order 13443, relating to facilitation of hunting heritage and wildlife conservation.

SEC. 103. DEFINITION.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “Federal public land” means any land or water that is—

(i) owned by the United States; and

(ii) managed by a Federal agency (including the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service) for purposes that include the conservation of natural resources.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “Federal public land” does not include any land or water held in trust for the benefit of Indians or other Native Americans.

(2) HUNTING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “hunting” means use of a firearm, bow, or other authorized means in the lawful—

(i) pursuit, shooting, capture, collection, trapping, or killing of wildlife; or

(ii) attempt to pursue, shoot, capture, collect, trap, or kill wildlife.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “hunting” does not include the use of skilled volunteers to cull excess animals (as defined by other Federal law, including laws applicable to the National Park System).

(3) RECREATIONAL FISHING.—The term “recreational fishing” means the lawful—

(A) pursuit, capture, collection, or killing of fish; or

(B) attempt to capture, collect, or kill fish.

(4) RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.—The term “recreational shooting” means any form of sport, training, competition, or pastime, whether formal or informal, that involves the discharge of a rifle, handgun, or shotgun, or the use of a bow and arrow.

SEC. 104. RECREATIONAL FISHING, HUNTING, AND SHOOTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and subsection (g), and cooperation with the respective State and fish and wildlife agency, Federal public land management officials shall exercise their authority under existing law, including provisions regarding land use planning, to facilitate use of and access to Federal public lands and waters for fishing, sport hunting, and recreational shooting except as limited by—

(1) statutory authority that authorizes action or withholding action for reasons of national security, public safety, or resource conservation;

(2) any other Federal statute that specifically precludes recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting on specific Federal public lands, waters, or units thereof; and

(3) discretionary limitations on recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting determined to be necessary and reasonable as supported by the best scientific evidence and advanced through a transparent public process.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—Consistent with subsection (a), the head of each Federal public land management agency shall exercise its land management discretion—

(1) in a manner that supports and facilitates recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting opportunities;

(2) to the extent authorized under applicable State law; and

(3) in accordance with applicable Federal law.

(c) PLANNING.—

(1) EFFECTS OF PLANS AND ACTIVITIES.—

(A) EVALUATION OF EFFECTS ON OPPORTUNITIES TO ENGAGE IN RECREATIONAL FISHING, HUNTING, OR SHOOTING.—Federal public land planning documents, including land resources management plans, resource management plans, travel management plans, general management plans, and comprehensive conservation plans, shall include a specific evaluation of the effects of such plans on opportunities to engage in recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting.

(B) NOT MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—No action taken under this title, or under section 4 of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd), either individually or cumulatively with other actions involving Federal public lands, shall be considered to be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and no additional identification, analysis, or consideration of environmental effects, including cumulative effects, is necessary or required.

(C) OTHER ACTIVITY NOT CONSIDERED.—The fact that recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting occurs on adjacent or nearby public or private lands shall not be considered in determining which Federal public lands are open for these activities or for setting levels of use for these activities.

(2) USE OF VOLUNTEERS.—If hunting is prohibited by law, all Federal public land planning documents of listed in paragraph (1)(A) of an agency shall, after appropriate coordination with State fish and wildlife agency, allow the participation of skilled volunteers in the culling and other management of wildlife populations on Federal public lands unless the head of the agency demonstrates, based on the best scientific data available or applicable Federal statutes, why skilled volunteers shall not be used to control overpopulations of wildlife on the land that is the subject of the planning documents.

(d) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND FOREST SERVICE LANDS.—

(1) LANDS OPEN.—Lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, including lands designated as wilderness or administratively classified as wilderness eligible or suitable and primitive or semi-primitive areas but excluding lands on the Outer Continental Shelf, shall be open to recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting unless the managing Federal agency acts to close lands to such activity. Lands may be subject to closures or restrictions if determined by the head of the agency to be necessary and reasonable and supported by facts and evidence, for purposes including resource conservation, public safety, energy or mineral production, energy generation or transmission infrastructure, water supply facilities, protection of other permittees, protection of private property rights or interests, national security, or compliance with other law. The head of the agency shall publish public notice of such closure or restriction before it is effective, unless the closure or restriction is mandated by other law.

(2) SHOOTING RANGES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency—

(i) may lease its lands for shooting ranges; and

(ii) may designate specific lands for recreational shooting activities.

(B) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Any designation under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall not subject the United States to any civil action or claim for monetary damages for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by any activity occurring at or on such designated lands.

(c) NECESSITY IN WILDERNESS AREAS.—

(1) The provision of opportunities for hunting, fishing and recreational shooting, and the conservation of fish and wildlife to provide sustainable use recreational opportunities on designated wilderness areas on Federal public lands shall constitute measures necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the wilderness area.

(2) The “within and supplemental to” Wilderness purposes, as provided in Public Law 88–577, section 4(c), means that any requirements imposed by that Act shall be implemented only insofar as they facilitate or enhance the original or primary purpose or purposes for which the Federal public lands or Federal public land unit was established and do not materially interfere with or hinder such purpose or purposes.

(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1 of each year, the head of each Federal agency who has authority to manage Federal public land on which fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting occurs shall publish in the Federal Register and submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(A) any Federal public land administered by the agency head that was closed to recreational fishing, sport hunting, or shooting at any time during the preceding year; and

(B) the reason for the closure.

(2) CLOSURES OR SIGNIFICANT RESTRICTIONS OF 640 OR MORE ACRES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Other than closures under subsection (c), the withdrawal, any change of classification, or any change of management status that effectively closes or significantly restricts 640 or more contiguous acres of Federal public land or water to access or use for fishing or hunting or activities related to fishing and hunting (or both) shall take effect only if, before the date of withdrawal or change, the head of the Federal agency that has jurisdiction over the Federal public land or water—

(i) publishes notice of the closure, withdrawal, or significant restriction;

(ii) demonstrates that coordination has occurred with a State fish and wildlife agency; and

(iii) submits to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate written notice of the withdrawal, change, or significant restriction.

(B) AGGREGATE OR CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.—If the aggregate or cumulative effect of small closures or significant restrictions affects 640 or more acres, such small closures or significant restrictions shall be subject to these requirements.

(g) AREAS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this title requires the opening of national park or national monuments under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service to hunting or recreational shooting.

(h) NO PRIORITY.—Nothing in this title requires a Federal agency to give preference to recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting over other uses of Federal public land or over land or water management priorities established by Federal law.

(i) CONSULTATION WITH COUNCILS.—In fulfilling the duties set forth in this title, the heads of Federal agencies shall consult with respective advisory councils as established in Executive Orders 12962 and 13443.

(j) AUTHORITY OF THE STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as interfering with, diminishing, or conflicting with the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of any State to manage, control, or regulate fish and wildlife under State law (including regulations) on land or water within the State, including on Federal public land.

(2) FEDERAL LICENSES.—Nothing in this title authorizes the head of a Federal agency head to require a license or permit to fish, hunt, or trap on land or water in a State, including on Federal public land in the States, except that this paragraph shall not affect the Migratory Bird Stamp requirement set forth in the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (16 U.S.C. 718 et seq.).

TITLE II—RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Recreational Shooting Protection Act”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) **NATIONAL MONUMENT LAND.**—The term “National Monument land” has the meaning given that term in the Act of June 8, 1908 (commonly known as the “Antiquities Act”; 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.).

(3) **RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.**—The term “recreational shooting” includes any form of sport, training, competition, or pastime, whether formal or informal, that involves the discharge of a rifle, handgun, or shotgun, or the use of a bow and arrow.

SEC. 203. RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management shall be open to access and use for recreational shooting, except such closures and restrictions determined by the Director to be necessary and reasonable and supported by facts and evidence for one or more of the following:

- (1) Reasons of national security.
- (2) Reasons of public safety.
- (3) To comply with an applicable Federal statute.
- (4) To comply with a law (including regulations) of the State in which the National Monument land is located that is applicable to recreational shooting.

(b) **NOTICE; REPORT.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Except as set forth in paragraph (2)(B), before a restriction or closure under subsection (a) is made effective, the Director shall—

(A) publish public notice of such closure or restriction in a newspaper of general circulation in the area where the closure or restriction will be carried out; and

(B) submit to Congress a report detailing the location and extent of, and evidence justifying, such a closure or restriction.

(2) **TIMING.**—The Director shall issue the notice and report required under paragraph (1)—

- (A) before the closure if practicable without risking national security or public safety; and
- (B) in cases where such issuance is not practicable for reasons of national security or public safety, not later than 30 days after the closure.

(c) **CESSATION OF CLOSURE OR RESTRICTION.**—A closure or restriction under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall cease to be effective—

- (1) effective on the day after the last day of the six-month period beginning on the date on which the Director submitted the report to Congress under subsection (b)(2) regarding the closure or restriction, unless the closure or restriction has been approved by Federal law; and
- (2) 30 days after the date of the enactment of a Federal law disapproving the closure or restriction.

(d) **MANAGEMENT.**—Consistent with subsection (a), the Director shall manage National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management—

- (1) in a manner that supports, promotes, and enhances recreational shooting opportunities;
- (2) to the extent authorized under State law (including regulations); and
- (3) in accordance with applicable Federal law (including regulations).

(e) **LIMITATION ON DUPLICATIVE CLOSURES OR RESTRICTIONS.**—Unless supported by criteria under subsection (a) as a result of a change in circumstances, the Director may not issue a closure or restriction under subsection (a) that is substantially similar to closure or restriction previously issued that was not approved by Federal law.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PRIOR CLOSURES AND RESTRICTIONS.**—On the date that is six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, this title shall apply to closures and restrictions in place on the date of the enactment of this title that relate to access and use for recreational shooting on National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(g) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than October 1 of each year, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

- (1) any National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management that was closed to recreational shooting or on which recreational shooting was restricted at any time during the preceding year; and
- (2) the reason for the closure.

(h) **NO PRIORITY.**—Nothing in this title requires the Director to give preference to recreational shooting over other uses of Federal public land or over land or water management priorities established by Federal law.

(i) **AUTHORITY OF THE STATES.**—

(1) **SAVINGS.**—Nothing in this title affects the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of a State to manage, control, or regulate fish and wildlife under State law (including regulations) on land or water in the State, including Federal public land.

(2) **FEDERAL LICENSES.**—Nothing in this title authorizes the Director to require a license for recreational shooting on land or water in a State, including on Federal public land in the State.

TITLE III—POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION AND FAIRNESS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act of 2012”.

SEC. 302. PERMITS FOR IMPORTATION OF POLAR BEAR TROPHIES TAKEN IN SPORT HUNTS IN CANADA.

Section 104(c)(5)(D) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1374(c)(5)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

“(D)(i) The Secretary of the Interior shall, expeditiously after the expiration of the applicable 30-day period under subsection (d)(2), issue a permit for the importation of any polar bear part (other than an internal organ) from a polar bear taken in a sport hunt in Canada to any person—

“(I) who submits, with the permit application, proof that the polar bear was legally harvested by the person before February 18, 1997; or

“(II) who has submitted, in support of a permit application submitted before May 15, 2008, proof that the polar bear was legally harvested by the person before May 15, 2008, from a polar bear population from which a sport-hunted trophy could be imported before that date in accordance with section 18.30(i) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(ii) The Secretary shall issue permits under clause (i)(I) without regard to subparagraphs (A) and (C)(ii) of this paragraph, subsection (d)(3), and sections 101 and 102. Sections 101(a)(3)(B) and 102(b)(3) shall not apply to the importation of any polar bear part authorized by a permit issued under clause (i)(I). This clause shall not apply to polar bear parts that were imported before June 12, 1997.

“(iii) The Secretary shall issue permits under clause (i)(II) without regard to subparagraph (C)(ii) of this paragraph or subsection (d)(3). Sections 101(a)(3)(B) and 102(b)(3) shall not apply to the importation of any polar bear part authorized by a permit issued under clause (i)(II). This clause shall not apply to polar bear parts that were imported before the date of enactment of the Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act of 2012.”.

TITLE IV—HUNTING, FISHING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Hunting, Fishing, and Recreational Shooting Protection Act”.

SEC. 402. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION.

Section 3(2)(B) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2602(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (v), by striking “, and” and inserting “, or any component of any such article including, without limitation, shot, bullets and other projectiles, propellants, and primers;”;

(2) in clause (vi) by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and”; and

(3) by inserting after clause (vi) the following: “(vii) any sport fishing equipment (as such term is defined in subsection (a) of section 4162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) the sale of which is subject to the tax imposed by section 4161(a) of such Code (determined without regard to any exemptions from such tax as provided by section 4162 or 4221 or any other provision of such Code), and sport fishing equipment components.”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112-444. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112-444.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 15, after “of Federal public lands,” insert “including the establishment of safe and convenient shooting ranges on such lands.”.

Page 5, line 4, strike “; or” and insert a semicolon.

Page 5, line 6, strike the period and insert “; or”.

Page 5, after line 6, insert the following:

(iii) the training of hunting dogs, including field trials.

Page 6, line 5, strike “and waters” and insert “, including Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, or lands administratively classified as wilderness eligible or suitable and primitive or semi-primitive areas.”.

Page 7, line 20, after “(16 U.S.C. 668dd),” insert “as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997.”.

Page 8, strike lines 4 through 10 and insert the following:

(C) **OTHER ACTIVITY NOT CONSIDERED.**—Federal public land management officials are not required to consider the existence or availability of recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting opportunities on adjacent or nearby public or private lands in the planning for or determination of which Federal public lands are open for these activities or in the setting of levels of use for these activities on Federal public lands, unless the

combination or coordination of such opportunities would enhance the recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting opportunities available to the public.

Page 8, line 13, strike "of" the first place it appears.

Page 8, line 15, strike "agency" and insert "agencies"

Page 9, line 3, after "Forest Service, including" insert "Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas,".

Page 9, beginning at line 18, strike "The head" and all that follows through line 21.

Page 9, strike lines 23 through page 10, line 4 and insert the following:

(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency shall use his or her authorities in a manner consistent with this Act and other applicable law, to—

(i) lease or permit use of lands under the jurisdiction of the agency for shooting ranges; and

(ii) designate specific lands under the jurisdiction of the agency for recreational shooting activities.

Page 10, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 11, line 3, and insert the following:

(e) NECESSITY IN WILDERNESS AREAS AND "WITHIN AND SUPPLEMENTAL TO" WILDERNESS PURPOSES.—

(1) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.—The provision of opportunities for hunting, fishing and recreational shooting, and the conservation of fish and wildlife to provide sustainable use recreational opportunities on designated wilderness areas on Federal public lands shall constitute measures necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the wilderness area.

(2) The term "within and supplemental to" Wilderness purposes in section 4(a) of Public Law 88-577, means that any requirements imposed by that Act shall be implemented only insofar as they do not prevent Federal public land management officials and State fish and wildlife officials from carrying out their wildlife conservation responsibilities or providing recreational opportunities on the Federal public lands subject to a wilderness designation.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) are not intended to authorize or facilitate commodity development, use, or extraction, or motorized recreational access or use.

Page 11, strike line 4 and all that follows through line 6, and insert the following:

(f) REPORT.—Not later than October 1 of every other year, beginning with the second October 1 after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each Federal agency who has

Page 11, line 9, strike "publish in the Federal Register and"

Page 11, lines 14 through 18, redesignate subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively (and conform the margins accordingly).

Page 11, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 12, line 23, and insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(g) CLOSURES OR SIGNIFICANT RESTRICTIONS OF 640 OR MORE ACRES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Other than closures established or prescribed by land planning actions referred to in subsection (d) or emergency closures described in paragraph (3) of this subsection, a permanent or temporary withdrawal, change of classification, or change of management status of Federal public land that effectively closes or significantly restricts 640 or more contiguous acres of Federal public land to access or use for fishing or hunting or activities related to fishing and hunting (or both) shall take effect only if, before the date of withdrawal or change,

the head of the Federal agency that has jurisdiction over the Federal public land—

(A) publishes appropriate notice of the withdrawal or change, respectively;

(B) demonstrates that coordination has occurred with a State fish and wildlife agency; and

(C) submits to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate written notice of the withdrawal or change, respectively.

(2) AGGREGATE OR CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.—If the aggregate or cumulative effect of separate withdrawals or changes effectively closes or significantly restricts 1280 or more acres of land or water, such withdrawals and changes shall be treated as a single withdrawal or change for purposes of paragraph (1).

(3) EMERGENCY CLOSURES.—Nothing in this Act prohibits a Federal land management agency from establishing or implementing emergency closures or restrictions of the smallest practicable area to provide for public safety, resource conservation, national security, or other purposes authorized by law. Such an emergency closure shall terminate after a reasonable period of time unless converted to a permanent closure consistent with this Act.

Page 12, after line 23, insert the following:

(3) NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM.—Nothing in this Act is intended to amend or modify the provisions of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), except as expressly provided herein.

Page 13, line 22, after "license" insert "fee,".

Page 18, after line 18, insert the following:

(j) CONTROLLING PROVISIONS.—In any instance when one or more provisions in title I and in this title may be construed to apply in an inconsistent manner to National Monument land, the provisions in this title shall take precedence and apply.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 614, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, this manager's amendment is a noncontroversial amendment to H.R. 4089 that makes several technical, clarifying, and harmonizing changes to the bill. It adds to the bill amendments that were adopted by the Natural Resources Committee when it considered several of the individual bills that are now separate titles of the Sportsmen's Heritage Act.

In addition, although I believe the original bill never allowed extractive commercial activity or motorized travel in wilderness areas, this amendment adds language that will say so explicitly.

Finally, the amendment reduces the administrative tasks faced by the agencies with regard to the format and frequency of public notice and congressional reporting requirements.

I ask for your support for this amendment, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, we do not object to this dab of lipstick on H.R. 4089.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112-444.

Mr. HOLT. 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 12, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 13, line 2 and insert the following:

(g) AREAS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this title requires the opening to hunting or recreational shooting of—

(1) a national park or national monument under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service; or

(2) a unit of the National Park System (that is not a national park or national monument) unless specifically provided by statute that such unit be open to hunting or recreational shooting.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 614, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4089 deems all Federal land open for hunting and recreational shooting unless a closure is made by the head of the agency here in Washington. The authors of the legislation intended to exempt from the bill lands under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service. I'm sure, I have it on good authority from them, from the authors, that this was their intention. However, as written, the bill only exempts national parks and national monuments. My amendment is a simple, technical correction that ensures all units of the National Park Service are included in the exemption.

The exemption language in title I is, I believe, unintentionally broad and not clear. The National Park System includes units that have a variety of designations—national seashores, national scenic trails, national battle fields, among others. The National Park System has units in urban areas, in rural areas, in suburban communities, in the East, in the West, in the center of our country.

And without this amendment, H.R. 4089 could potentially open for hunting the Paterson, New Jersey, Great Falls National Historic Park in the heart of Paterson, the third-largest city in my State. The bill could, as written, potentially allow hunting within Antietam or Manassas National Battlefields.

All units of the National Park System, like our national battlefields and military parks, are sacred ground and should be reserved for solemn contemplation of the sacrifices of our ancestors. My amendment would ensure

that the policies of the National Park Service involving firearms in areas controlled by the National Park Service stay in place.

Now, some have suggested that the historic battle reenactments constitute recreational shooting, and this, my amendment, would, they say, prevent reenacting on battlefields. Maybe my good friend from Utah doesn't know the National Park Service policy.

It's important to note that current National Park Service policy, right now, prohibits "battle reenactments and demonstrations of battle tactics that involve exchanges of fire between opposing lines or any other form of simulated warfare." I'm not aware of any problems that this sensible policy has caused.

It's important to note that there are National Park System units like Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area in Washington State, I say to my friend, the chairman, or Craters of the Moon National Preserve in Idaho that allow hunting and recreational shooting. My amendment would not affect those policies. The hunting and recreational shooting could continue in those places.

I just want to emphasize, this is a technical amendment. I'm not getting at the merits for or against the bill overall. But should this bill proceed, it would be a big mistake to say that the hunting, the recreational shooting could take place in Gettysburg and Chincoteague and any number of other places that aren't intended.

Let's ensure that, in the hurry to open all Federal lands to hunting and recreational shooting, we don't carelessly open up to gunfire consecrated grounds like the Civil War battlefields, like the parks and beaches and forests of our national recreation areas.

I urge my colleagues to support this technical correction to the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Holt amendment uses a blunderbuss and not a rifle to address the complex issue of the programs in national parks that involve shooting. This issue goes beyond sport or subsistence hunting, which are currently allowed in some park units.

In addition to national parks that allow traditional forms of hunting, the National Park Service has a historic weapons program that would be silenced, contrary to what my good friend and the author of this amendment, Mr. HOLT, says.

In 2011, more than 600 national parks participated in some form of historic weapons demonstrations. From cannons to flintlocks, the Park Service says this program is "undeniably popular with visitors" and drew just less

than a million visitors to various national parks around the country last year.

At Fort Vancouver National Park in Oregon and Washington, for example, both rangers and volunteers regularly fire muskets and cannons to demonstrate the historic role these weapons played in the history of the site.

One of the most popular public participation events in many parks involves the reenactment of historic battles. Thousands of reenactors participate. They use their own historically accurate weapons and costumes to recreate, on location, the great battles that took place at our Civil War sites. For many of those who participate or come to watch, these educational passions are the favorite of the national park events.

It was on this week, 237 years ago, that General Thomas Gage, the Royal Governor in Boston, sent his troops to confiscate the patriot weapons at Lexington and Concord. And at the Minute Man National Historic Park today, a living history event is conducted in which volunteers are permitted to bring reproductions of the flintlock muskets, pistols, and percussion cap weapons their ancestors used during the first battle for our independence.

At a time when the National Park Service is running a multibillion dollar maintenance backlog, the Holt amendment will disarm it of its real draw. So I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and to allow the Park Service to continue the tradition of educating visitors about our proud American history.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HOLT. My amendment simply ensures that nothing in this act would force hunting in the National Park Service. I really don't understand what the chairman is talking about here, because where it is allowed, it would be allowed. Where it's not allowed, it would not be allowed. It is policy of the National Park Service not to allow reenactment of battles.

□ 1610

The battle reenactments and demonstrations of battle tactics that involve exchanges of fire between opposing lines, the taking of casualties, hand-to-hand combat, et cetera, are prohibited in all parks. Park Service employees can conduct demonstrations as part of their living history program. That's done now. It would be continued under this.

What this says is, under this legislation, were it to become law, a person who wants to hunt in Gettysburg Park can't do that unless the National Park Service policy allows it. That's all this says. It extends it to all facilities of the National Park Service, not just what was specified in the bill parks and monuments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of the time.

I beg to differ. I understand where my good friend from New Jersey is coming from. I'm sure that's what his intent is, but that's not what his amendment says. His amendment says that that activity has to be provided by statute at each facility, and that's simply not the case. We haven't done that. We blanket authority give that to the National Park System to carry on what is classified as pastimes, that sort of activity. He prohibits that unless it's provided by statute. He did not offer an amendment to say we should statutize every one of those at every one of the sites. That's the flaw in the amendment. It was brought up in Rules yesterday, and yet the amendment wasn't corrected and so here we are.

Now, I understand what he's trying to do, but the amendment does not say that. So I urge defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. 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 New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-444.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 14, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 105. APPLICABILITY CONDITION.

This title shall be in effect and apply only when less than 75 percent of Federal public land is available for hunting, fishing, or recreation shooting, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

Page 18, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 204. APPLICABILITY CONDITION.

This title shall be in effect and apply only when less than 75 percent of Federal public land (as defined section 103) is available for hunting, fishing, or recreation shooting, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 614, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to emphasize the point that nearly 85 percent of

all public lands are already open for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting. Whether we are talking about Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management—including national monuments—National Park Service lands, or Forest Service lands, in each and every case the majority are open for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting.

My amendment would only trigger the provisions in title I and II of this legislation if less than 75 percent of Federal public lands are open for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting. I can't think of any other use that occurs on 75 percent of our public lands.

I understand that some individuals are upset about some specific court decision or specific local closures, but we need to keep things in perspective. Right now, more than 4 out of 5 acres are open for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting. Given that, do we really need Federal employees in D.C. making decisions about which lands to close or, worse yet, have Congress make that decision?

My State and my district are both blessed with Federal lands. Debates occur all the time about shooting ranges, and they have been very fierce, as I mentioned earlier. Local land managers have worked with local groups and communities to come up with solutions, including providing access on other Federal lands. Unless we see significant closures across the landscape, I think we should allow local managers to make local decisions based on local input.

The problem this bill claims to solve does not exist, but this amendment would allow the provisions of the bill to kick in if this problem ever actually developed.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, last year, the Bureau of Land Management decided that it would close a lot of the land it manages to shooting sports. The agency never explained why it wanted to do this, but one BLM official was quoted in a news article as stating, "It's not a safety issue; it's a social conflict issue." He elaborated by saying that urbanites "freak out" when they hear shooting.

Now, after a public outcry on this, the Interior Secretary had to send out an order telling BLM to stand down on this regulation, but the question is really: For how long?

There is nothing that prevents the Obama administration from changing its mind—say, immediately after the November election—and again seeking to arbitrarily limit shooting sports.

That's why this bill is necessary, to prevent such an arbitrary action by bureaucrats to limit recreational shooting, fishing, and hunting without justification.

The amendment by the ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands is even more arbitrary. While the amendment is drafted to appear reasonable, it is most certainly not. The devil is in the clever details. It appears to permit fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting, but in reality the amendment nullifies the actual purpose of the underlying bill to protect these activities.

First, one needs to understand that you could fit a lot of eastern States in a small fraction of our land that is BLM land. BLM controls 253 million acres of land, more than one-eighth all the land in the United States.

Second, the term "public land" used in this amendment has an expansive meaning. Legally, public land means more than national forest and BLM land. It also includes the Outer Continental Shelf. So, under this amendment, as long as fishing is allowed in any part of the ocean, no actual land need to be open to hunting; in other words, the 20 percent requirement could be satisfied in the Outer Continental Shelf.

Who hunts in the Outer Continental Shelf, Mr. Chairman?

Again, the bill we are considering today is about public land open to American people for outdoor recreation. That is a good goal. This amendment tries to hijack the bill by sending it 180 degrees from the intent of the underlying legislation.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the argument that nothing to do with hunting and shooting has happened yet but there may be a secret plan to do so after the election, that's as preposterous as it is ridiculous. The problem does not exist, and this bill would do real harm.

The example that my good friend, the chairman, used about urban encroachment and development speaks to the point that we have been trying to make in this legislation, that the greatest threat to hunting and fishing and recreational shooting is exactly that—development, privatization, and unregulated extraction—as we were talking about around the Grand Canyon and uranium mining. Those threats to our public lands are the threats and the trends and the public policy that is being promoted by the majority that will limit and deny access to public lands to hunters, fishermen, and recreational shooters.

Right now, as we stand, BLM, 245 million acres, 95 percent open to those activities; Park Service, 84 million acres, 70 percent open to those activities; fish and Wildlife, 150 million acres, 50 percent open to those activi-

ties; Forest Service, 193 million acres, 95 percent open to those activities, "those activities" being hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting.

If we want to protect access and protect the opportunities for hunters and fishermen in our public lands, I would urge the approval of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Arizona said that suggesting in my argument that there could be a change in direction after the November election—and I'll paraphrase. He said that's preposterous. It may be. But I would just remind my colleagues that in a situation here several weeks back when it was not supposed to be recorded, our President was talking to the President of Russia.

□ 1620

This was recorded on an open mike when he was talking to the President, and again I'll paraphrase. He said, After the election, I'll have more flexibility on missile defense.

Now, on that issue, keep in mind, he had already given up the missile defense in Eastern Europe. Why would he want to have more flexibility for the defense of our country? The issue there is flexibility. And the issue is, if the President is going to use flexibility in that context, couldn't you apply the same flexibility to something that he has already done this year that has been reversed?

So I don't think it is preposterous. The flexibility issue, I believe, is going to be an issue that is going to be talked about a lot between now and November, and it could apply to a great deal of policies that we could be considering in this House. This is one of them because the administration has already said that these activities should make BLM lands off limits to target shooting. I don't know why that same principle could not be applied if the President has more flexibility after the election.

So I urge the defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-444.

Mr. PETERS. 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 title III.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 614, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to support my amendment, which strikes a bailout that was slipped into this bill for 41 wealthy sport hunters who want to import polar bear trophies taken during hunts in Canada.

Polar bears were listed as threatened in May of 2008 by the Bush administration's Fish and Wildlife Service, which prohibited their importation as trophies. This protection was not implemented overnight. Trophy hunters were warned. They were warned by Federal agencies and hunting associations for more than a year that the final listing would cut off imports immediately. The Hunting Report told its readers in 2007:

The bottom line is, no American hunter should be putting hard, non-returnable money down on a polar bear hunt at this point.

These individuals knowingly assumed the risk that their trophies might not be approved for importation, and they decided to hunt and to kill these beautiful, threatened creatures anyway.

While it is too late to save these bears, passing this bill creates a perverse incentive for trophy hunters to rush to hunt any species soon to be protected under the Endangered Species Act because their friends in Congress will simply bail them out after the fact. We cannot allow that, and that's why I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

I am deeply surprised the gentleman from Michigan would, in fact, propose the amendment. He has one of these bears from his State, and a lot of hunters are not wealthy. This is a legal activity in Canada. They hunted these bears prior to 2008 and even prior to 2007. These are dead bears, and they are sitting in Canada. When the hunters hunted legally, the Canadian Government gave them the proper authority to do so, and it helped the native villages. Right now, there are more bears in Canada than there ever has been in history.

Hunting is a vital process of the management of game, and these people in-

cluded two wounded veterans. They were in Iraq, in that heated area, and the one dream they had when they got back was to be able to go and hunt a polar bear. I can understand that. They shot their trophies legally and with the blessing of the Canadian Government and the local province, and then they expected to be able to return those bears, those hides—and yes, even sometimes the bodies—back home for the proper display of their hunts. To say now you can't import something when a bear was declared threatened by, yes, the Bush administration—and wrongfully so—the bears are not threatened. There are more bears now than there were in 1964. I'm probably the only individual on this floor who had ever shot a polar bear in '64, and I'm certainly not rich.

I am suggesting that this amendment is ill-placed, poorly thought out, and improper. I want those people who did things legally by the nation of our neighbors and blessed by the province to be able to bring those trophies back home, as they have the right to do. Yet the act of a Secretary of the Interior took that away from them arbitrarily. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. I rise in strong support of the Peters amendment. Without this amendment, the bill will undermine the protections currently in place for wild species under the Endangered Species Act and under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

In this case, the hunters who chose to kill these polar bears knew they were taking a risk. They had good information that polar bears would be listed as an endangered, threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, and they acted contrary to it. They were repeatedly warned by Federal agencies and hunting associations that the final listing would cut off imports immediately, and they had well over a year's notice. Despite this knowledge, hunters still chose to shoot and kill polar bears at a time when the species faced severe hardship and when legal protections were imminent.

We should not encourage a small group of people to take conscious risks and then turn around and ask Congress for relief. If we pass this bill without the Peters amendment, we are, in effect, telling hunters that, when species are likely candidates for the endangered or threatened lists, kill them as soon as you can, and then Congress will give you special treatment and exempt you from the law.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Peters amendment. Don't destroy the long-term conservation efforts for the special interests of a few trophy hunters who are hoping for home decor and bragging rights. I will strongly oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am surprised by my good friend from California. He has a lot of polar bears in California.

It's really amazing to me. He doesn't know squat about the population of polar bears. Then to imply that these are rich people who are going to hunt, now isn't that class warfare? It's exactly a Democrat position, the idea that now this is wrong when they did it legally. These bears weren't all killed in 2008, and they weren't all warned in 2008. I want to see the documentation of that. You know there's no documentation. That's the same propaganda you get out of the same groups of people that are anti-gun and anti-hunting.

Yes, step up to the plate. That's what you are. I know that. Yet to take that right away from an American citizen, especially from a wounded veteran—two of them—is wrong. It is wrong when this is legally taking species arbitrarily by a Secretary of the Interior who is saying now they're threatened. By the way, the administration does not oppose this bill. That's amazing. The Fish and Wildlife Service actually supports this bill now because we made some changes that they wanted, and we gave them, specifically recognizing that it does not encourage hunting.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Notwithstanding the statement of my very good friend from Alaska, I rise in support of Mr. PETERS's amendment. It would remove a provision that would allow for the importation of polar bears killed in Canada, but the provision only benefits 41 big game hunters who shot bears in Canada prior to their listing as a species threatened with extinction.

□ 1630

These hunters were on notice that the trophies would likely not be allowed into the United States, but rushed to hunt the bears anyway. Now they're asking for Congress to bail them out by creating an exemption in the law so they can bring their trophies into the country.

It's not about the number of polar bears. It is about the underlying principle that decisions related to the protection of threatened and endangered animals should be based upon science and subject to consistent enforcement, not dependent upon the whims of Congress. Polar bears are already threatened, and the last thing they need is more trophy hunters chasing them down and shooting them. But that's exactly what will happen if this Congress demonstrates that it is fully willing to retroactively change the law in this manner to accommodate the wishes of a very small minority. It's only 41 big-game hunters but we're changing the law on their account?

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and a Federal court have rejected previous requests to import trophies after 2008. That should be the final word on the subject.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Peters amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The gentleman from Alaska has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The gentleman from Virginia has lots of polar bears in Virginia. I know it's spring-time, but I don't think there's many polar bears in Virginia.

It's strange that all three of them have said endangered species. This has nothing to do with endangered species. This is about marine mammals. Endangered species, in fact, are still imported to the United States. Hartmann's mountain zebras, yes; the African elephants, yes. We can still import those. This has to do with marine mammals.

I really can't understand because the government warns you—it's not against the law, but they warn you and you better follow it because we're warning you. That's not law. These people may have been notified there's a possibility, but they hunted under existing law, under existing permits and paid for. To take that away from them—I don't care if it's one person or 500 people or 41 people. When the law is followed and we don't follow through with it, then shame on us. These people did what was right, and legally. Now you're trying to take that right away from them.

I urge a strong resounding "no" on this amendment and vote for the people of America to have a right under the Constitution as long as they follow the law to do something that's correct and they've done that. They did everything by the law and to say now to have an amendment and say you don't have a right when they followed it correctly is shame on you.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

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

Mr. PETERS. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112-444.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that has been made in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

TITLE V—HUNTING IN KISATCHIE NATIONAL FOREST

SEC. 501. HUNTING IN KISATCHIE NATIONAL FOREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the Act of June 4, 1897 (16 U.S.C. 551), the Secretary

of Agriculture may not restrict the use of dogs in deer hunting activities in Kisatchie National Forest, unless such restrictions—

(1) apply to the smallest practicable portions of such unit; and

(2) are necessary to reduce or control trespass onto land adjacent to such unit.

(b) PRIOR RESTRICTIONS VOID.—Any restrictions regarding the use of dogs in deer hunting activities in Kisatchie National Forest in force on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be void and have no force or effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 614, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment today maintains the State of Louisiana's ability to regulate hunting within its borders. In a decision announced March 1, 2012, the Forest Service Regional Forester located way over in Atlanta, Georgia, went over the heads of the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission to forever prohibit the use of dogs to hunt deer in Kisatchie National Forest.

Deer hunting has a long and important cultural history within the State of Louisiana. When French settlers first came to Louisiana in the 18th century, Louisiana was covered by thickets and dense timber. Most of these settlers had companion dogs with them, but the most treasured were the deerhounds. The use of dogs would help the hunter drive the deer out of the forest because deer were so plentiful and provided exciting races that provided sound nourishment.

Hunting in many forms has been for decades, and continues to be, a compatible activity on the 600,000-acre Kisatchie National Forest. Oddly enough, the Regional Forester does not prohibit the use of dogs for hunting raccoon, squirrel, rabbit, and game birds.

In 2011, the Kisatchie dog deer season was only 9 days and only applies to certain ranger districts. According to communication with the Forest Service, seven southern States allow hunting on national forests within their borders. They include Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina; but in this case, not Louisiana. However, this is the first time the Forest Service has issued a ban on dog deer hunting, or hunting deer with dogs, within a specific State.

According to the Forest Service itself, they indicate that revenue generated on dog deer hunting, including expenses to care for dogs, contributes to approximately 18 to 29 direct jobs and results in roughly \$890,000 to \$1.4 million of income. By their own assessment, it is likely that some economic benefits will be lost depending on whether hunting with dogs for deer leave the area to pursue the sport elsewhere. Now this is about to kill even more jobs in Louisiana.

I would also like to emphasize that the State of Louisiana, the NRA, and

the Safari Club all support my amendment; and I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLEMING. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his talk and discussion about the long history and strong local support for this traditional form of hunting in his State.

The primary purpose of this legislation is to limit unjustified Federal bureaucratic limitations and restrictions on hunting and fishing in public lands. The circumstances that he has detailed demonstrate that his amendment fits squarely within the spirit of this bill, and I therefore support the amendment.

It is important to recognize that it is the authority of States to regulate hunting and fishing. Individual Federal agency personnel should not be substituting their opinion for the laws of the State.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman and I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fleming amendment.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There are a few points that I really believe need to be made. The decision to eliminate dog deer hunting in this forest was made only after more than half a dozen public meetings, a comment period that resulted in a 1,000 comments which were thoroughly reviewed. In fact, the policy has been amended in response to those specific local concerns.

The justification for this policy is not only to prevent trespassing, though this is one reason it is necessary. The forest has a checkerboard pattern of non-Federal lands mixed in with Federal lands. Dog deer hunting results in deer running over long distances and hunters pursuing them and at times discharging firearms on the run. In an area with private homes, the Forest Service determined that this was simply too dangerous.

The Forest Service has collected input from local residents and not hunters who fear for their safety during dog deer hunting season. To be clear, while the decision was ultimately approved by the region in Atlanta, the policy was developed by the local Forest Service staff who work on the forest.

Lastly, this amendment is redundant and wasteful because a rule already in place meets the requirements of the proposed amendment. The current rule already covers the smallest portion of forest possible because with the checkerboard lands the rule must cover the entire forest to be effective.

While public safety is the primary justification for this rule, preventing trespass is another reason for the rule and why it was put in place.

□ 1640

The Fleming amendment would throw out the current rule and then require a new rule that meets the exact same requirements. This is redundant, a waste of time and money.

Finally, according to the Forest Service, the State of Louisiana already prohibits dog deer hunting on State lands, so this is simply consistent with State policy. This amendment should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to respond to some of the statements that were made.

I received a petition of thousands of hunters from Louisiana and several States who wanted this to continue. The State, not the Federal Government, is in the best position to make this determination. By October 6, 2009, the Forest Service had received 1,237 responses to its 2009 request for comments. Of these, 320 agreed with the proposed prohibition, but 917 were against it. That's a 77 percent majority of these respondents who were actually from central Louisiana where this Kisatchie National Forest exists. During October 2011, the Forest Service received over 1,300 more comments on the original proposal and environmental analysis. All but five letters—all but five letters, Mr. Chairman—were opposed to the proposed prohibition.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, with that, I will close. The contradiction is very important.

The majority talks about local control, local control. In this instance, you have the State of Louisiana that has prevented this, that has prohibited this type of hunting on its lands, and that is a local decision to be honored, but it is okay to honor that decision, but on Federal lands we want to make an exception and set a precedent.

I would suggest that the contradiction in this amendment merits its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. FLEMING. I just want to respond, again, the people of Louisiana, the State of Louisiana has full support of doing away with this prohibition. This was a decision made by somebody in Atlanta, a Federal person, that has to do with what is really a local issue. This is a tradition that goes back 300 years, and I think it's pretty obvious that the people of Louisiana support the continuance of hunting deer with dogs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112-444.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. 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 the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE V—RECREATIONAL FISHING FOR ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS IN THE BLOCK ISLAND SOUND TRANSIT ZONE

SEC. 501. RECREATIONAL FISHING FOR ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS IN THE BLOCK ISLAND SOUND TRANSIT ZONE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (a), the Secretary shall not prohibit fishing for Atlantic Striped Bass in the Block Island Sound transit zone.

(b) EXCEPTION.—This subsection does not limit the authority of the Secretary to establish seasonal or other temporary limitations on fishing that are specifically necessary for the conservation and management of Atlantic striped bass.

(c) BLOCK ISLAND SOUND TRANSIT ZONE DEFINED.—In this subsection the term “Block Island Sound transit zone” means the area of the exclusive economic zone within Block Island Sound, north of a line connecting Montauk Light, Montauk Point, New York, and Block Island Southeast Light, Block Island, Rhode Island; and west of a line connecting Point Judith Light, Point Judith, Rhode Island, and Block Island Southeast Light, Block Island, Rhode Island.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 614, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The purpose of my amendment is straightforward. It opens an area off the coast of my congressional district to recreational striped bass fishing. Striped bass is a popular game fish in New York, and it has long been an important catch for recreational fishermen.

The formation of an exclusive economic zone creates a small area of Federal water in the Block Island Sound between Montauk Point, Block Island, and Point Judith, Rhode Island. In most cases, when you hit the 3-mile point off the coast of the United States, you have nothing but Federal waters in front of you. This is not always the case for New York fishermen. Because of this geographic anomaly, when the ban on striped bass fishing in the EEZ went into effect, it closed off 60 percent of New York's traditional striped bass recreation areas from fishing, according to the Montauk Boatmen and Captains Association in my district.

The National Marine Fisheries Service recognized this unique area by designating it as a transit area where it was permissible for fishermen to possess striped bass on their boats as long as no fishing takes place while in the EEZ and the boat is in continuous transit.

My amendment goes one step further and opens this relatively small area to recreational fishing. Mindful of the need for reasonable conservation, my amendment also provides the ability to take necessary action for conservation purposes.

Fishermen and charter captains on Long Island know these waters better than anybody in Washington, D.C. Our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about government regulation stifling the economic recovery. After all, fishermen are job creators, both directly and indirectly. They hire crews, they have their boats maintained by mechanics, and they sell their catch to restaurants where Americans go out to eat.

I support fisheries management that is designed to promote robust health of fish stocks; but as the representative for the oldest fishing ports in New York State, I also support sensible efforts to ensure our fishermen can fish and earn their livelihood.

Opening this area would once again give recreational fishermen access to fruitful striped bass fishing grounds. Charter boats will benefit, as will the ports they depart from as people come to the east end of Long Island for great fishing. This will promote job growth and tourism, which is the goal of the underlying legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act's authorization of appropriations expired at the end of fiscal year 2011. Our Fisheries Subcommittee intends to hold hearings on the reauthorization in this Congress. I think this would be the appropriate time and place to have the discussion which is the subject of your amendment.

I understand the gentleman's concern. Believe me, we have heard other concerns on the Atlantic striped bass. If the gentleman would withdraw his amendment, I can assure him that he will get a full hearing on the content of his amendment in our committee this year.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I very much appreciate that offer, Mr. Chairman. Based on your assurance that this issue will receive a full hearing in your committee or in the appropriate subcommittee, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I thank you very much, and we will work together on

this. This is a larger issue, and I certainly understand the gentleman's concerns.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I appreciate that.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HEINRICH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112-444.

Mr. HEINRICH. 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 the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—ACTIVITIES WITHIN WILDERNESS OR LAND MANAGED AS WILDERNESS

SEC. 501. ACTIVITIES WITHIN WILDERNESS OR LAND MANAGED AS WILDERNESS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to allow oil and gas development, mining, logging, or motorized activity on Federal public land (as defined in section 103) designated or managed as wilderness.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 614, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As an active sportsman, I am proud to introduce this amendment today. It's likely that you have heard claims from some of my colleagues across the aisle that the manager's amendment will resolve the concerns that I have raised today, thus making this amendment redundant or duplicative.

Mr. Chairman, that is simply not the case. While I appreciate the intent of my colleagues to resolve my concerns, their language is still far too vague and needs additional clarification. As an avid hunter, I strongly support increasing access to public lands for hunting and fishing, but we can achieve that goal without eliminating the very wilderness protections that have protected some of the best wildlife habitat and, I would add, some of the best backcountry hunting opportunities in our Nation.

The bill under consideration today would eliminate long-standing protections against logging, oil and gas drilling, and motor vehicle use in wilderness areas. It would create a loophole in the Wilderness Act for anything that would provide "opportunities for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting."

Under the Wilderness Act, land managers are allowed to act in ways that are otherwise not allowed in wilderness areas if the action is necessary for "the minimum requirements necessary" for the administration of the area. In practice, the minimum requirements necessary language and standard means

that land managers can use motorized vehicles, chainsaws, even helicopters in extreme emergencies, to fight fires, rescue stranded hikers, or remove downed trees from trails that threaten human safety.

This bill would extend that kind of exemption to any action that would "provide an opportunity for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting." This means that activities otherwise not allowed in a wilderness area, like motor vehicle use, would now have to be permitted if it could be used to facilitate everyday activities like hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting.

Now, the manager's amendment includes language intended to address these concerns by providing that these provisions "are not intended to authorize or facilitate commodity development, use, or extraction, or motor recreational access or use."

□ 1650

Whether or not that's the bill's intention, the language in the bill allows for that possibility, and saying that wasn't the intent doesn't change what the language allows.

In contrast, my amendment provides that nothing in this bill "shall be construed to allow" these otherwise prohibited activities in wilderness areas.

"Intended" versus "shall"; there's a very powerful legal difference. And sportsmen across the country recognize this difference and support my amendment. In the last few hours, I've heard from countless supporters in my own State, including the New Mexico Wildlife Federation; the New Mexico chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers; Dona Ana County Associated Sportsmen; the High Desert Sportsmen; and the Sportsmen Concerned of Northeast New Mexico, just to name a few. And nationally, we've heard from groups like the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership and TU.

As the bill's sponsors say that they are not trying to create sweeping exemptions to the Wilderness Act, I have no doubt that they'll support my amendment, as it clearly eliminates these loopholes that were unintentionally included. As a back-country hunter, I know how valuable wilderness is to hunters and anglers, and I hope my colleagues will continue to support protecting wildlife habitat in wilderness areas and vote for my amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the section of the bill that applies to hunting and fishing was derived from the excellent bill offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

I have noticed that whenever a new wilderness designation bill is intro-

duced and a subcommittee hearing is held, the sponsor testifies that his or her bill will not reduce hunting because hunting is clearly permitted in wilderness areas. And they are right. Nevertheless, when an anti-hunting group went to court recently to block hunting in the wilderness section of a national forest in Michigan, the Forest Service had to waste a great deal of time and money justifying the hunting permitted there.

Similarly, anti-hunting groups have sought to use the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, to entangle the land management agencies in NEPA's briar patch when the agencies allow hunting activity on public land.

Now I'm certain that many would agree that hunting and fishing on public land is not a new major Federal action that requires a full environmental impact statement. However, to protect sportsmen and to prevent the waste of resources that occurs when conservation dollars are diverted into defending against nuisance lawsuits, Dr. BENISHEK's provision gives clear statutory support to legitimacy of hunting on public land.

I believe from the beginning that the Benishek bill dealt only with hunting and fishing. It never authorized motorized travel or extractive industries, even though some environmental activist groups quickly made that accusation. But to allay any genuine concerns people may have, we worked closely with a wide variety of conservation groups and decided to include in the manager's amendment that was passed a provision that explicitly states that the relevant portions of the bill—and I quote from the amendment—"are not intended to authorize or facilitate commodity development, use, or extraction, or motorized recreational access or use."

With that very direct language I can honestly say that virtually every major conservation group that is not anti-hunting supports the bill. I don't have time to read the whole list, but it does include the NRA, the Safari Club, the bipartisan Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance, Ducks Unlimited, the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

I think H.R. 4089, as amended, now has the support of the entire range of sportsmen conservation groups, ranging from those considered conservative to those that are quite liberal, and do not believe that the wilderness section needs any additional changes as offered by the gentleman from New Mexico's amendment. Again, the concerns expressed by the gentleman from New Mexico in support of his amendment, in my view, are unfounded. This bill deals squarely with hunting and fishing, and does not authorize motorized travel or mining or other such activities in wilderness areas.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague and a sportsman from northern New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Heinrich amendment. I want to thank my friend from New Mexico for offering this amendment to ensure protection of our wilderness areas.

Mr. Chairman, I'm from the western United States. I'm a supporter of the Second Amendment. I'm a hunter and a fisherman. My family raised sheep and cattle on allotments in the area where I was raised. Like many other States in the West, we New Mexicans value our access to public lands for hunting, fishing, shooting, and recreational enjoyment.

I want to make sure that everyone understands that I'm not opposed to everything in this bill, but I do have specific concerns with language that would create a loophole in the Wilderness Act. This loophole would undermine one of the defining laws that protects public lands and enables us to have pristine areas to hunt and fish—critical areas that should be preserved for future generations to enjoy. But this bill, as written, walks a dangerous line.

I had concerns in the committee markup of this bill, and today I reiterate these concerns—specifically, language in section 104(e), which opens up for interpretation to allow motorized vehicles in sensitive areas, completely undermining the effort to protect these lands. Although the majority has indicated that they have clarified this problem in the manager's amendment, a CRS memorandum issued on April 13, 2012, on section 104(e) of H.R. 4089 has confirmed my concern that section 104(e) "could lead to motorized use and inappropriate commercial activities in congressionally designated wilderness areas."

If the majority states through the manager's amendment that their intention is not to open up these areas for motorized vehicles, then let's make absolutely sure that this won't happen. I'm glad to see that they see that there's a problem as well, which they've attempted to address. But sadly, the loosely worded amendment won't accomplish that.

Let's work together to support the Heinrich amendment and make sure that we don't combine motorized vehicles with Second Amendment issues in our backyards. I think we can work together, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

It appears that the argument here is that this language that we've drafted and passed in the manager's amendment is not strong enough. Let me read the appropriate words. In the gen-

tleman from New Mexico's amendment, he focuses on the word "shall," which, of course, is strong language. But he follows it with "construed." Now that raises the question: Construed by whom?

Our language says very specifically that nothing in here is intended to authorize or facilitate any use regarding extraction. We say that is the intent of the law, very specifically. When you use the word "construed," I dare say, Mr. Chairman, that you are opening this wide open to litigation, and maybe that is exactly what the gentleman intended.

By focusing on "shall," he doesn't focus on the operative word, which is "construed," because "construed" can be used by anybody outside in order to sue. We say very specifically, even though we didn't think extraction was part of this underlying legislation, but we say very specifically it's not intended to reinforce it. That was the reason that provision was in the manager's amendment.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat the Heinrich amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

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

Mr. HEINRICH. 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 New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112-444.

Ms. FOXX. 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 the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—DESIGNATION OF AND RESTRICTIONS ON NATIONAL MONUMENTS

SEC. 501. DESIGNATION OF AND RESTRICTIONS ON NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—No national monument designated by presidential proclamation shall be valid until the Governor and the legislature of each State within the boundaries of the proposed national monument have approved of such designation.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not implement any restrictions on the public use of a national monument until the expiration of an appropriate review period (determined by the Secretary of the Interior) providing for public input."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 614, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As a supporter of H.R. 4089, I rise today to offer an amendment which would add another positive element to the underlying bill. As we all know, the Antiquities Act of 1906 authorized the President to designate national monuments on Federal lands that contain historical landmark structures or other objects of scientific interest. This authority has been used 129 times by Presidents of both parties to designate such national treasures as the Grand Canyon, Grand Teton, and the Statute of Liberty.

As someone who has enjoyed and appreciated some of the abundance of national and historic treasures throughout this great country, I greatly appreciate the importance of protecting these great blessings.

Currently, a National Monument designation allows for the President to impose unilaterally further restrictions on the use of Federal lands.

□ 1700

Since State authorities are more aware of the local circumstances affecting land restrictions, I've offered a standalone bill, H.R. 302, the Preserve Land Freedom for Americans Act of 2011, which is the model for the amendment I'm now offering. This amendment provides for accountability to the process by requiring the approval of the legislatures and Governors of the States where monuments are proposed to be located.

With the Federal Government currently owning such a large percentage of land throughout the country, particularly in Western States, it's important to respect and allow State policymakers to weigh in on proposed Federal land restrictions within their borders.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you.

I rise in strong opposition to the Foxx amendment and in strong support of National Monuments and the Antiquities Act.

Following in the footsteps of Teddy Roosevelt, who used the Antiquities Act to protect the Grand Canyon, and Franklin Roosevelt, who used it to protect the Grand Tetons, 16 Presidents—eight Republicans and eight Democrats—have used the Antiquities Act to designate approximately 130 national monuments. In more recent history, President George W. Bush used the Antiquities Act to designate the largest national monument in history. Most recently, President Obama used the act to preserve an enormously popular Fort Monroe in Virginia.

These special places might have been lost to development or destruction had the 59th Congress not authorized Presidents to use the Antiquities Act to

move quickly to protect Federal lands. And that is worth repeating: the Antiquities Act allows designation of national monuments on Federal land only. This land is already owned by the Federal Government, and the claim that there is some kind of land grab going on is totally false.

Our national monuments are valuable, popular tourism designations that serve as powerful economic engines. Headwaters Economics studied 17 large national monuments in 11 Western States and found positive impacts to the local economies and employment.

The Antiquities Act has served present and future generations well for more than a century, and there is no need for this amendment. National monuments do not harm private property rights, and they improve the quality of life in surrounding communities while saving historic, cultural, and scenic resources for our children and our grandchildren.

The Foxx amendment will hobble the Antiquities Act by giving States a veto over Federal designations on Federal land, and it would do so based on criticisms of the act and of national monuments that are patently false. The Foxx amendment should be defeated, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 40 seconds to the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Unfortunately, the Antiquities Act is used more often than not to circumvent Congress' role in setting land-use policy or to foreclose any opportunity for anyone outside the White House to participate in whatever decision they make, including the affected States.

Unlike America in 1906 when the antiquities law was first enacted, we now have an elaborate set of other laws and regulations that require deliberative processes and procedures to be followed before any significant action affecting public lands can be taken.

I think the gentlelady's amendment would improve this process, and with that, I support it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 2¾ minutes.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Chairman, for more than a century, the Antiquities Act has given American Presidents the authority to protect some of our Nation's most important and threatened places. Across my State of New Mexico, we see the benefit of the Antiquities Act.

Bandelier National Monument, Carlsbad Caverns National Park, White Sands National Monument, and El Morro National Monument were all originally protected through the Antiquities Act.

Research done last year by the New Mexico Green Chamber of Commerce

shows that New Mexico's 10 national monuments established through the Antiquities Act account for 1.3 million annual tourist visits and \$54 million in annual tourist spending supporting over 1,000 New Mexico jobs. In the last few weeks, countless New Mexicans, including sportsmen like myself, have asked President Obama to designate a new national monument to protect the Organ Mountains outside of Las Cruces, New Mexico.

We are calling on our President to protect our vulnerable natural and cultural resources in southern New Mexico through the Antiquities Act. This amendment offered by my colleague from North Carolina would take that power away from the President and give State legislatures the power to make decisions about public lands that belong to all Americans.

The Antiquities Act was specifically designed to allow Presidents to respond quickly to protect places in the national interest. Had the Antiquities Act been written with the language of this amendment, the Grand Canyon could have been overrun by sprawl, ancient cliff dwellings and the Petrified Forest National Park might have been looted, and the Arches National Park wouldn't even exist.

An additional concern is that several State legislatures only meet for a limited number of days each year and can't respond to urgent threats to public lands. In my State, we only meet for 60 days in odd years and 30 days in even years.

The Foxx amendment would prevent archeological, cultural, and historical sites from receiving the urgent protections they need. It also doesn't recognize that the United States has vast areas of unincorporated territory that is not under the jurisdiction of any State legislature.

President George W. Bush used the Antiquities Act to protect lands and waters in unincorporated Federal areas, including the Marianas Trench Marine and Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monuments.

National monuments should not be a partisan issue. After being signed into law by President Theodore Roosevelt, 16 Presidents of both parties—eight Republicans and eight Democrats—have used this act to protect federally owned lands and waters to better protect America's treasures for future generations. And by attaching this divisive issue to this bill, the chances of a Presidential veto are greatly increased. I hope that we would refrain from endangering the pro-sportsmen portions of this bill with controversial issues like this one. As an active sportsman, I strongly support the Antiquities Act, and I ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The Antiquities Act, which allows the President to designate land, is a legislative function

that the legislature gave to the executive branch in Teddy Roosevelt's time. Whether it is good or not, it is wrong for Congress to give its authority away to the executive branch. At the time, it was thought it would be okay because there were specific restrictions placed on it. You had to have a specific something geological, historical that you were going to preserve, it was in imminent danger, and it was going to be on the smallest area possible in the debate that was going to be over a couple hundred acres.

The unfortunate thing is Presidents since that time have used this monument designation power for political purposes in areas quite bigger than that. The last monument that was created in my State was not a couple of hundred acres. It was bigger than the States of Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island combined. It was done at 9 a.m. after the Governor of the State was told about it at 2 a.m., after having been told earlier that day that nothing was going to happen in this kind of an area.

Earlier this year, the Antiquities Act was used at Fort Monroe when the entire delegation and the local community were in favor of it. When ours was done, as well as many of the other Antiquity Act monuments were done, the local delegation was not in favor of it, and the Governor was not in favor of it. Everyone was not in favor of it. What the Foxx amendment tries to do is simply say, look, if you're going to keep this power with the President, at least get a check-and-balance system somewhere. Let's make sure that the local people, the State people are fine with this designation before the President does something arbitrarily, capriciously and, unfortunately too often, for political reason.

Keep the legislative power where it should be, with the legislature, but at least if you're not going to do that, at least put some kind of logical check and balance on the system.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 45 seconds remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank my two colleagues who spoke on behalf of my amendment and tell them how much I appreciate their comments. And I want to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, if designating an area as a national monument would be such a good idea, there shouldn't be any problem with gaining approval from the legislatures and the Governor, and it takes no power away from the President but allows the States to be part of the process.

I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Foxx Amendment that seeks to gut the Antiquities Act and add unnecessary bureaucracy.

The Antiquities Act is the best tool in the tool box for saving America's heritage—cultural and natural—to respect what our ancestors set aside for us and to inspire, educate, and enlighten future generations.

The Antiquities Act has a long bipartisan tradition. After being signed into law by President Theodore Roosevelt, sixteen presidents of both parties—8 Republicans and 8 Democrats—have used this Act to protect federally-owned lands and waters to better protect America's treasures for future generations.

The Antiquities Act protects our national heritage. Sites like the Statue of Liberty, the Grand Canyon, and the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument and in my Congressional District the Pinnacles National Monument have been protected through the Antiquities Act.

The Foxx Amendment seeks to gut the Antiquities Act. The Antiquities Act was specifically designed to allow presidents to respond quickly to protect places in the national interest.

Had the Antiquities Act been written with Rep. Foxx's language, the Grand Canyon would be overrun by sprawl, ancient cliff dwellings and the Petrified Forest National Park would have been looted, and Arches National Park wouldn't even exist.

The Foxx Amendment is poorly conceived. Several state legislatures only meet every other year and are ill-equipped to respond to urgent threats to public lands.

The Foxx Amendment would prevent archaeological, cultural and historical sites from receiving the urgent protections they need from looting, vandalism or other threats.

The Foxx Amendment also doesn't recognize that the United States has vast areas of unincorporated territory that is not under the jurisdiction of a state legislature.

President George W. Bush used the Antiquities Act to protect lands and waters in unincorporated federal areas including the Marianas Trench Marine and Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monuments.

Stand up for our National Parks and our national heritage. Vote against the Foxx Amendment to H.R. 4089.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, 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. 4089) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1753

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-446) on the resolution (H. Res. 619) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4348) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 9, SMALL BUSINESS TAX CUT ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-447) on the resolution (H. Res. 620) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for domestic business income of qualified small businesses, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 614 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. 4089.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1755

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. 4089) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112-444 by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-444 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. HEINRICH of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 8 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) 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 152, noes 260, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—152

Ackerman	Dold	Larsen (WA)
Baldwin	Doyle	Larson (CT)
Bass (CA)	Edwards	Lee (CA)
Becerra	Ellison	Levin
Berkley	Engel	Lewis (GA)
Berman	Eshoo	Lipinski
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Loebsack
Bonamici	Fattah	Loftgren, Zoe
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Lowe
Brown (FL)	Gerlach	Lujan
Butterfield	Gonzalez	Lynch
Capps	Green, Al	Maloney
Capuano	Grijalva	Markey
Carnahan	Gutierrez	Matsui
Carney	Hahn	McCarthy (NY)
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	McCollum
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Chu	Heinrich	McNerney
Cicilline	Higgins	Meeks
Clarke (MI)	Himes	Miller (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Hinchesy	Miller, George
Clay	Hinojosa	Moran
Cleaver	Hirono	Murphy (CT)
Clyburn	Holt	Nadler
Cohen	Honda	Neal
Connolly (VA)	Hoyer	Olver
Conyers	Israel	Pallone
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Pascrell
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	(TX)	Paulsen
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Davis (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Peters
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kaptur	Platts
DeLauro	Keating	Polis
Deutch	Kildee	Price (NC)
Dingell	Kucinich	Quigley
Doggett	Langevin	Reichert

Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Viscosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger

Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark

Sutton
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Viscosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews
Braley (IA)
DeGette
Dicks
Finler
Fincher
Frank (MA)

Garamendi
King (IA)
Marino
McCauley
McGovern
McIntyre

McMorris
Rodgers
Napolitano
Paul
Pitts
Rangel
Slaughter

□ 1818

Messrs. PERLMUTTER, BRADY of Texas, GRIMM and WITTMAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CLYBURN, AL GREEN of Texas, LUJÁN and PLATTS 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. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 158, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 158, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) 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 138, noes 279, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—138

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Biggert
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
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
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzel
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
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 (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster

Ackerman
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Ciocline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings

Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Biggert
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
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
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann

Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fores
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kieme
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis

Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell

NOES—279

Shimkus Thompson (MS) Welch
Shuler Thompson (PA) West
Shuster Thornberry Westmoreland
Simpson Tiberi Whitfield
Smith (NE) Tipton Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ) Turner (NY) Wittman
Smith (TX) Turner (OH) Wolf
Southerland Upton Womack
Stearns Walberg Woodall
Stivers Walden Yoder
Stutzman Walsh (IL) Young (AK)
Terry Walz (MN) Young (FL)
Thompson (CA) Webster Young (IN)

McCollum Price (NC) Sires
McDermott Quigley Smith (WA)
McGovern Reichert Speier
McNeerney Reyes Stark
Meeks Richardson Sutton
Miller (NC) Richmond Tierney
Miller, George Rothman (NJ) Tonko
Moore Roybal-Allard Towns
Moran Ruppertsberger Tsongas
Murphy (CT) Rush Van Hollen
Nadler Sánchez, Linda Velázquez
Neal T. Visclosky
Oliver Sanchez, Loretta Wasserman
Pallone Sarbanes Schultz
Pascarell Schakowsky Waters
Pastor (AZ) Schiff Watt
Pelosi Schwartz Waxman
Perlmutter Scott (VA) Welch
Peters Scott, David Wilson (FL)
Pingree (ME) Serrano Woolsey
Platts Sewell Yarmuth
Polis Sherman

Price (NC) Sires
Quigley Smith (WA)
Reichert Speier
Reyes Stark
Richardson Sutton
Richmond Tierney
Rothman (NJ) Tonko
Roybal-Allard Towns
Ruppertsberger Tsongas
Rush Van Hollen
Sánchez, Linda Velázquez
T. Visclosky
Sanchez, Loretta Wasserman
Sarbanes Schultz
Schakowsky Waters
Schiff Watt
Schwartz Waxman
Scott (VA) Welch
Scott, David Wilson (FL)
Serrano Woolsey
Sewell Yarmuth
Sherman

Thompson (CA) Webster
Thompson (MS) West
Thompson (PA) Westmoreland
Thornberry Whitfield
Tiberi Wilson (SC)
Tipton Wittman
Turner (NY) Wolf
Turner (OH) Womack
Upton Woodall
Walberg Yoder
Walden Young (AK)
Walsh (IL) Young (FL)
Walz (MN) Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews Hoyer Pitts
Cohen Marino Rangel
Dicks McIntyre Slaughter
Filner Napolitano Sullivan
Fincher Paul

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews Lowey Pitts
Dicks Marino Rangel
Filner McIntyre Schweikert
Fincher Napolitano Slaughter
Kaptur Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1822

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. Stated for: Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 159, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) 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 155, noes 262, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—155

Ackerman Courtney Himes
Baldwin Crowley Hinchev
Bartlett Cummings Hinojosa
Bass (CA) Davis (CA) Hirono
Becerra Davis (IL) Holt
Berkley DeGette Honda
Berman DeLauro Hoyer
Bishop (NY) Deutch Israel
Blumenauer Doggett Jackson (IL)
Bonamici Dold Jackson Lee
Bono Mack Doyle (TX)
Brady (PA) Edwards Johnson (GA)
Braley (IA) Ellison Johnson (IL)
Brown (FL) Engel Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield Eshoo Keating
Campbell Farr Kildee
Capps Fattah Kucinich
Capuano Fitzpatrick Langevin
Carnahan Frank (MA) Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN) Frelinghuysen Larson (CT)
Castor (FL) Fudge Lee (CA)
Chu Gallegly Levin
Cicilline Garamendi Lewis (GA)
Clarke (MI) Gonzalez Lipinski
Clarke (NY) Green, Al Loeb sack
Clay Grijalva Lofgren, Zoe
Cleaver Guterrez Lynch
Clyburn Hahn Maloney
Cohen Hanabusa Markey
Connolly (VA) Hastings (FL) Matsui
Conyers Higgins McCarthy (NY)

NOES—262

Adams Farenthold Lummis
Aderholt Flake Lungren, Daniel
Akin Fleischmann Mack
Alexander Fleming Manzullo
Altmire Flores Marchant
Amash Forbes Matheson
Amodei Fortenberry Foy
Austria Foy Franks (AZ)
Baca Gardner McCaul
Bachmann Gardner McClintock
Bachus Garrett McCotter
Barletta Gerlach McHenry
Barrow Gibbs McKeon
Barton (TX) Gibson McKinley
Bass (NH) Gingrey (GA) McMorris
Benishek Gohmert Rodgers
Berg Goodlatte Meehan
Biggart Mica Gosar
Bilbray Gowdy Michaud
Bilirakis Granger Miller (FL)
Bishop (GA) Graves (GA) Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT) Graves (MO) Miller, Gary
Black Green, Gene Mulvaney
Blackburn Griffin (AR) Murphy (PA)
Bonner Griffith (VA) Myrick
Boren Grimm Neugebauer
Boswell Guinta Noem
Boustany Guthrie Noem
Brady (TX) Hall Nugent
Brooks Hanna Nunes
Buchanan Harper Nunnelee
Bucshon Harris Olson
Buerkle Hartzler Owens
Burgess Hastings (WA) Palazzo
Burton (IN) Hayworth Paulsen
Calvert Heck Pearce
Camp Heinrich Pence
Canseco Hensarling Peterson
Cantor Herrera Beutler Petri
Capito Hochul Poe (TX)
Cardoza Holden Pompeo
Carney Huelskamp Posey
Carter Huizenga (MI) Price (GA)
Cassidy Hultgren Quayle
Chabot Hunter Rahall
Chaffetz Hurt Rehberg
Chandler Issa Renacci
Coble Jenkins Ribble
Coffman (CO) Johnson (OH) Rigell
Cole Johnson, Sam Rivera
Conaway Jones Roby
Cooper Jordan Roe (TN)
Costa Kelly Rogers (AL)
Costello Kind Rogers (KY)
Cravaack King (IA) Rogers (MI)
Crawford King (NY) Rohrabacher
Crenshaw Kingston Rokita
Critz Kinzinger (IL) Rooney
Cuellar Kissell Ros-Lehtinen
Kline Kline Roskam
Labrador Kline Ross (AR)
Lamborn Labrador Ross (FL)
Lance Lamborn Royce
Dent Landry Runyan
DesJarlais Lankford Ryan (OH)
Diaz-Balart Latham Ryan (WI)
Dingell Latham Scalise
Donnelly (IN) Latta Schilling
Dreier Latta Schmidt
Duffy Lewis (CA) Schock
Duncan (SC) LoBiondo Schrader
Duncan (TN) Long Scott (SC)
Eilmlers Lucas Scott, Austin
Emerson Luetkemeyer Sensenbrenner
Lujan Lujan Sessions

Lummis Lungren, Daniel E. Mack
Manzullo Marchant Matheson
McCarty (CA) McCaul
McClintock McCotter
McHenry McKeon
McKinley McMorris
Rodgers Meehan
Mica Gosar
Michaud Miller (FL)
Miller (MI) Miller, Gary
Mulvaney Murphy (PA)
Myrick Neugebauer
Noem Nugent
Nunes Nunnelee
Olson Owens
Palazzo Paulsen
Pearce Pence
Peterson Petri
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 (AR) Ross (FL)
Royce Runyan
Ryan (OH) Ryan (WI)
Scalise Schilling
Schmidt Schmidt
Schock Schrader
Scott (SC) Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner Sessions

□ 1826

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. Stated for: Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 160, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HEINRICH The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) 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 176, noes 244, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—176

Ackerman Connolly (VA) Green, Al
Baca Conyers Grijalva
Baldwin Cooper Gutierrez
Bass (CA) Costa Hahn
Bass (NH) Costello Hanabusa
Becerra Courtney Hastings (FL)
Berkley Critz Hayworth
Berman Crowley Heinrich
Blumenauer Cummings Higgins
Bonamici Davis (CA) Himes
Bonamici Davis (IL) Hinchev
Bono Mack DeFazio Hinojosa
Brady (PA) DeGette Hirono
Braley (IA) DeLauro Holden
Brown (FL) Holt
Butterfield Dicks Honda
Campbell Dingell Hoyer
Capps Doggett Israel
Capuano Dold Jackson (IL)
Cardoza Doyle Jackson Lee
Carnahan Edwards (TX)
Carney Ellison Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN) Johnson (IL)
Castor (FL) Engel Johnson, E. B.
Chu Eshoo Kaptur
Cicilline Farr Keating
Clarke (MI) Fattah Kildee
Clarke (NY) Frank (MA) Kind
Clay Fudge Kind
Cleaver Garamendi Kucinich
Clyburn Gibson Langevin
Cohen Gonzalez Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone

Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden

Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul

McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
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
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews
Finler
Fincher
Landry

Marino
McIntyre
Napolitano
Paul

Pitts
Rangel
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1830

Mr. MORAN changed his vote from
“no” to “aye.”

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

Stated for:
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 161, I was
away from the Capitol due to prior commit-
ments to my constituents. Had I been present,
I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms.
FOXX) 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 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 223, noes 198,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

AYES—223

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodi
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold

Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodi
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon

Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
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
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Ackerman
Altmire
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch

Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doid
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee

Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markley
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Reyes

NOES—198

NOES—244

Richardson	Scott, David	Towns
Richmond	Serrano	Tsongas
Rothman (NJ)	Sewell	Van Hollen
Roybal-Allard	Sherman	Velázquez
Ruppersberger	Shuler	Visclosky
Rush	Simpson	Walz (MN)
Ryan (OH)	Sires	Wasserman
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
T.	Smith (WA)	Waters
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Watt
Sarbanes	Stark	Waxman
Schakowsky	Sutton	Welch
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	West
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Schwartz	Tierney	Woolsey
Scott (VA)	Tonko	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	McIntyre	Rangel
Filner	Napolitano	Slaughter
Fincher	Paul	
Marino	Pitts	

□ 1835

Messrs. ENGLE, COHEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 162, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the 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. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, 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. 4089) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, and, pursuant to House Resolution 614, he 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 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

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

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

Mr. TIERNEY. I am.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tierney moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4089 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—FIGHTING OIL MARKET SPECULATION, MANIPULATION, AND FRAUD
SEC. 501. FIGHTING OIL MARKET SPECULATION, MANIPULATION, AND FRAUD.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodities Futures Trading Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out enforcement, examinations, market surveillance and analytics, registration, and compliance activities which relate to oil and refined product commodity markets fraud, excessive speculation, and market manipulation.

TITLE VI—PROHIBITION ON HUNTING AND FISHING TRIPS PAID FOR BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS OR REGISTERED FOREIGN AGENTS
SEC. 601. PROHIBITION ON HUNTING AND FISHING TRIPS PAID FOR BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS OR REGISTERED FOREIGN AGENTS.

Nothing in this Act shall allow, promote, or facilitate hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting activities on Federal lands that are financed by a registered lobbyist or registered foreign agent for the benefit of a Member of Congress.

□ 1840

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer the final amendment to this bill that will give the Commodity Futures Trading Commission the resources that it needs to put an end to the speculation that’s contributing to the high gas prices across this country.

I want to be clear, Mr. Speaker. This amendment will not kill the bill, and it will not send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the House will still immediately proceed to a vote on the final passage of the bill, and it should.

Today, estimates are that speculators control about 70 percent of the open interest in commodity markets—70 percent. Ten years ago, that number was 30 percent. These speculators are essentially large banks and hedge funds. They never actually take control of the oil. They just flip the contract, make their quick profit and get out. However, unlike trading in the stocks and bonds of traditional companies, commodities speculation has a real and big-time effect on Americans, driving up the price of gas. It creates undue hardship whether you are a business owner with a small fleet of cars or a large fleet of trucks or are a homeowner who is taking his kids back and forth to school, doing your shopping or running other essential errands. This hurts people who are already struggling to make ends meet.

According to one official at the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, speculation, not the lack of production, has increased the price of gas by at

least 22 percent, and today’s price is about 56 cents per gallon. This should be unacceptable to every single one of us.

What is needed is for this Congress to make a concerted effort to curb speculation and Wall Street’s anticonsumer practices. This amendment will do just that, and it will ensure that the CFTC has the resources it needs to carry out investigations and enforcement activities to stop commodity markets fraud, excessive speculation, and market manipulation. The President has recognized the importance of this issue and, just today, has called on this Congress to support increases in the CFTC’s surveillance and enforcement staff for oil futures market trading, among other things. We need to give American families the confidence that illegal manipulation, fraud, and market rigging are not contributing to these high prices of gas. This House can take the first step and approve this amendment.

The amendment also ensures that nothing in the underlying bill allows, promotes, or facilitates lobbyist junkets related to hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting activities on Federal lands. I would hope that we can all agree that this bill should not create any loopholes to lobbying restrictions that are currently in place, and my amendment simply ensures that this is the case. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

The rise in gas prices is not about Obama. It is about OPEC, oil companies, and Wall Street speculators. Wall Street speculators now control nearly two-thirds of the oil market, up from 11 percent just 10 years ago. Morgan Stanley now controls 15 percent of New England’s home heating oil. Experts tell us that as much as 25 percent of the price of oil is the result of excessive speculation, which means American drivers are paying a “Wall Street speculation tax” of more than 70 cents on every gallon of gasoline.

Wall Street speculators have turned oil markets into a crude oil casino. Yet the majority actually tried to cut funding for our Wall Street cops, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, by \$30 million. Today, Mitt Romney called the administration’s efforts to crack down on speculation a gimmick. But protecting Wall Street consumers, protecting Main Street consumers over Wall Street isn’t a gimmick; it should be a given.

This motion will give the CFTC speculation cops the resources and personnel they need to put an end to Wall Street’s gasoline gambling. Vote “aye” on the Tierney motion to crack down on Wall Street speculation and to protect Main Street consumers. Vote “aye” on the Tierney motion to recommit.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a week ago or so, I said history repeats itself, and I said it in the context that we keep hearing the same arguments over and over and over again. History repeats itself, it seems like, every week. So here we are, right back from the district work period, and history is repeating itself all over again. We are talking about energy, but we are talking about the wrong solutions.

The reason we have an energy problem in this country is due to the policies in this administration. It is so simple. We've said it over and over. In fact, last year, we addressed the issue of trying to increase the energy supply, American energy, to create American energy jobs. Unfortunately, only a few on that side voted with us. Now the other side is starting to get it. Energy matters in this country. We need to develop American energy. This is history repeating itself. Vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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—ayes 160, noes 261, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

AYES—160

Ackerman	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Baldwin	Clay	Engel
Bass (CA)	Cleaver	Eshoo
Becerra	Clyburn	Farr
Berkley	Cohen	Fattah
Berman	Connolly (VA)	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Fudge
Blumenauer	Costello	Garamendi
Bonamici	Courtney	Gonzalez
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Herrera, Gene
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Butterfield	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Capps	DeFazio	Hahn
Capuano	DeGette	Hanabusa
Carnahan	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Carney	Deutch	Higgins
Carson (IN)	Dicks	Himes
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Hinchee
Chu	Doggett	Hinojosa
Ciilline	Doyle	Hirono
Clarke (MI)	Edwards	Holden

Holt	McNerney	Schakowsky	Price (GA)	Scalise	Thornberry
Honda	Meeks	Schiff	Quayle	Schilling	Tiberi
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Schwartz	Reed	Schmidt	Tipton
Israel	Miller, George	Scott (VA)	Rehberg	Schock	Turner (NY)
Jackson (IL)	Moore	Scott, David	Reichert	Schrader	Turner (OH)
Jackson Lee	Moran	Serrano	Renacci	Schweikert	Upton
(TX)	Murphy (CT)	Sewell	Ribble	Scott (SC)	Walberg
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Sherman	Rigell	Scott, Austin	Walden
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Sires	Rivera	Sensenbrenner	Walsh (IL)
Jones	Oliver	Smith (WA)	Roby	Sessions	Walz (MN)
Kaptur	Pallone	Speier	Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Webster
Keating	Pascrell	Stark	Rogers (AL)	Shuler	West
Kildee	Pastor (AZ)	Sutton	Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Westmoreland
Kucinich	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Simpson	Whitfield
Langevin	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)	Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Tierney	Rokita	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Larson (CT)	Pingree (ME)	Tonko	Rooney	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Lee (CA)	Polis	Towns	Ros-Lehtinen	Southerland	Womack
Levin	Price (NC)	Tsongas	Roskam	Stivers	Woodall
Lewis (GA)	Quigley	Van Hollen	Ross (AR)	Stutzman	Yoder
Lipinski	Rahall	Velázquez	Ross (FL)	Sullivan	Young (AK)
Loeb sack	Reyes	Visclosky	Royce	Terry	Young (FL)
Lofgren, Zoe	Richardson	Wasserman	Runyan	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Lowe y	Richmond	Schultz	Ryan (WI)		
Lujan	Rothman (NJ)	Waters			
Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Watt			
Maloney	Ruppersberger	Waxman			
Markey	Rush	Welch			
Matsui	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)			
McCarthy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda	Woolsey			
McCollum	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth			
McDermott	Sarbanes				
McGovern					

NOES—261

Adams	Dent	Jordan
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Kelly
Akin	Diaz-Balart	Kind
Alexander	Dold	King (IA)
Altmire	Donnelly (IN)	King (NY)
Amash	Dreier	Kingston
Amodei	Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)
Austria	Duncan (SC)	Kissell
Baca	Duncan (TN)	Kline
Bachmann	Ellmers	Labrador
Bachus	Emerson	Lamborn
Barletta	Farenthold	Lance
Barrow	Fitzpatrick	Landry
Bartlett	Flake	Lankford
Barton (TX)	Fleischmann	Latham
Bass (NH)	Fleming	LaTourette
Benish ek	Flores	Latta
Berg	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Biggert	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bilbray	Foxx	Long
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Bishop (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (UT)	Gallegly	Lummis
Black	Gardner	Lungren, Daniel
Blackburn	Garrett	E.
Bonner	Gerlach	Mack
Bono Mack	Gibbs	Manzullo
Boren	Gibson	Marchant
Boswell	Gingrey (GA)	Matheson
Boustany	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McCaul
Brooks	Gosar	McClintock
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McCotter
Buchanan	Granger	McHenry
Buchson	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Buerkle	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Burgess	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Burton (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Calvert	Grimm	Meehan
Camp	Guinta	Mica
Campbell	Guthrie	Michaud
Canseco	Hall	Miller (FL)
Cantor	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Capito	Harper	Miller, Gary
Cardoza	Harris	Mulvaney
Carter	Hartzler	Murphy (PA)
Cassidy	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Chabot	Hayworth	Neugebauer
Chaffetz	Heck	Noem
Chandler	Heinrich	Nugent
Coble	Hensarling	Nunes
Coffman (CO)	Herger	Nunnelee
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Olson
Conaway	Hochul	Owens
Cooper	Huelkamp	Palazzo
Costa	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen
Crawford	Hultgren	Pearce
Crenshaw	Hunter	Pence
Critz	Hurt	Peterson
Cuellar	Issa	Petri
Culberson	Jenkins	Platts
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Poe (TX)
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo
	Johnson, Sam	Posey

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	McIntyre	Rangel
Filner	Napolitano	Slaughter
Fincher	Paul	
Marino	Pitts	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1904

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 163, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 163 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Motion to recommit H.R. 4089—Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 274, nays 146, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—274

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

Denham	King (IA)	Ribble
Dent	King (NY)	Richmond
DesJarlais	Kingston	Rigell
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Rivera
Donnelly (IN)	Kissell	Roby
Dreier	Kline	Roe (TN)
Duffy	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rogers (MI)
Ellmers	Landry	Rohrabacher
Emerson	Lankford	Rokita
Farenthold	Latham	Rooney
Fitzpatrick	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Flake	Latta	Roskam
Fleischmann	Lewis (CA)	Ross (AR)
Fleming	Lipinski	Ross (FL)
Fiorde	LoBiondo	Royce
Forbes	Loebsock	Ryunyan
Fortenberry	Long	Ryan (OH)
Fox	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Schilling
Gallely	Lungren, Daniel	Schmidt
Garamendi	E.	Schock
Gardner	Mack	Schrader
Garrett	Manzullo	Schweikert
Gerlach	Marchant	Scott (SC)
Gibbs	Matheson	Scott, Austin
Gibson	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Sessions
Gohmert	McClintock	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McCotter	Shuler
Gosar	McHenry	Shuster
Gowdy	McKeon	Simpson
Granger	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Graves (GA)	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Green, Gene	Meehan	Southerland
Griffin (AR)	Mica	Stearns
Griffith (VA)	Michaud	Stivers
Grimm	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Guinta	Miller (MI)	Sullivan
Guthrie	Miller, Gary	Terry
Hall	Mulvaney	Thompson (CA)
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (MS)
Harper	Myrick	Thompson (PA)
Harris	Neugebauer	Thornberry
Hartzler	Noem	Tiberi
Hastings (WA)	Nugent	Tipton
Hayworth	Nunes	Turner (NY)
Heck	Nunnelee	Turner (OH)
Heinrich	Olson	Upton
Hensarling	Owens	Walberg
Herger	Palazzo	Walden
Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Walsh (IL)
Hochul	Pearce	Walz (MN)
Holden	Pence	Webster
Huelskamp	Peterson	Welch
Huizenga (MI)	Petri	West
Hultgren	Platts	Westmoreland
Hunter	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Hurt	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Posey	Wittman
Jenkins	Price (GA)	Wolf
Johnson (OH)	Quayle	Womack
Johnson, Sam	Rahall	Woodall
Jones	Reed	Yoder
Jordan	Rehberg	Young (AK)
Kelly	Reichert	Young (FL)
Kind	Renacci	Young (IN)

NAYS—146

Ackerman	Conyers	Hastings (FL)
Baldwin	Courtney	Higgins
Bass (CA)	Crowley	Himes
Becerra	Cummings	Hinche
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Berman	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Holt
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Honda
Bonamici	Deutch	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Israel
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	Dold	(TX)
Capps	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Carnahan	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Engel	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Keating
Chu	Farr	Kildee
Ciilline	Fattah	Kucinich
Clarke (MI)	Fudge	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Gonzalez	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Green, Al	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lee (CA)
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Levin
Cohen	Hahn	Lewis (GA)
Connolly (VA)	Hanabusa	Lofgren, Zoe

Lowey	Pelosi	Sewell
Lujan	Perlmutter	Sherman
Lynch	Peters	Sires
Maloney	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)
Roby	Polis	Speier
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stark
McCarthy (NY)	Quigley	Sutton
McCollum	Reyes	Tierney
McDermott	Richardson	Tonko
McGovern	Rothman (NJ)	Towns
McNerney	Royal-Allard	Tsongas
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Miller (NC)	Rush	Velázquez
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Visclosky
Moore	T.	Wasserman
Moran	Sanchez, Loretta	Schultz
Murphy (CT)	Sarbanes	Waters
Nadler	Schakowsky	Watt
Neal	Schiff	Waxman
Oliver	Schwartz	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Pascarell	Scott, David	Yarmuth
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Marino	Pitts
Filner	McIntyre	Rangel
Fincher	Napolitano	Slaughter
Frank (MA)	Paul	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1913

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 164, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during roll-call vote No. 164 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on Final Passage of H.R. 4089—Sportsmen's Heritage Act of 2012.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3288

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 3288.

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

There was no objection.

JOBS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the March employment report continues to show us that the Federal Government has not been helping to create jobs in our economy. A Wall Street Journal editorial from April 9 highlighted a few examples from the report. Here is one extremely startling statistic:

The labor force participation rate—or the share of civilian population that is working—dropped again to 63.8 percent. In March, 2009, a month after the \$800 billion stimulus passed Congress, the labor participation rate was nearly 2 percentage points higher, at 65.6 percent.

This is a prime example that continuously throwing money of hard-

working taxpayers that the Federal Government takes from them at the problem will not solve it. We need real solutions that will stimulate our proven economic engine: small businesses. That's why I support the Small Business Tax Cut Act that will help 22 million hardworking small businesses retain and create more jobs.

THE MEDICARE ORTHOTICS AND PROSTHETICS IMPROVEMENT ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to H.R. 1959, the Medicare Orthotics and Prosthetics Improvement Act. This legislation has been designed to improve the quality of orthotic and prosthetic care and reduce fraudulent payments for orthotic and prosthetic services under Medicare.

This legislation would require the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to reimburse only those providers who have been accredited or licensed in orthotics and prosthetics. The legislation also would require CMS to report to Congress on its enforcement efforts to reduce fraud and abuse. Fraud and abuse contributes not only to rising costs, but it also harms patients, particularly when medically necessary devices are arbitrarily provided or without qualified providers.

Mr. Speaker, we need to collectively look at ways to create savings by combating waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare system. This legislation will enhance patient care and ensure that Medicare fraud is addressed, particularly when the fiscal solvency of the Medicare program is in question.

GSA GONE WILD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's party time at the General Services Administration. The good times rolled in Las Vegas, where the GSA spent over \$800,000 of tax money on a conference for 300 people. Now we learn that back in 2010, the GSA employees escaped their marble palace in Washington, D.C., and jetted off to Sin City for a taxpayer-funded high-dollar boondoggle. This so-called "conference" included a \$31,000 reception, fancy awards, food, wine, lavish suites with bubbling hot tubs, clowns, swanky parties, iPod giveaways, and even a mind reader. This kind of lavish spending is exactly why Americans don't trust the government with their money.

But what happened in Vegas just didn't stay in Vegas. A GSA whistleblower snitched off the bureaucrats-gone-wild bunch. Now, GSA officials are folding their cards, cashing in their chips, and resigning. The day of reckoning has come for those who played

poker with the people's money. Public servants should not be public serpents. These government bureaucrats should pay out of their own pockets the taxpayer money they squandered in Las Vegas.

And that's just the way it is.

TROUBLE BETWEEN SUDAN AND SOUTH SUDAN

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the situation went from bad to worse in Sudan, with military clashes erupting into a full-blown crisis along the troubled border region between Sudan and South Sudan. President al-Bashir, wanted by the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity, is directing this new round of bombings that threaten a fragile peace.

It was less than a year ago that the world's youngest nation was born in South Sudan, and already we are witnessing the disturbing return to violence and inhumanity.

Last month, I was joined by 67 Members of my House colleagues on a letter to President Obama expressing our serious concern for the ongoing human calamity in Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me just say half a million lives hang in the balance as the Sudanese Government attacks rebels and civilians alike with a methodical strategy to stop cultivation and block humanitarian aid. We must not idly stand by. So I call on my colleagues to sponsor legislation by our colleagues—Representatives CAPUANO, MCGOVERN, WOLF—and myself who have recently introduced H.R. 4169, the Sudan Peace, Security, and Accountability Act, to update the diplomatic tools in Sudan to reflect the current dangers on the ground.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
Washington, DC, March 30, 2012.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, DC.

CC:
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton
Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: We write to express our serious concern for the ongoing human calamity in the Sudanese border areas of South Kordofan, Blue Nile, Abyei, and Darfur, and in Yida and other refugee camps in South Sudan. The Sudanese government continues to target civilian populations through the use of indiscriminate bombing and the denial of humanitarian aid. These actions have left nearly half a million people at risk of starvation in the coming weeks and months. Sudan's impending rainy season, and resulting poor road conditions, will soon make the delivery of any aid extremely difficult, if not impossible.

We applaud your recent actions demonstrating your firm commitment to ending the humanitarian crisis in South Kordofan and the border areas. There are two upcoming opportunities for the United States to further support a humanitarian agenda em-

phasizing aid delivery and access to these border areas. First, the United States will assume the rotating presidency of the United Nations Security Council in April and secondly, the United States will host the G8 summit at Camp David in May.

We hope that the United States will take advantage of both platforms by demanding full and unimpeded access for international humanitarian organizations to the border regions, while calling on Khartoum to agree to a concrete timeline to implement the United Nations-African Union-League of Arab States Tripartite Proposal. Specifically, we request that the United States ensure that Sudan and South Sudan are placed as a priority on the U.N. Security Council agenda during the U.S. presidency. These efforts will complement and further advance the message on Sudan you delivered this week to Chinese President Hu Jintao during your bilateral meeting in Seoul.

Khartoum's notorious ability to delay and its failure to honor agreements suggest that a more robust, consistent and coordinated approach is needed to protect the lives of vulnerable populations. We have seen such sustained international coordination led by the United States in both negotiating the Comprehensive Peace Agreement signed in 2005, and in helping to implement the successful South Sudan referendum in 2011.

Now is the time to act. Affected areas of South Kordofan and Blue Nile reached emergency levels of food insecurity in March, and the situation has continued to deteriorate. This is one level short of famine. The remaining areas within South Kordofan, as well as much of Blue Nile state, are facing crisis levels of food insecurity.

Recognizing the concrete steps your Administration has taken to spare the lives of vulnerable populations and prevent further conflict, we ask that you use the upcoming opportunities at the United Nations Security Council and the G8 summit in May to leverage multilateral pressure on the Government of Sudan and its supporters. We appreciate your ongoing commitment to that goal.

Respectfully Yours,

Barbara Lee, Michael E. Capuano, James P. McGovern, Al Green, Karen Bass, G.K. Butterfield, Judy Chu, Wm. Lacy Clay, James E. Clyburn, Keith Ellison, Bob Filner, and Howard L. Berman.

André Carson, Yvette D. Clarke, Emanuel Cleaver, Elijah E. Cummings, Chaka Fattah, Marcia L. Fudge, Raúl M. Grijalva, Sheila Jackson Lee, Rick Larsen, John W. Olver, Lucille Roybal-Allard, and Robert C. Scott.

Terri A. Sewell, Michael M. Honda, Hank Johnson, John Lewis, Cedric L. Richmond, Gregorio Sablan, David Scott, Bennie G. Thompson, Edolphus Towns, Frederica S. Wilson, John Conyers Jr., and Laura Richardson.

Corrine Brown, Jackie Speier, Peter A. Defazio, Melvin L. Watt, Lynn C. Woolsey, Donna M. Christensen, Alcee L. Hastings, Maxine Waters, Pete Stark, Carolyn B. Maloney, Aaron Schock, and Donna F. Edwards.

Maurice D. Hinchey, Russ Carnahan, Zoe Lofgren, Lois Capps, Michael H. Michaud, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Stephen F. Lynch, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Brad Sherman, Sam Farr, Jesse L. Jackson Jr., and Danny K. Davis.

Steve Cohen, Jan Schakowsky, Chris Van Hollen, Jerrold Nadler, Charles Rangel, Marcy Kaptur, James P. Moran, and Steve Israel.

□ 1920

WE CAN DO BETTER

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I truly believe we can do better. I join my colleague from Texas to speak and raise the question of: What was the GSA, the General Services Administration, thinking? There are a lot of good workers and we should not attribute to them bad acts, but it was such poor judgment—\$800,000 to be spent recklessly on party hearty.

But I also want to raise the question of the contracts that the GSA sends out. In the instance of the stimulus dollars, my Federal building has been rehabbed under the stimulus moneys to create jobs, and we can't get the contractor, Gilbane, to address the question of diversity in the workforce or diversity in contractors. What a terrible shame. There has been some hard work and some attention, but not the hard press that should come about when you seek fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to mention the fact that I'm supporting Mr. COURTNEY's bill, of Connecticut, because it is a shame to double, triple the interest rates on loans that college students need to provide for their education.

Finally, I want to say that NASA has sent the *Discovery* to the Smithsonian. I want a shuttle in Houston, and we're never giving up until we get it. We are the historic home for the shuttle.

HUNGER AND THE RYAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in tonight's Democratic Special Order, we will be highlighting the severe and immoral cuts made to antihunger and nutrition programs in the House Republican budget.

Right now, millions of American families and children are suffering from food insecurity. As the map here clearly shows, food hardship is a national tragedy. It is present in each and every congressional district. The districts that are highlighted in pink and in red have the most food hardships, while the districts in yellow are not far behind. Districts highlighted in blue have the lowest food hardship, but the national average is that nearly one in five Americans struggles with food hardship. Simply put, they are at risk of going hungry.

According to a study done by the Center for Budget Policy and Priorities, the Republican budget, composed by Chairman PAUL RYAN and endorsed by Presidential candidate Mitt Romney, would "impose extraordinary cuts in programs that serve as a lifeline for

our Nation's poorest and our most vulnerable citizens." Not the least of these are America's critical antihunger initiatives like food stamps and the Women, Infants and Children, or WIC, program, all of which the Ryan Republican budget threatens to slash by as much as 19 percent.

That means, for example, that over 8 million men, women, and children could be cut from food stamps, and 2½ million pregnant and post-partum women, infants and children may be slashed from the WIC program. The Ryan budget slashes these antihunger initiatives while preserving subsidies for Big Oil, tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. It is a reverse Robin Hood budget that, in the words of Robert Greenstein, the head of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, would "likely produce the largest redistribution of income from the bottom to the top in modern U.S. history, and likely increase poverty and inequality more than any other budget in recent times and possibly in the Nation's history."

As many religious and ethical observers have noted this week, the decisions made in this budget are antithetical to our basic moral values. Last Friday, 60 Catholic leaders and theologians wrote a letter to Chairman RYAN arguing that his budget was "morally indefensible and betrays Catholic principles of solidarity, just taxation, and a commitment to the common good. A budget that turns its back on the hungry, the elderly, and the sick while giving more tax breaks to the wealthiest few can't be justified in Christian terms."

This Ryan Republican budget is particularly cruel when you consider the scale of need in the current economy where 13 million are unemployed and one in six are living below the official poverty line.

As another group of Christian leaders, the Circle of Protection, has urged, Congress should "give moral priority to programs that protect the life and the dignity of poor and vulnerable people in these difficult times."

Our antihunger initiatives like food stamps and WIC are just such programs. Tonight, I'm proud to be joined by my colleagues. We will discuss the profound impact the Ryan-Romney Republican budget will have on these programs.

With that, I am so pleased to ask my colleague from California (Mr. FARR), who is the ranking member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, to continue our dialogue for this evening.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I call you Chair because you were chair when I was on the committee, and I always respect your leadership in this field.

As was stated, I am ranking member of the House Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee, and that is responsible for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration. The entire budgets of those administrations are bigger than

the budget of all of California. It is a very important program, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture is responsible for food policy. Most of our food policy in the United States is about health care. It's about feeding people and assisting those who don't have adequate access to fresh fruits and vegetables through creation of farmers markets and things like that.

I'm here tonight because I'm deeply disturbed by the attention and sort of the media satisfaction that some are getting when they hear about the Ryan budget cut, squeeze, and trim; and I want to talk tonight a little bit not only to the families that receive the benefits but to the farmers who grow the food in this country.

The Ryan budget is one you ought to look at before you leap, because if you look at it in detail, you will find that it has a lot to do with knowing about the price of everything and the cost of everything, but very little about knowing the value of what these programs are all about.

Look, food in America is very important, and we wouldn't be having all these health care debates and issues if it weren't for the issues of health care. Health care begins with food. If you're going to grow healthy people, it has to do with what they eat, and we also know it has to do with the exercise that they participate in.

Of about a \$100 billion budget, \$65 billion of that is in food and nutrition. It's about feeding people. We feed a lot of people in the government. We certainly feed everybody in the military. We feed people in public institutions. We feed children in schools, and we also give families a choice of what they want to buy with the old food stamp program, now known as the SNAP program, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

In my district, one out of every five families is receiving this assistance. And what do they do with that? They can buy, because we produce so much fresh fruits and vegetables, a much healthier diet than they would have otherwise. Indeed, if we're going to prevent illness in America, we have to keep people healthy.

Who grows this food? Who produces this food? It's the farmers of America. They don't give it away. We buy it from them.

A huge percentage of the income to farmers in this country comes from the food they produce for our institutional feeding and for our health care programs. The Ryan budget devastates that. He cuts, squeezes, and trims the farmers in this country, the growers, the people that create the food security in America.

So look before you leap. This budget does a lot more harm than good.

□ 1930

And, frankly, the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program is a very good program. We even have spouses and children of military families that

are receiving this because at some locations the pay isn't great enough to be able to give them all of the nutritional foods that they need.

So if we're going to grow a healthy America, we've got to keep this program, and we've got to avoid falling in love with the Ryan budget which will do everything but create a healthier, safer, sounder and more fiscally capable government. I urge the defeat of that budget and the support of the American farmers.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from California. And as this is, as I said, an issue that is coast to coast, I'd like to recognize our colleague from Massachusetts, someone who has been an unbelievable champion of eliminating hunger in the United States, JIM MCGOVERN from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague from Connecticut for her passion and for her leadership on this issue, and for reminding us all of a terrible truth, and that is, there is not a single community in the United States of America that is hunger-free; that there are millions of our fellow citizens, men, women and children of every age and every background you can imagine, who are hungry or who are food insecure. They don't have enough to eat, can't put a nutritious meal on the table for their families. They go without meals on a regular basis.

This is happening in the United States of America, the richest country on this planet; and every one of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, should be ashamed of that fact.

I tell people all the time that hunger is a political condition. We have the food. We have this incredible natural resource in this country that we're able to produce enough food to be able to feed our population. We have this incredible agriculture community, wonderful farmers from coast to coast who can grow our food. And yet millions of our citizens go without.

We have the food, we have the infrastructure, we know what to do. We have everything but the political will to eradicate hunger in America.

Now, look, we all agree that we have a problem with our debt, and we need to get our budget under control. But it's hard to believe that the first place the Republicans are looking to balance the budget are on the backs of the poor and the most vulnerable in this country, on the backs of people who are hungry, because tomorrow in the Agriculture Committee, following in line with the Ryan budget, the Republican leadership is going to ask that the Agriculture Committee cut \$33 billion out of the SNAP program.

That's how they're going to balance the budget. First thing out of the box, going after the SNAP program, a program that has worked to keep millions of people not only out of hunger, but out of poverty.

I will insert an article into the RECORD that appeared in The New York

Times talking about how the SNAP program has prevented millions of Americans from going into poverty.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 9, 2012]

FOOD STAMPS HELPED REDUCE POVERTY RATE, STUDY FINDS

(By Sabrina Tavernise)

WASHINGTON.—A new study by the Agriculture Department has found that food stamps, one of the country's largest social safety net programs, reduced the poverty rate substantially during the recent recession. The food stamp program, formally known as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, reduced the poverty rate by nearly 8 percent in 2009, the most recent year included in the study, a significant impact for a social program whose effects often go unnoticed by policy makers.

The food stamp program is one of the largest antipoverty efforts in the country, serving more than 46 million people. But the extra income it provides is not counted in the government's formal poverty measure, an omission that makes it difficult for officials to see the effects of the policy and get an accurate figure for the number of people beneath the poverty threshold, which was about \$22,000 for a family of four in 2009.

"SNAP plays a crucial, but often underappreciated, role in alleviating poverty," said Stacy Dean, an expert on the program with the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, a Washington-based research group that focuses on social programs and budget policy.

Enrollment in the food stamp program grew substantially during the recession and immediately after, rising by 45 percent from January of 2009 to January of this year, according to monthly figures on the U.S.D.A. Web site. The stimulus package pushed by President Obama and enacted by Congress significantly boosted funding for the program as a temporary relief for families who had fallen on hard times in the recession.

But the steady rise tapered off in January, when enrollment was down slightly from December, a change in direction that Ms. Dean said could signal that the recovery was having an effect even among poor families.

The program's effects have long been known among poverty researchers, and for Ms. Dean, the most interesting aspect of the report was the political context into which it was released.

In a year of elections and rising budget pressures, social programs like food stamps are coming under increased scrutiny from Republican legislators, who argue that they create a kind of entitlement society.

In an e-mail to supporters on Monday, Representative Allen B. West, a Florida Republican, called the increase in food stamp use a "highly disturbing trend." He said that he had noticed a sign outside a gas station in his district over the weekend alerting customers that food stamps were accepted.

"This is not something we should be proud to promote," he said.

Kevin W. Concannon, the under secretary of agriculture for food, nutrition and consumer services, argued that since the changes to the welfare system in the 1990s, the food stamp program was one of the few remaining antipoverty programs that provided benefits with few conditions beyond income level and legal residence.

"The numbers of people on SNAP reflect the economic challenges people are facing across the country," Mr. Concannon said. "Folks who have lost their jobs or are getting fewer hours. These people haven't been invented."

The study, which examined nine years of data, tried to measure the program's effects

on people whose incomes remained below the poverty threshold. The program lifted the average poor person's income up about six percent closer to the line over the length of the study, making poverty less severe. When the benefits were included in the income of families with children, the result was that children below the threshold moved about 11 percent closer to the line.

The program had a stronger effect on children because they are more likely to be poor and they make up about half of the program's participants.

"Even if SNAP doesn't have the effect of lifting someone out of poverty, it moves them further up," Mr. Concannon said.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take on a myth that some of my Republican friends have been propagating that somehow the SNAP program is a wasteful program. I've heard over and over and over again that the amount we've spent on SNAP has risen over the last decade. It has, in part, because we've gone through a terrible economic crisis. More and more of our fellow citizens have fallen into poverty, have had to rely on SNAP.

CBO tells us that they expect what we spend on SNAP to go down as the economy gets better. And this is a social safety net. This is a program that provides protection for people when they hit difficult economic times. So that is why spending has increased. It has nothing to do with fraud or waste or abuse.

In fact, the GAO and the USDA have reported time and time again that SNAP is one of the most efficiently run programs in the Federal Government. Less than 3 percent error rate, and that includes people who get underpaid what they're entitled to.

I dare anybody here to find me a program at the Pentagon that has such a low error rate in terms of the utilization of taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is this: what we're talking about here is not just a program, is not just numbers. We're talking about people. We're talking about our neighbors. And we're talking about not just people who are unemployed. We're talking about working people. Millions of working families benefit from SNAP. They're out there working trying to make ends meet, but they don't earn enough. So because of that, we have this program called SNAP to help them get by and to put nutritious food on the table for their children.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk all we want about our budgetary problems. I want to close with this. You know, people say to me, well, we can't afford to spend any more on hunger programs because, you know, things are tough and the budget need to be tight.

But I would counter, Mr. Speaker, by saying we can't afford not to. There is a cost to hunger in America and that cost we all pay for: avoidable health care costs, lost productivity in the workplace. Children who go to school without enough to eat can't learn in school. That all adds up. That is a huge cost of billions and billions of dollars that we all have to pay. And that

doesn't even count what we invest in programs like SNAP and WIC and other programs designed to provide nutrition and food for our fellow citizens.

So I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the battle against hunger has historically been a bipartisan one. We've been able to come together, Republicans and Democrats, and be able to stand together to support programs that provide a circle of protection for our most vulnerable citizens.

And all of a sudden, you know, my Republican colleagues and some of the Presidential candidates are using hunger as a wedge issue, calling President Obama the Food Stamp President. Well, I'm proud that in this country we care about our fellow citizens, especially when they fall on hard times.

I urge my colleagues, especially on the Republican side, to stand up against your leadership and to stand with us and to stand with people who are in need. If government is not there for the neediest, then I'm not sure what good government is.

Mitt Romney doesn't need government. He's a multi-millionaire. Donald Trump doesn't need government. But there are millions of our fellow citizens who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in a difficult economic situation who rely on these programs.

It is beyond comprehension to me that tomorrow the Republicans want to cut \$33 billion out of SNAP. With all the places they could look for savings, they're going after programs to help the most vulnerable. That is unacceptable and unconscionable, and I hope that the majority in this House stand up strongly against that.

I thank my colleague for yielding the time.

Ms. DELAURO. I want to thank my colleague. I want to thank him for his eloquence. He makes a comment that these are not just statistics about the people who are being hurt. The fact of the matter is last week in my district during our district break I did an event on hunger in our community. And there I had the head of the Connecticut food bank, the woman who heads up the End Hunger Connecticut organization, and a young woman, her name was Susan Vass from Branford, Connecticut. She stood up and with tears in her eyes talked about her circumstances. Out of a job, that's someone who is a former pension adviser, a human resources director who's now unemployed, cannot find a job. She has three boys 18, 14 and 10 years old. They eat—she stood there crying—one meal a day. If we cut back on food stamps, and because she's now not eligible, she can't get them because her unemployment benefits take her over the mark, so she relies on the Connecticut food bank.

And when the food stamps are cut, the food banks don't get the emergency assistance program funding. So her ability to feed her family will continue to drop.

It's wrong. It's immoral in a land that has plenty and we are bountiful with food in this Nation.

I'm so delighted that our colleague, JACKIE SPEIER from California, has joined us tonight for this conversation.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank my colleague from Connecticut, who says it better than any of us and with such great fervor and passion.

You know, there are times here when I am elated, and there are times here when I'm sick to my stomach. And tonight is one of those times when I am sick to my stomach. I am embarrassed for this body.

I'm embarrassed that the Republicans want to stuff polar bears and bring them back to this country as trophies for their hunters, but they do not want to stuff the bellies of poor kids in our country. There is something fundamentally wrong, and I say that with a great deal of remorse, really.

One in seven Americans now is in poverty and needs to be part of the SNAP program. You know, I think it's really important for us to say it over and over again. This program is not filled with fraud.

□ 1940

This program is one of the best programs that we run in the government, where the error rate and the fraud is less than 3 percent.

Now, I took the Food Stamp Challenge last fall, and I've got to tell you that it was a humbling experience. And for every one of my colleagues who want to cut the food stamp program by \$33 billion, I challenge them to live on the equivalent of food stamps for just 5 days. I did it for 5 days, \$4.50. There were no lattes in my diet. There were no Big Macs in my diet. There was no sushi in my diet. My diet consisted of canned tuna, eggs, one head of lettuce, and tomatoes for 5 days, and a can of instant coffee from the dollar store. That's how I survived. At the end of 5 days, I thought to myself, I just did this for 5 days. How about the family that needs to do this day in, day out, month after month.

What we don't say often enough on this issue is that you are only eligible for the SNAP program if you are a family of four making less than \$22,000 a year. If you make more than \$22,000 a year, you are not eligible, and the only place you can go to is the food banks.

So if we really are going to be a country that thinks about the poorest among us, we cannot reduce this program. We cannot say to those who are just making it, who are making less than \$22,000 as a family of four, that we're not going to help you put food into the bellies of your kids.

I say to my Republican colleagues: Don't do this. If you are, in fact, going to vote for this budget, then you take that Food Stamp Challenge for 5 days. You see what it's like and then vote for it. I thank my colleague.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlelady. Your words are poignant. If any-

body would like to do this, they really should walk in people's shoes and understand what it's about. When the American people say that they don't believe Congress understands what their lives are about, in this instance you bear it out. Thank you.

Someone whom we are deeply going to miss in the next session of this Congress, there hasn't been a greater champion for women and their families in the House of Representatives than our colleague from California, Congresswoman WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the Congresswoman from Connecticut for this Special Order and for those kind words. Thank you very much.

So let me see, do I have this right? Am I getting it? My colleagues on the other side of the aisle think it's just fine for the wealthiest Americans to avoid their fair share of the tax burden, that it's fine for a millionaire to pay a lower Federal tax rate than his secretary. So, tell me who they believe should make do with less in order to close the budget deficit. Just who do they want to sacrifice? Oh, of course, those Americans who are barely getting by, who can't afford life's basic necessities without support from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, to convert SNAP into a block grant program and cut nutrition assistance would cut a giant hole in the social safety net. Actually, the SNAP program is a smart investment in Americans who need help the most. It stimulates the economy, it increases worker productivity, it's good for our children's development and academic performance. At this very moment, when a harsh economy is threatening the security of so many families, we should be increasing these investments. We shouldn't be standing here talking about scaling them back.

You know, Mr. Speaker—you probably don't know—I know what it's like to be working and still not earn enough to put food on the table. I was a single mother, it was 45 years ago. I had three small children, they were 1, 3, and 5 years old. Their dad was ill, he abandoned us. I went back to work to support my family. In fact, I had to lie about my marital status and about my childcare arrangements just to get a job—remember, that was 40 years ago. My salary was not enough to provide for the four of us, so to help my paycheck cover the basic needs of my family I went on public assistance—kept on working—and that was how I could make ends meet. But without food stamps, we never could have made ends meet. As I said, my children were 1, 3, and 5 years old. They had needs.

Eventually, we got through the rough patch and my children grew up to be healthy, successful adults—they're amazing, by the way—but I don't know what we would have done or how we would have survived without that help. In fact, isn't that what America is about? When our fellow citizens fall on hard times, don't we pitch in to help

them? Well, that's not what the Republican philosophy is. It's quite different than that. I believe that they believe every man and woman is on their own and should be fending for themselves.

Millionaires and billionaires deserve the special breaks that they don't need. And more hardship for Americans who are suffering enough already is just what they have to do when they happen not to be very wealthy, or in need. It's appalling, and it's shameful.

Mr. Speaker, you don't need to have my personal experience; nobody needs to. I didn't have to do the food stamp test for 5 days—I know what it's like to live on food stamps. But we, as Americans, as Members of Congress, have to fight with everything that we have to protect the nutrition programs that we have in this country because families in America depend on it.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlelady for her words, and for her telling about her personal experience.

I'd like to recognize the vice chair of our Democratic Caucus, the Honorable XAVIER BECERRA of California—which, by the way, has over a 19 percent food hardship rate.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentlelady from Connecticut, my good friend ROSA DELAURO, for not just this evening, but for the years of work that she has done in committee, for her district, and simply in Congress as being one of the champions of not just children and families who are in need, but the fight to make sure that all these families have an opportunity to have access to real nutrition, not just food, but real nutrition. Because there were days when ketchup was called a vegetable. And some people made the fight to make sure that nutrition really meant good food, so that if we were going to help Americans—as we want to, as good Americans, help our fellow Americans—then let's be sure we're doing it so that they end up healthy Americans as well.

So we're here to talk about the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP. SNAP is the acronym. But really what we're here to talk about is the fact that in America children still go to bed hungry. It's hard to believe, but that's the way it is for too many families in our country.

Now, the numbers are staggering. They're staggering because of the Bush recession which left so many Americans in a place they had never been before. In fact, you had to go back some 70, 80 years to find a situation similar, when we saw the Great Depression in America.

We went from somewhere in the mid-twenties, some 26 million Americans who qualified for SNAP assistance, to over 45 million, around 45 million families during the height of this Great Recession who qualified for benefits. Most of those folks who qualified included families with children, or seniors, or persons with disabilities. It should come as no surprise. But what's really disheartening is to see how many

Americans live in extreme poverty, a life that most of us would not recognize.

□ 1950

When we talk about extreme poverty, we are talking about Americans who are living on less than \$2 a day. The number of Americans who were living on less than \$2 a day doubled during the Bush recession. The number of poor children who were in extreme poverty doubled during the Bush recession. Most of the people we're talking about, as my colleagues have said earlier, are living on less than \$22,000 a year as a family of four. Those in extreme poverty are living on, obviously, far less. With an individual, not a family but just an individual, we're talking about someone who would have to have an income of \$11,000 or less to be able to qualify for any assistance with the SNAP program.

What probably makes it the most difficult for many of us here in Congress and for most Americans to really grapple with as to this issue of food insecurity and children in America going to sleep hungry is the fact that this Congress is taking on legislation which would actually provide tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires at this very moment that we speak about food insecurity. So it is difficult to comprehend how we could say to Americans today, who are working hard but earning very little and who are trying to figure out how to keep their kids from going to sleep hungry at night, that we still have the money to provide tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires but that we can't figure out a way to continue a great program called SNAP that relies on our farmers to grow this food and then to make some of it available at a discounted rate to American families who are having a tough time.

This is all about values. This is all about the American family. It's all about whether we believe in the better days still to come for our country.

I happen to be someone who grew up in a very tiny house—about a 600-square-foot home—with my three sisters. My father got about a sixth grade education. My mother came from Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico, when she married my father at the age of 18. They came to Sacramento, California, with only the money they had in their pockets. They never once had to ask for assistance. They worked very hard. They were fortunate that they always found a way to make ends meet. I never had the Converse or the Keds or the Levi's jeans. My first bike was a bike that my friend was willing to sell to my father and me because he had just gotten a new one, but I never went to sleep hungry.

So I will tell you right now that it's a different thing to experience something where the thing you want the most before you go to sleep is a bite to eat. Too many of our kids are upset that they didn't get to watch that television program or didn't get to play on

the computer very much at night. There are still too many American children who are concerned that, when they go to bed, they wish they'd have something else in their stomachs. I believe America has the moral fiber to say that we're going to deal with this problem.

I thank the gentlelady from Connecticut for, once again, continuing the fight, because the reality is that we could figure out a way to help millionaires and billionaires continue to be successful and create the next wave of wealthy and successful Americans. At the same time, we should be able to figure out a way to make sure that the SNAP program is there for Americans who, through no fault of their own, find themselves without work and who, through no fault of their own, are trying to figure out how they will let their children go to bed with full stomachs. If we do this the right way, we'll get it solved.

I sat on the Bowles-Simpson Commission a year and a half ago, which found a way to save \$4 trillion in our budget. It did not touch the SNAP program. I sat on the supercommittee, which was supposed to also fashion a budget deficit reduction deal, and that task force was also going to come up with a deal that would not have touched the SNAP program. We can certainly do far better than what we see in the House Republican budget, which is going after the SNAP program. I encourage all of my colleagues to stand up, not just for the SNAP program but for Americans today, because there are some families who tonight are trying to figure out how they can keep their children from going to bed hungry.

So I thank the gentlelady from Connecticut for all she has done for so long to champion this issue.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

I think one of the most important things that you commented on tonight was the number of U.S. households living below the World Bank measure of severe poverty in developing nations. That means they're living on less than \$2 a day per person. At the start of 2011, we had 1.4 million households, 2.8 million children—that's 800,000 households—who were living on \$2 a day, and we have colleagues in this institution who want to take food out of the mouths of those children.

Mr. BECERRA. Some people don't believe that that's the case. That is America.

Ms. DELAURO. That is.

Now I would like to say "thank you" to our colleague from New Jersey, Congressman HOLT, and ask him to join our conversation this evening.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from Connecticut. I thank Mr. BECERRA for his heartfelt and very moving remarks, and I thank Ms. SPEIER from California.

Look at this. Look at this map: 46 million Americans rely on SNAP. More than 9 million others rely on WIC,

which is the Women, Infants, and Children food assistance. In New Jersey, my home State, more than 1 million residents rely on SNAP benefits to keep food on the tables. Then the budget, the Republican-Ryan budget, endorsed by Mitt Romney, would shred our social safety net while cutting taxes for the wealthy. It would cut food stamps, as these are generally known, by \$133 billion over 10 years.

The authors of this or anyone who voted for it should walk a little bit in those shoes. I've walked in the shoes. More specifically, I've walked down the supermarket aisle with beneficiaries, with people who work in the food assistance programs, with food bank representatives. How does it go? Well, you can't buy that. No, you can't afford that. Oh, Mommy, can I have this? No. We're going to have to put that back on the shelf.

\$31.50 a week. Nobody is doing this to have a little taste of luxury. Yet we have people come to the floor here in the House and say, before any of these millions of people get this assistance, they should have drug tests or means tests. I call them suspicion tests. Somehow they're trying to rip us off.

No, these are not welfare queens. Look, the average recipient is on these benefits for less than a year. More than half of them go to households where the income is below half the poverty line. The poverty line is low enough, but half of these recipients are at half that rate. Nearly 75 percent of SNAP participants are in families with children, and about half are working. These are working families who are trying to make it.

Is anybody who voted for this budget suggesting that the millionaires who might get an extra \$100,000 on average submit to a drug test? submit to a means test? Are we suspicious of them? How about the executives of the oil companies who are getting billions of dollars of benefits in this? Are we going to subject them to drug tests or to means tests in order to show that they're deserving?

My friend from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) already mentioned the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. They wrote:

As pastors and teachers, we remind Congress that these—meaning the budget decisions—are economic, political and moral choices with human consequences.

Please, respectfully, they urge the rejection of any efforts to reduce funds or to restructure programs in ways that harm struggling families and people living in poverty.

I thank my colleague so much for shedding a bright light on this heart-breaking subject.

□ 2000

Ms. DELAURO. It is a heartbreaking subject. And when you think about in that budget when we talk on averages, the number is a \$150,000 or a \$187,000 tax break to the wealthiest people in

the Nation. They don't worry what they're picking up at the grocery store. They're eating well. Their kids are eating well. Their grandkids are eating well, as ours are in this institution. But it's the people that we represent who are in difficulty, and they need to know to look to us to help them when it is so tough out there economically. This program is working in the way that it should.

I thank the gentleman.

Now someone who knows what is going on really in the heartland of our country where they have suffered severe economic depression, and that is in the State of Ohio. Let me welcome to this conversation, our colleague, Congresswoman FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentlelady so much, and I thank you for your passion on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, there is a cold and cruel war being waged on the poor and hungry in America. I stand today with my colleagues as a voice for the more than 46 million Americans who depend on the food stamp program. I cannot and I will not stand by as my Republican colleagues attempt to balance the budget on the backs of these Americans.

Yesterday, the House Agriculture Committee unveiled the Reconciliation Act of 2012. The drafters of this legislation could have proposed cuts to any program within the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction; yet they decided to satisfy reconciliation targets by cutting only one program: the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, better known as SNAP. The proposal would cut more than \$33 billion from SNAP over 10 years.

Some may try to make you believe these cuts only apply to administrative costs, or they will say that the proposal is an attempt to reduce fraud or waste. They are misleading the public, Mr. Speaker. A majority of the cuts will come from benefits. These cuts will take food out of our seniors' refrigerators and food from the mouths of babies.

Nearly half of all SNAP participants are children. The Republican proposal would not only affect children being fed at home. Oh, no. That would probably be bad enough. This proposal goes further. The Congressional Budget Office predicts this proposal would prevent more than 280,000 children from receiving free meals in school. A school lunch is the only meal many poor children have every day. Millions of children already go to school hungry, Mr. Speaker. Now my Republican colleagues want to exacerbate the problem. I wonder, what did children do to deserve these proposed cuts? Of all the programs that could be cut, why attempt to balance the budget on the backs of schoolchildren?

In Ohio, more than 1.5 million people depend on the SNAP program. These are our neighbors and our friends who live in rural, suburban, and urban Ohio. SNAP is a powerful antipoverty program that has helped make our econ-

omy stronger. SNAP is the safety net for millions of people who find themselves unemployed for the first time in their lives. Without SNAP benefits, the disabled would suffer. Without SNAP benefits, seniors would be forced to make the choice between food or a roof over their heads. Without SNAP, children would go hungry. The hungry and the poor and the most vulnerable people cannot afford these cuts. Mr. Speaker, they cannot pay all of our bills by themselves.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlewoman, and I also recognize the gentleman from Ohio who as well understands what the effects of this recent recession have been to his community, his State, and the people that he represents, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlelady, and I'm glad I have the opportunity to follow the gentlelady from Cleveland because my district is just south of her district.

As you can see from the map of Ohio, there is severe poverty and food insecurity in the northeastern part of Ohio, but all the way down, as you can see, all the way into the south. And the SNAP program is one program that we're highlighting here tonight.

But I think it's important for us to recognize how this fits into the context of an overall budget that also cuts the Medicaid program by a third. Think about the stress, A, regarding the SNAP program if you're utilizing it. What is that family going to do if a third of the Medicaid budget is cut and early childhood is cut and Pell Grants are cut and student loan rates go up and all the way down the line? We're talking about putting a huge squeeze on the poorest people in our society when we only have 300 million or 400 million people and we're trying to compete with 1.4 billion people in China and 1.3 billion or 1.4 billion people in India. How are we going to be a competitive country? That's the question that we have to ask here if you can't even get enough food in a kid's belly before they go to school.

We need to look at this in the context of what are the investments we need to make in order to be a successful country, period. We've heard a lot of amazing stories here tonight, heart-wrenching stories of people who ended up being Members of Congress because of some of these programs. Who is the next generation of leadership? Are we going to invest in them, or are we going to say, You're on your own?

We have now on the other side, Mr. Speaker, the nominee of a major political party in the United States of America saying: "I'm not concerned about the poor," and making light of us asking people with the Buffett rule to maybe pay a little bit more. You know what? They say, oh, that's not that much money. It's only 11 hours of government spending and blah, blah, blah. You know what? That Buffett rule can help put food in people's bellies. For the 175,000 people in my con-

gressional district in northeast Ohio that are living in poverty, that Buffett rule would help pay for the SNAP program. Is it insignificant now?

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

My God, what we could do if we had the will to do it. That's what this is about. It's a question of our values and where our priorities are. Is it about our kids, or is it about the richest 1 percent of the people in this Nation getting \$150,000 or \$187,000 in a tax break?

The gentlewoman from California has been extraordinary in her fight for the food stamp program, and she hasn't been afraid to take on anyone in any party on this issue of making sure that the food stamp program is secure. I recognize the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

First, let me thank my colleague, Congresswoman DELAURO, for yielding and those kind words. But let me just thank you for not only organizing this Special Order, but for really continuing to beat the drum so that the country can understand how important nutrition programs are to our Nation. This is not just a job for Congresswoman DELAURO. This is about her life's work. So I just have to thank her for her leadership.

Republicans are preparing to attack families on food stamps. They are planning to take an axe to one of the most important protections for the poor, children, seniors, the disabled, which is, of course, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. They are attempting to cut up to \$33 billion from critical, anti-hunger programs even, mind you, as they bring up this bill, H.R. 9, the Small Business Tax Cut Act, which is another \$46 billion tax holiday for the very wealthy. They are trying to bring this up at the same time.

When Republicans target programs that protect vulnerable Americans from massive cuts that risk making millions of children suffer hunger and deprivation, they are doing so unfortunately in the name of fiscal responsibility and deficit reduction. Yet in the very next breath when they want to give away tax breaks to the already wealthy businesses, then those same deficits don't seem to matter.

Mr. Speaker, making cuts on struggling families during hard times is not only heartless and mean and immoral, but it also makes no sense because it doesn't reduce the deficit, nor create jobs. Critical programs like SNAP and WIC not only feed hungry children and families, but they support the overall economy. Every single dollar of SNAP benefits generates a \$1.84 in economic activity, and the Congressional Budget Office rated an increase in SNAP benefits as one of the two most cost-effective of all spending and tax options it examined for boosting growth and jobs in a weak economy.

Let me tell you today I really had the privilege to speak—and, Congresswoman DELAURO, I want to say to you thank you again for this because I know, as I said earlier, this is your life's work. This is not just about your job, okay. This is about you as a human being. This is about us and our values.

But let me tell you, many years ago while I was raising my two small children, two little boys as a single mother, I fell upon some very difficult times like Congresswoman WOOLSEY. She encouraged me to talk about this when I came here because, you know what, I was so embarrassed I never talked about it until LYNN WOOLSEY encouraged me to begin to share my story.

□ 2010

But I had to go on food stamps to help me just feed my kids during that very difficult period in my life, and it was hard. Again, I was very embarrassed. But to this day, mind you, to this day I want to thank my government and the people of the United States for extending this helping hand to me as a bridge over troubled waters.

Even though I was embarrassed and didn't want to be on public assistance, I had to for a while, and it was not that I was a welfare queen, but this was a very difficult time. Most families, 95, 98 percent of the families, don't really want to be on food stamps. They want to trade their book of food stamps for a living-wage paycheck. That's what they want.

Cutting SNAP, it simply doesn't make any sense. There are still four job seekers for every one job in America, and so we can't cut the benefits that help to keep food on their tables and provide that bridge over troubled waters until they can get their job.

For the life of me, it's really hard, it's really hard to understand how people of faith have forgotten what the Scriptures say, that we are our brothers' keepers, we are our sisters' keepers. This is the United States of America. This is not a poor developing country.

What the Republican budget proposes is that we will create a country that we won't even recognize, one that says go for what you know, one that says I got mine, you get yours. This 11 percent cut in food stamps, which the Republicans propose, it says you're on your own, mind you. You're on your own, unless you are very wealthy.

I know the American people aren't going to go for this. Our values as a country won't allow this kind of cut in the SNAP program. Americans care about the common good, and so I am confident that the Republicans, the Tea Party Republicans, they are going to hear from the American people on this.

Congresswoman DELAURO, once again I just thank you for giving us the opportunity to do this. I thank you because it is a privilege to be able to stand up for the 46 million people who

need this helping hand, as one who needed a helping hand at a point in my life, and it helped me to live the American Dream for myself and for my family.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlewoman from California, and I want to make sure that we have the opportunity to hear from three more of our colleagues and our colleague from New York, Congressman TONKO. Thank you for being here tonight. And then we will hear from Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY and Congressman LARSON.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative DELAURO, and thank you for leading us in what is a very important hour of discussion as we address some of the critical choices before this House. As my good friend and colleague, ROSA DELAURO, from Connecticut indicated, our budget, our budget outcomes are a sum total of our priorities, what has value in our society. What are those sensitivities that we express? What are those outright requirements, basic foundational requirements of our society?

I would suggest to you that one of those basic needs is to enable people to have the soundness of nutrition, to enable us to feed families that have stumbled across difficult times. What we have at risk as we speak here this evening on this House floor is the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

The SNAP program touches one in seven Americans. That is a staggering statistic, and for every \$5 in new SNAP benefits that we offer, they generate as much as \$9 in economic activity, almost a two-time economic factor. In my home district in upstate New York, in the Capital Region, some 23,000 households are utilizing SNAP funds. One in four of those SNAP recipients are 60-years-old and older.

Then we also have situations where three and four have had at least one member of the family out of work in the past 12 months. We have many children; one in two on SNAP are under 18 years of age.

This tells us there's a growing need out there. We have had a tough economy, and people have stumbled across tough times. Why is this so important to discuss right now? Because before the end of this month there will be an effort made through this House—they are asking that the Ag Committee come up with cuts that are brutal.

They are asking for the Ag Committee to come up with a sum total of \$33.2 billion. Put right onto the chopping block are SNAP funds. So we are affecting the weakest amongst us, the most hungry amongst us, and we're not recognizing that those dollars invested in these families will recirculate into our regional economies.

This is a sound program that ought to be continued. There needs to be sensitivity shown, there needs to be prioritization of a very important factor here. That is sound nutrition for our American families. I have seen it, I

have witnessed it firsthand in our district. It works, it works well. We need to set this as a high priority, and I thank Representative DELAURO for allowing me a few moments of time to share concerns on behalf of the good people that I represent in the 21st District of upstate New York.

Ms. DELAURO. You represent them well. I thank my colleague.

I want to be in a trench with the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY. She is a tough fighter, and at the base of that it's about families and their children. Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank you so much for the opportunity to participate in this debate where so many of our colleagues have come down to the floor to talk about it.

This is the richest country in the world, and yet one out of five of our children is considered food insecure, goes hungry. That is such a moral outrage.

You know, the average food stamp benefit is \$1.50 a meal. That's what you get when you're lucky enough to be part of the SNAP program. And as this chart shows, this map shows, it's everywhere. I actually live in a district that was considered one of the least hard-hit by food insecurity, but that's all relative.

In the Ninth Congressional District in Illinois, more than 11 percent of the households are experiencing food hardship, the inability to put enough food on the table. And even the least of the hard-hit districts has 7 percent of its families unable to put enough food on the table in the richest country in the world. It's intolerable.

You know, the headline today in Politico, "Republicans Ax Aid to the Poor" makes me so sad. Who are we as a country? What are we as a country where a candidate for President, a Republican candidate for President, denigrates Barack Obama by calling him the food stamp president. I'm proud that this President wants to defend, protect, and save a program that feeds so many people.

And here's what the Catholic bishops say:

SNAP, also known as food stamps, helps feed millions of households. At this time of economic turmoil and growing poverty, the committee should oppose cuts in this effective and efficient anti-hunger program that helps people live in dignity.

I just want to say we are asking for dignity for Americans that are struggling. The average food stamp recipient is only on it for 9 months. One of the former recipients called it a trampline that helps you get past it.

I'm asking for dignity for Americans and saving the nutrition programs, especially the SNAP program, the food stamp program.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentle lady. I am delighted to be joined by my colleague from Connecticut, who is chair of the Democratic Caucus and

whose career, whether it was in the State senate in Connecticut in our legislature there or his work here, has been remarkable. At its core, again, are our children and our families.

I recognize Congressman JOHN LARSON of Connecticut.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlelady from Connecticut and the dean of our delegation, the deaness, I should say, for her tireless work and advocacy on the part of not only the citizens of the Third Congressional District of Connecticut but across this great Nation and, I daresay, this globe.

I never cease to be amazed by the eloquence of our Members, so many of them coming forward and speaking their minds and speaking from their heart about the people that we're sworn to serve and represent. This week in Congress we face, again, legislation, rather ironically, where we are deeming, deeming a budget passed, almost as though we would deem that the hungry be fed.

Franklin Roosevelt, in another time, recognized the great sacrifice that a nation had to endure, and President Obama this past January called upon the shared sacrifice that is required amongst a nation, a nation that needs to pull together in a very difficult recessionary time.

□ 2020

And in this time it's a time where you have to make choices. And those choices have to be based on your values and have to be based, as the President said, on sacrifice. Roosevelt called for the warm courage of national security that comes from a shared sacrifice.

Forty-six million people receive assistance, primarily women and children, who get fed and nourished. We're going to have a debate on a budget that strikes at the core of this at a time when we would give tax breaks of \$47 billion, while we're taking away from the neediest amongst us?

Roosevelt said the problem with our colleagues on the other side is they can become frozen in the ice of their indifference towards their fellow citizens, everyday Americans serving and struggling in this recessionary period. And what do we get in return? We get RomneyCare, we get tax breaks for BainCapital. We get tax breaks that are coming to the Nation's wealthiest 1 percent at a time where we ask the middle class, who is struggling, to pay for it.

We're out here today talking about a very important program that provides nutrition to the least amongst us, and we're calling for cuts that are not only going to take from them but are going to take from students that are trying to be able to pay off their educational loans. This has got to stop. We're a better country than this.

I commend the gentlelady from Connecticut for bringing this to our attention and focusing on the needs of a great Nation that in a time of budgetary concerns has to choose the appro-

priate values for the country, that has to make the appropriate choices. We all agree on the need to sacrifice, but it has to be shared and shouldn't be balanced on the backs of the middle class and the poorest amongst us.

I thank the gentlelady from Connecticut for her leadership.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman and I thank my colleagues for joining us tonight.

GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS: HEALTH CARE'S BROKEN PROMISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, in this hour, I and my colleagues who will be joining me very shortly—other physicians who are from the GOP Doctors Caucus, perhaps nurses, and other health care workers as well—in this next hour we're going to be talking about our favorite subject, and that is health care reform. We're going to be talking about specific aspects, things that have actually come to light to us that I think are important. We're going to have other things that in the coming days we're going to learn about how ObamaCare was passed, what things were done by the other side of the aisle to make that happen, things that maybe some would call sausage-making, others would say it's improper. But we'll certainly spend some time on that as the days come.

I want to continue a theme that we've been discussing, and that is the broken promises of ObamaCare. Remember, to get ObamaCare passed, President Obama made a number of promises.

I'll start with the first one that is relevant to our topic tonight, and that is: Under my plan, no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase. That was candidate Obama, Senator Obama at the time, who talked about all the number of things that were going to be good about ObamaCare; but in fact we see that virtually everything that's come up, with a few possible exceptions, has not been so favorable.

I think that taxes is really a very relevant subject to speak about this evening because here we are and today is the tax deadline for the IRS, and we all have that on our minds. It's interesting, whenever I file my taxes, the first thing I think about doing is projecting into the next year what the issues are going to be for me and my taxes. And so I think it's only proper and the timing is excellent that we talk about that this evening.

Remember, Candidate Obama pledged he would not raise any of your taxes and promised not to tax health benefits. His health care broke those promises at least 10 times. Here's just a line-up of some of the taxes that we're talking about.

Fifty-two billion dollars in fines on employers who do not provide government-approved coverage. Remember that under ObamaCare not only is there a mandate date for individuals to buy health insurance. There's a mandate on the employers, the business owners to buy it as well. And upon both is the burden to buy not health insurance but government-conceived health insurance, that is, health insurance that the government in its wisdom—our Federal Government—decides and deems is proper for us. And so you have to make two fulfillments in that mandate. One is to buy health care insurance and, number two, health care insurance that's approved by the government.

Thirty-two billion dollars in taxes on health insurance plans. The actual health plans are going to be taxed as well. Now, who is going to pay that tax? Do you think the insurance companies are going to pay it? No, it's going to be passed down to you, the subscriber, as taxes on business always make their way down to the consumer.

Five billion dollars in taxes from limits on over-the-counter medication; \$15 billion in taxes from limiting the deduction on itemized medical expenses; \$13 billion in taxes from new limits on flexible-spending arrangements; \$60 billion in taxes on health insurance plans; \$27 billion in taxes on pharmaceutical companies; \$20 billion in taxes on medical device companies; \$3 billion in taxes on tanning services; \$3 billion in taxes on self-insured health plans; and \$1 billion in new penalties on health savings account distributions. The health care law also includes a high income tax. Because it's not indexed for inflation, it will eventually hit 80 percent of taxpayers.

I draw my colleagues' attention to this slide: "ObamaCare's Rising Tax Burden." You can see that the tax burden in 2012, the year we're in, is \$190 for a family of four. That's \$15 billion. You see that the burden goes up each year, and that in the out-years, 2022, it makes it above \$150 billion. In 2032, the burden goes well above \$250 billion. And it finally tops out at \$320 billion total, and that's an average of \$3,290 for a family of four.

□ 2030

So what am I saying? Remember that when you hear the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle, it talks about how we should be having more sacrifice from the wealthy and more sacrifice from those who make more. Folks, we've been down this road before.

Remember the luxury tax that came out some years ago? What did it do? It killed the companies that made boats and luxury items. It created a lot of job losses. The people who were hurt were the working class people, not the wealthy. They can still buy those things anyplace they want to.

We also came up with this silly idea of an alternative minimum tax to make the wealthy do their fair share.

Well, we have the AMT today, and where has it gotten us? Because that was never indexed for inflation, middle class people are being hit by the alternative minimum tax. So it's no longer a tax on wealthy. It is a tax on the middle class, the people that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk so fondly of.

That's an important point, and that is that every time we come up with a tax on the wealthy, it always makes its way to the working class and the middle class.

Now, why is this? Is this by accident or is it by grand design? Well, folks, we all know that inflation occurs every year at an average rate of about 3 percent, but it's been as high as 16 percent in our history. And so any time we have a tax law that affects people in a certain income, we know that automatically, over time, people with lower and lower incomes, because while their absolute dollars in value are going to go up, the truth is, the purchase power of those dollars goes down. So that pushes more and more people of lower and lower income levels into higher and higher tax brackets.

So, again, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle love all of these taxes on the wealthy, but they can never make enough money. We've heard in recent days about the infamous Buffett tax, the Buffett rule that would require superwealthy people to pay some additional tax. And their own side agrees that would only add about \$4 billion per year, not even a drop in the bucket, less than 1 percent of the annual deficit.

So why is that important? It's important because if you're going to get more income from taxes—and I would argue that you never really get more income from taxes, but if you think you can, you can only do it when you spread it out among the middle class and the working class. And the way you do that, kind of the silent way, the camel nose under the tent, is to pass it on the wealthy first, and then, through inflation, it's passed down to albeit a lower income level but a much larger group, because you simply can't get enough tax revenue by putting a lot of tax on the wealthy. There just isn't enough wealthy people out there to do it. The way you have to do it is push it down where there's a lot of people, and that's the middle class and the working class.

Another slide here, rhetoric versus reality on premium cost, the average annual cost of family health insurance premiums in the U.S.

Here we are 2012. This is what President Obama in campaigning for ObamaCare said would happen, that you would follow this blue line down, and the costs would go down by 2,500. And what are we hearing from all the actuaries, the CBOs and others? Not only will it go up by \$393, but we already have a differential of around \$4,000 from where President Obama said we would be today and where we actu-

ally are. It hasn't gone down; it's actually gone up.

Let's talk about a couple more taxes, and then I'm going to introduce a colleague here and give him some sharing time as well.

The surtax on investment income, \$123 billion, which begins this past January, the creation of a new 3.8 percent surtax on investment income earned in households making at least \$250,000 for a couple or \$200,000 single. Now this is the homeowner real estate tax that you've heard about. It was, again, passed in the dead of night. Folks, this is a terrible tax, 3.8 percent on investment income.

Now, when you sell your home, it may or may not be classed as investment income, but it can be, it just depends on the situation. But it's not just that. If you own any type of other property, if you own stocks and bonds, mutual funds, whatever, they could be easily subject to this, and it is not indexed to inflation.

Again, let me reemphasize this. Yes, it's a tax on people who make over \$200,000 a year, but if you make \$50,000 a year, over time, this will affect you, too, because inflation will bring those dollars up in real terms because of inflation, and your buying power will stay at the \$50,000 level, but you will show on paper that you're making \$200,000, and this tax will affect you.

So the bottom line here is that ObamaCare has many taxes, and certainly they are Trojan horses by any explanation; and, yes, they don't raise a lot of revenue at first, but down the road they raise a lot of revenue, but not on the wealthy folks, on the middle class. That's who's getting hurt by ObamaCare.

A medicine cabinet tax, \$5 billion beginning this past January, Americans are no longer able to use their health savings accounts and flexible spending accounts and all those other types of accounts on over-the-counter drugs. So that means if you want to use your health savings account to pay for your cold medicine or medicine you're taking for a headache like Aleve or Motrin or something like that, if you want to pay for it through your health savings account, you're going to have to go get a prescription from your doctor. And the doctor is going to say, Look, I'm overwhelmed with all these people wanting me to do this. We're going to have to charge something for that, so that means more cost. Ultimately, more bureaucracy, more paperwork, more cost, and up until now, prior to ObamaCare, that was not the case. You could write that off or pay for that out of your health savings account.

An HSA withdrawal tax hike, \$1.4 billion, that began in January 2011. It increases additional tax on nonmedical early withdrawals from an HSA from 10 to 20 percent, disadvantaging them relative to IRAs and other tax advantage accounts. So, you see, if you have an early withdrawal from your IRA or some other type of retirement plan,

you've had a 10 percent penalty, and that was true of HSAs. So that's been doubled. So ObamaCare has limited the use of health savings accounts, but at the same time has made the penalties even steeper for using it.

And I can tell you, in my own case, in my own companies, apart from my own medical practice, we have used health savings accounts to tremendous benefit to our employees because it has lowered their cost and taken a lot of the anxiety and the fear away from their cost in being caught in some sort of illness that would bankrupt them otherwise.

An excise tax on charitable hospitals, that's immediate, \$50,000 per hospital if they fail to meet new community health assessment needs. Section 1411 increases the Medicare hospital insurance portion of the payroll tax, so this provision will increase the employees' portion from 1.45 percent to 2.35 percent for families making more than \$250,000 a year or individuals making above 200. Combined with the employers' portion, the total rate will increase by 3.8 percent on every dollar of income over \$250,000.

And, again, I implore you, I realize, hey, I don't make \$250,000, I don't make \$200,000, but because of inflation—and trust me, with the monetary easing and the monetary policies that are coming out of this administration in half of the last 3½ years—when inflation gets going again, which it will quite soon, you will be driven up into those income levels, but your buying power will be the same as it is today. So, trust me, you're not getting by with anything. You're going to get hit with this tax just like everybody else.

The reality is—and I'm going to be recognizing my good friend, Dr. GINGREY, here in a moment. The reality is ObamaCare includes tons of new taxes and tax hikes. Heritage has a list of them that shows an increase in revenue of more than \$500 billion in 10 years. Two examples that clearly hit consumers are the 10 percent tax on indoor tanning services that will raise \$2.7 billion between 2010 and 2019 and, beginning in 2013, the 2.3 percent excise tax on manufacturers and importers of certain medical devices that will raise \$20 billion between 2010 and 2019.

And I'm just going to just throw in a couple of more things.

Remember, this discussion began with this being the April 15—April 17 deadline for your taxes and the Internal Revenue Service.

□ 2040

Remember that under ObamaCare as many as 16,000 new IRS agents will be hired. Estimates vary, of course, and that many have not been hired yet. But there's no question about it that the IRS will be beefed up to the tune of billions of dollars in order to make that happen.

So, with that, I've been joined by my colleague, my good friend, Dr. PHIL GINGREY, an obstetrician/gynecologist

from Georgia, someone that I look up to very much, who's been a great mentor to me and a role model; who was here as a physician in days past when there weren't many doctors in the House of Representatives, and has helped facilitate, in fact helped start, the GOP Doctors Caucus, which is speaking here tonight, and helped grow our numbers from just a handful of physicians and health care workers to now over 15 MDs and upwards of around 20 total health care workers that we have in the House of Representatives that I think are making big, big differences in particularly health care policy overall.

I yield to the gentleman, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding, and I thank him for his kind words. I'm happy to share the time with him tonight and plan to remain here on the House floor for the rest of this hour.

I'll make some comments now and yield back to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING, and maybe he'll yield some additional time to me later in the hour.

But, you know, I couldn't help but notice in the previous hour which was allotted to our Democratic colleagues, their leadership hour, they went first tonight, and they chose to talk about the SNAP program within the Department of Agriculture. And of course, SNAP is an acronym for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, which was formerly known, I think more people would commonly know it as the food stamp program. And they spent the whole hour talking about the unintended consequences of cutting discretionary Federal spending and reducing government bureaucracy and bloatedness and saying that when you do that, of course, you hurt the poor and the nearly poor, that they desperately need these programs. They made some legitimate points, of course.

We're talking about health care in our hour and, specifically, about the passage of ObamaCare almost 2 years ago, indeed, a little more than 2 years ago now to create a whole new entitlement program for people, the uninsured, not the folks that were covered under safety net programs like the program for children, the SCHIP program it's called, the health care program for the poor, Medicaid, certainly not the program for our seniors and our disabled Americans under Medicare, but for folks that were somewhere in the middle that maybe couldn't afford or weren't offered health insurance by their employer.

But they never talked about the unintended consequences of what would happen. I'm sure our colleagues didn't intentionally pass a 2,600-page bill that would deliberately hurt anybody. I don't think anybody on either side of the aisle in any Congress would do that, any administration would do that.

But we physician Members, the gentleman from Louisiana, myself, and others that have worked in the health care industry, all of our—most of our—professional lives before we got to Congress, understood far better and knew exactly what the unintended consequences would be of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what the gentleman from Louisiana's been talking about and pointing out in the poster presentation, the slide presentation that he has made. I could probably take the rest of the hour talking about the unintended consequences and list them. My good colleague and our friend on the Senate side, the chairman of the Senate Policy Committee, also a physician, orthopedic surgeon from Wyoming, Dr. BARRASSO, just recently came out with a white paper on health care policies dated March 13, so just about a month ago. And Dr. BARRASSO, in that paper, Mr. Speaker, lists 10 different unintended consequences.

The gentleman from Louisiana's already mentioned a couple, gone over a couple; but I'd like to just take a few minutes before yielding back to him, a go over a few of the promises that he has not yet mentioned. One, and this is a quote from President Obama: "I will protect Medicare." In a 2009 address to Congress, President Obama promised that he would "protect Medicare."

Well, the President's health care law, however—Dr. FLEMING may have mentioned this—takes more than \$500 billion from the Medicare program and uses that money. Now, he said, and the Democrat majority at the time said, well, you know, we're strengthening Medicare. But over \$500 billion, more than a 10 percent cut per year in Medicare over a 10-year period of time, it took to create this new entitlement program.

The Medicare actuary has actually written that the Medicare cuts cannot be simultaneously used to finance other Federal outlays such as the coverage expansion under this PPACA and to extend the Medicare trust fund.

You can't pay for two things with the same amount of money. Indeed, I wish we could. Then maybe folks wouldn't have to be on food stamps, as an example.

The Congressional Budget Office, on that same point, wrote, Medicare provisions in the President's health care plan, quote, and, again, this is the CBO, "would not enhance the ability of the government to pay for future Medicare benefits."

President Obama actually admitted in an interview, you can't say that you are saving on Medicare and then spending the money twice. That's what the President said. But that's exactly what the law does. It spends the same money twice, undermining, unfortunately, a great Medicare program that needs to be strengthened and protected. That was one of the promises broken, promises made, but not kept, as Dr. BARRASSO, Senator BARRASSO, pointed out.

Let me add one more. This is No. 5 of the 10 that Dr. BARRASSO mentioned in

his white paper of last month from the policy committee on the Senate side. Candidate Obama said there was no need for a mandate. This is back in 2008 in that campaign against Senator Hillary Clinton.

Candidate Obama opposed a mandate to buy insurance, and made it one of the hallmarks of his primary campaign. He claimed that penalizing people for not buying health insurance—listen to this, Mr. Speaker—was like, and I quote, "solving homelessness by mandating everyone buy a house." He said, President Obama, Senator Obama at the time, Candidate Obama, solving homelessness by mandating everyone buy a house.

Well, this is like solving the uninsured problem by mandating that all the rest of us pay for health insurance for a lot of people that could afford to buy health insurance but just simply did not want it.

I don't know how many millions of people make more than \$50,000 a year or \$75,000 a year that really didn't want, don't want, would rather pay as they go. I don't recommend it. Dr. FLEMING doesn't recommend it, Mr. Speaker. We think they ought to have some minimal coverage and certainly catastrophic coverage; but this is their right, their liberty to choose if they want to not have that coverage.

And President Obama's health care law, as we all know now, created an unprecedented Federal requirement for all citizens to purchase a product merely because they exist, because they're living and breathing. And not just a product. Under this bill when it's fully implemented in 2014, the minimal coverage requirement, as the gentleman from Louisiana pointed out, wouldn't allow them to, let's say, have a mini-med policy, as many of the franchisees do across this country in the fast-food industry.

□ 2050

They all had to be granted waivers. So here again, another promise made and not kept.

I have a couple more that I'll get to maybe later on in the hour, but just to point that out. And clearly, the Supreme Court, I think, now understands much of that in the testimony they heard a couple weeks ago. So I'll yield back to my colleague and stick with him during the remaining portion of the time.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, I thank my friend and colleague. I'll certainly be returning back to you for some more information that's very valuable information.

I want to get back to and sort of recap some of the things I talked about, and that is that the taxes are tremendously increased under ObamaCare. Well, let's talk about the financing of ObamaCare. I'm just going to stick with the basics. There are a lot of ways it is theoretically financed, but I'm going to tell you maybe the three major ways that it's supposedly paid for.

Well, number one, you heard my friend, Dr. GINGREY, say that ObamaCare actually takes over \$500 billion—that is, over a half-trillion dollars—from existing Medicare and uses that to subsidize the middle class health plans for people below a certain income level. We're going to get to that in just a moment—I'm going to draw your attention to this chart and talk about those subsidies. But not only does it do that, but as my good friend says, it's used to extend the life of Medicare.

So this is basically how it works. The idea of the bill is it takes money out of Medicare and theoretically makes Medicare last longer—because it's running out of money—by taking the same money out of the middle and putting it at the end. I don't understand how that can work, but that's the way it works. That would be sort of like taking money out of your paycheck in the middle of the year and somehow living on nothing for about 3 months, and then going back to what you took out and paying at the end. It makes no sense.

Not only that, but it takes the same \$500 billion—and we've really honed down on this in our committees, and Secretary Sebelius had to admit that this was true—it takes the same \$500 billion that's used to prolong the life of Medicare to subsidize middle class health plans. I don't know—where I come from in Louisiana, we can't spend the same dollar twice. You can spend it place A and place B. If my kids want to go to the movies or they want to do some entertainment, or maybe they need money for their education, I can give it to them, and they can spend it one time. They don't get to use the same dollar twice. And folks, neither can your Federal Government. So that is really smoke-and-mirrors accounting. We've called them out on it, and they've really basically admitted that's true.

But then another way that ObamaCare is paid for is by over \$800 billion in taxes in 10 years, which I've gone over a number of these, and I'm going to get back to them. It really is not paid for. And we know, we're getting estimates now showing that as much as 300 to \$500 billion is going to be added over the next 10 years in deficits, total debt in that period of time. So it is not paid for. All of these steep taxes, all of these smoke-and-mirror types of accounting are not going to work.

Furthermore, half of the people who are going to get health care coverage cards that they wouldn't otherwise get are going to be on Medicaid. Today, Medicaid pays on average about 60 percent of what Medicare pays to health care providers, which is already too low. So what is the chance that 15 million Americans are going to come newly on the rolls, and they're going to carry a card around that pays less than what the doctor can afford to accept to even cover the cost of that care, or oth-

erwise go out of business, what's the chance they're going to find doctors? So what we'll have is a drop in the number of physicians, a steep rise in the demand in health care. And so these people will all end up in emergency rooms.

To my colleagues, it's one thing to have coverage in health care. It's another thing altogether to have access to health care. All you have to do is look at other countries that have socialized health care—Great Britain, Canada, and many others, and even go to the extreme steps of Cuba and North Korea—they all have coverage, and it's free. The problem is there's no access to it. There are shortages. There are waiting times, as much as 1 year, 2 years to get a CT scan. People are dying as a result of that, and they show up in their statistics.

The death rates, for instance, from breast cancer and prostate cancer in the United States are much lower than they are in Canada and Great Britain. They have access to the same medications and the same quality physicians. The only difference is their health care systems themselves.

So let's get back again. I want to really focus on this topic for a moment before I yield time to my friend. And again, back to this idea that many of the taxes are going to be placed upon wealthy Americans in order to pay for ObamaCare. And I'll just step back through them again. There is a 40 percent excise tax on so-called "Cadillac" health plans, which would be health plans valued in excess of \$10,200 for individuals, \$27,500 for families. Those thresholds will grow annually by an inflation rate of 1 percent, which is about a third or less of what it really is.

So what that means is that, as ObamaCare unfolds, having an expensive gold-plated Cadillac health care plan, you're going to get taxed 40 percent more for having it. Well, maybe that's justified. But remember that after a few years, that will not be an expensive, gold-plated plan; that will be an average plan, and you will again have to pay the same 40 percent excise—bracket creep is what they called it back some years ago, and I think it applies here today.

Now, again, increases in Medicare hospital insurance. That's a payroll tax on people who make \$200,000 a year individually, \$250,000 as a couple, again, only applying to people who are in that \$200,000-plus range. And then, of course, I told you the 3.8 percent tax on your investments that are sold for those who, again, make \$200,000 or more.

Again, we go back to it. Remember the alternative minimum tax. Remember the luxury tax. Remember the tax that was placed on oil, the so-called "windfall" taxes. Ultimately, those taxes all fell to the middle class and below. Those are the ones who were burdened with them and why most of them have been repealed. We would repeal the alternative minimum tax if we could find a way to actually pay for it

now because we're spending at a level that we can't afford to repeal it, unfortunately.

So here is this chart, which is very important in this whole discussion. Under ObamaCare, there is an income threshold for receiving subsidy. So if your income is just below \$100,000 for a family, a married couple—and I believe that is a family of four total—if you make less than \$100,000, or about \$95,000 here, you'll get some kind of subsidy beginning in 2012, 2013. However, that subsidy, that line continues out all the way indefinitely, well past 2062 and before. Now, if you make \$90,000 or less than \$90,000 today, with inflation in those out-years—5 years, 10 years, 20 years, 30 years—you will break through this threshold. So you will not get the support, the subsidy in your health plan in those out-years. You'll get it early so that you think you're getting something, but ultimately that's going to basically go away, and you will not get that subsidy.

Now, also, if you make \$200,000 or \$250,000 a year, you will be the one paying in for those who need this subsidy. But you see this line comes down because people who make \$200,000 today, in 2022 they will still get a check that will say \$250,000, but it will be more like \$180,000 in today's dollars. With each year, it ratchets it down until finally you get to about 2042, or 2050, in that range. So a check today that says \$200,000 on it will buy equivalent to something like \$90,000 in those years because inflation devalues the actual currency that you hold.

So what you get is a crossover point where you see the subsidy threshold gets higher and higher. You've got to make more and more money to get that subsidy. But even though your income is the same, or going down, you actually drop out, and you get a crossover point. Where here, even though you're making \$200,000 or \$250,000, you're making too much for the subsidy, but you're not making too much to be taxed. And that is the problem.

□ 2100

Ultimately, over time, ObamaCare begins to take the subsidies out for those who are middle class and lower, and it begins to add taxes on those who are middle class and above. That is very destructive, my friends. That's the way you end up with socialized health care and with the kind of system that is working so poorly in many other countries.

We still have time to discuss some of these issues further, so I would ask my good friend from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, to elaborate on some of his points tonight.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, continuing on the line of reasoning that Dr. FLEMING just outlined in talking about not indexing these benefits for inflation, in fact, another thing that needs to be pointed out is that under current law in creating these exchanges and in trying to help people

who are uninsured because it's not affordable to them, we, the taxpayers, are going to subsidize people who purchase health insurance on these State exchanges even if they make up to 400 percent of the Federal poverty level. For a family of four, that's \$85,000 to \$90,000 a year. If John Q. Public knew that we were forcing them to subsidize the purchase of health insurance for people making up to \$90,000 a year, they would be appalled; but that, in fact, is the case.

In just continuing with what my friend from Louisiana was talking about, the other thing is that the law also expands the Medicaid program. Some States in past years, when times were better, were covering people on the Medicaid program at more than 100 percent of the Federal poverty level—indeed, some up to 185 percent or maybe 225 percent of the Federal poverty level when they could afford it. Yet to actually say in times like these that we are going to force the States to cover people up to 133 percent of the Federal poverty level when they can barely afford to cover at the 100 percent level is an unfunded and, probably, unconstitutional mandate.

Mr. Speaker, as you know and as my colleagues know on both sides of the aisle, this was part of the argument before the Supreme Court, as was that more publicized argument against requiring individuals to engage in commerce under the rules of the Commerce Clause. So that's a huge problem. As Dr. FLEMING points out, it will become even more of a problem because it's not indexed for inflation, and you will have more and more people being subsidized.

I want to get back, though, if the gentleman will allow me a little bit more time, to those failed promises that I discussed a little earlier.

In the Republican health care policy report from orthopaedic surgeon and Senator JOHN BARRASSO, which he put out just last month, let me go straight to No. 10. We mentioned a couple. This is broken promise No. 10. Get this, colleagues, and this is a quote from President Obama, our 44th President: These negotiations will be on C-SPAN.

Candidate Obama promised to televise all health care negotiations on C-SPAN. The process that created the President's health care plan was plagued, unfortunately—and it wasn't on C-SPAN—with backroom deals like the Cornhusker kickback, Gator aid and the Louisiana Purchase, cutting special deals with Senators from certain States. You don't have to be a genius to figure out what those three States are.

The President, indeed, even conceded the process—and he said—legitimately raised concerns, not just among my opponents but also among supporters, that we just don't know what's going on; and it's an ugly process, and it looks like there are a bunch of backroom deals.

Mr. Speaker, there were a bunch of backroom deals, and I think our col-

leagues are aware. We got a memo today from my committee, which is the Energy and Commerce Committee, and particularly from the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. We have been trying for almost 2 years—the committee staff on Energy and Commerce and on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations—to get information from the White House about all of these backroom deals that were cut, negotiated, during the process of getting buy-in from stakeholders that everybody in the country would recognize.

Now, I'm not pointing fingers or saying that anybody necessarily did anything wrong; but there is our own American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, America's Health Insurance Plans, AARP, which represents 37 to 40 million seniors, and all of these advocacy stakeholder groups in these back rooms. Promises were made, and there were policy changes in the law in exchange for something special for them. Again, Congressman FLEMING talked about sausage-making and the legislative process, but the President promised that all of that would be out in the open. Indeed, he said it would even be televised on C-SPAN. Here again, that's promise No. 10.

That's all we're asking from the White House, from the Office of Health Care Reform—I think Deputy Chief of Staff Nancy-Ann DeParle was a director of that effort in the White House—and they have done nothing for the last 2 years but stonewall. We are going to continue to ask for documents of what went on behind closed doors so that we the people, the American people, can understand how this possibly could happen, what we now know are the unintended consequences.

Dr. FLEMING has pointed out in his presentation and in his slides with regard to the taxation and with regard to people thinking that if they like their health insurance they can keep it, only to find out that they can't. Whether they're on Medicare Advantage or whether they get their health insurance from an employer or whether they're working and paying \$15 to \$20 a week for a minimal coverage plan that has catastrophic protection without waivers, all of those plans will be taken away from people even though they like them.

So, again, the problem is unbelievable, and the unintended consequences are unbelievable. Unfortunately, you'd better believe it, because it has happened.

Mr. FLEMING. Would you touch a moment, Dr. GINGREY, on the fact that while we're trying to expand coverage and all of those things that there will actually be people who will be pushed off their coverage of the health care they have today, such as by their employers. Would you expound on that.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out, because the law very specifically says,

if you employ 50 or more people, then you are going to be required by the Federal Government to provide for them a health insurance policy. Again, this is not just any health insurance coverage, but the one that the Federal Government, the uncle, demands that you provide.

By the way, we will be voting on a bill, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday on this House floor—we, the Republican majority. It is a bill introduced by House Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR, the gentleman from Virginia, to cut by 20 percent the taxes on those small businesses; and 30 percent of them are probably, in fact, owned and operated by women. To give them the opportunity to hire people and to stimulate the economy, that, in a way, is another subject, but in another way, it's actually the same subject, is it not?

Mr. FLEMING. Yes.

You say that the threshold is 50 employees and that they lose certain subsidies or certainly face more penalties or costs after 50. What is the chance that a small business that has 49 employees will dare hire another employee?

□ 2110

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. That is exactly the point. They won't. If they've got 49 employees and they really need 53, they'll probably hire eight more—or whatever the math is—as half-time people with no benefits because they can't afford to cover their health insurance. It is a job destroyer. It's not a job creator.

Then the other situation, of course, is for those that employ significantly more than 50. Maybe they've got 1,000 employees. Mr. Speaker, these companies are going to look at the mandated cost of coverage under ObamaCare, and they are going to say, You know what? Our bottom line will be a lot better if we just pay the darn fine.

I think the fine is about \$2,000 per year per employee that doesn't have health insurance coverage provided by them. And if they do provide the coverage under ObamaCare, as Dr. FLEMING points out, Mr. Speaker, today that would be \$12,000 a year probably for a family policy, but 10 years from now, it could be \$18,000 a year. The only groups that are held harmless from that in the taxation of these so-called Cadillac plans are guess who? The unions, organized labor.

These are all good points that people need to understand, the unintended consequences of the Federal Government trying to meddle in the marketplace and treat health care—one-sixth of the economy—just like it's any other business. You can't do that. The American people know it and they hate it.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman. Again, great points.

Estimates are as high as 20 million Americans who are on insurance today through their employers, happy and satisfied with the coverage they have,

that will be pushed off. Why? Because the employer, the business will find it at least financially reasonable and perhaps beneficial to just pay the fine, push the employees out into the marketplace, make them go into the exchanges and force them to have to deal with the realities of ObamaCare.

I know that people hearing me say this would say, Well, that's cold-hearted. If you really love your employees—and I have a small business and we employ considerably more than 50 employees, and I love my employees and I want them to have the best possible coverage. But look, if I have a competitor out there who can lower his cost by pushing his employees out and paying a penalty and then I go and do the right thing and pay that, then he's going to be able to sell his product at a lower price than me. That puts me out of business. Now not only do my employees not have health insurance, they don't have a job.

Back to this 50 threshold. Any time you have a law in the United States that penalizes an employer for hiring above a certain level, that is a terrible law by itself. It is disincentivizing an employer who is going to say, Well, I'm not going to grow my business. If I can't grow it by leaps and bounds and take tremendous risk and in the process bring in so much money to cover that incremental cost of health care, I'm not even going to try it. In fact, I may just close my business down altogether.

In the remaining moments we have—and I'll be happy to give Dr. GINGREY even further time to add some additional comments—I just wanted to go back again to this broken promise that was mentioned before both by Dr. GINGREY and myself, “I will protect Medicare,” President Barack Obama, September 2009. He promised he would protect Medicare.

Where are we today? The Republicans, through the Ryan plan, a very good plan, a very good budget, have a solution that will make Medicare sustainable for an indefinite period of time. The Democrats in the House say, No, we're not in for that. We're not in for anything. We have no ideas.

I'll remind folks in this body that the actuaries, the CBO, and all of the authorities tell us that Medicare runs out of money, becomes insolvent, becomes bankrupt in 4 to 8 years. So it's time that somebody comes up with a plan. We have a plan. We had one this year. We had one last year. We modified it a little bit to make it one that, I think, Democrats could accept, and they still have not signed on to it; although, we have one Democrat in the Senate who has, so it is bipartisan. But the President made the promise and the Republicans in the House are trying to keep it, and Democrats will not go along with that.

Again, to recap: ObamaCare cuts as much as \$575 billion from the Medicare program; \$200 billion from Medicare Advantage, which is a private form of

Medicare that many Americans enjoy and love. It forces over 7 million seniors out of their current Medicare plan. Fifteen percent of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health will close because of Medicare paying less under ObamaCare.

Again, you can't cut out over \$500 billion without cutting out reimbursements for something, and that's where it's going to be. It's going to be hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, and many other types of services that Medicare provides.

The CBO estimates that Medicare prescription drug coverage premiums will increase by 9 percent as a result of ObamaCare. Mr. Speaker, this is not a tax. It's not an expense just on the wealthy. It hits the middle class and the poor as well.

Finally, the CMS actuary projects the Medicare program could be bankrupt, as I mentioned before, as early as 2016. Medicare costs are projected to grow substantially from approximately 3.6 percent of the size of our economy, the GDP, in 2010, to 5.5 percent by 2035. That's the Medicare trustees.

The physician payment formula in Medicare needs to be fixed or seniors may lose their doctors. It costs \$316 billion. We're hearing all over America about physicians who are beginning to back away from seeing Medicare patients. Not because they don't want to, not because they are not willing to sacrifice, but because if they do, they go out of business and they can't make it. Already access is an issue because of money problems. Twelve percent of physicians stopped seeing Medicare patients due to the broken physician formula that we have and that cannot be resolved and our friends on the other side refuse to address.

In our closing moments, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman, if he has any comments.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I did want to make one other point. Actually, our colleague on the other side of the Capitol in the Senate, Senator TOM COBURN, OB/GYN and family practitioner, a great physician from Oklahoma—I hate that he's retiring at the end of this term. He has been a fantastic contributor to this debate. He has pointed out recently, Mr. Speaker, if people think that once the Medicare, the hospital insurance trust fund becomes insolvent, whether it's 2016 or 2020 or 2024, at the very latest, that doctors cannot be paid on their Medicare claims, their hospital part of Medicare, even if the Federal Government wanted to honor those claims because the trust fund is insolvent and pay those claims out of the general treasury as Dr. COBURN correctly points out, they cannot do it. And yet we are whistling past the graveyard, fiddling away while Rome is burning. That's what we're getting out of this administration.

Mr. FLEMING. That's very important, because what I'm understanding

you saying is that if the trust fund becomes insolvent and there are checks going out to physicians across America, we can't just connect a line over to the general budget and say we're going to cover the bills. No, they don't get paid. Checks will bounce. This is a problem that must be solved.

So to recap in the final moments that we have—and I want to thank my good friend, Dr. GINGREY, for joining me this evening. We really have a strong group of physicians and nurses and other health care workers in the GOP Doctors Caucus. We hope to be joined by some more next year as a matter of fact. We feel like the physicians are a strong force in the U.S. Congress, not just because they know and understand the health care economy, which is very unique, but also because physicians are unique in a way that we want to make a diagnosis and we want to treat and we want to cure. We're not about kicking the can down the road. We want to cure the disease or solve the problem and move to the next one, and so the more physicians we have here, I think we will.

□ 2120

But again, I want to just reiterate for my colleagues that just because you have a card that says you are entitled to care in the United States does not mean you have access to it. I want to reiterate that. Just because you have a card, just because you have coverage does not mean that the doors will open for you, and this is where our colleagues, I think, are misguided on the other side.

ObamaCare is all about giving coverage, all about giving cards to people, but it does not protect their access to care. Because, in fact, under their system, which is basically based on a socialized model, the only way that the government will be able to afford it, and taxpayers in general, will be to create long lines, create shortages, and say “no,” to be traffic cops to people.

And you know what? The parts of our health care system today that are government-run, already before ObamaCare, we are already seeing spot shortages; chemotherapeutic agents, injectable drugs, that are otherwise not expensive, but because of the quirks of this socialized, government-run, highly bureaucratic system, we're finding that the manufacturers can't make them because they don't get enough reimbursement to cover their cost.

So what happens is they slow down, or stop making them altogether, and we have diseases and cancers out there today where physicians are scrounging around looking for the correct chemotherapeutic agent which would cure their disease, and it's very expensive and has been around for many years, and we have to even look to other countries to supply that.

With that, I look forward to our next GOP Doctors Caucus. I always enjoy this. I hope that those in this Chamber

who listen to this find it at least somewhat informative.

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

TAXES, ENERGY, AND OTHER ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these are interesting times we live in, and I've appreciated my friends, my doctor friends. We have got two physicians who would certainly like to help heal America, but we have people in powerful positions in the Senate, as well as the White House, that don't appear to be interested in their prescriptions. I sure am, and I appreciate their observations. Also, they alluded to some of the energy issues before us in the country right now, and that's certainly worth noting.

First, I want to address something that we are hearing that the President, over and over and over, he is spending millions and millions of tax dollars running around the country telling people that the cure to what ails us and the cure to all unfairness is the Buffett rule. We are told that since Buffett may pay a lower percentage than his secretary, Warren Buffett and the President are saying we need to tax the wealthy more.

We found out the President pays, apparently, a lower tax rate than his secretary, 20 percent compared to a higher percentage that his secretary pays, and it leaves some of us baffled. If somebody really feels that it's fairness or a moral issue for Warren Buffett and the President to pay more taxes than their secretaries, then at least have the morality to do it. Don't come to Congress and say we demand you pass laws to force us to do the morally right thing because we're not going to do the morally right thing unless Congress passes a law making me, Warren Buffett, me, President Obama, do the right thing. We can't control ourselves and make ourselves do the morally proper thing, the fair thing, unless Congress passes a law.

Really? Is that what we have come to—that the leader of the free world just down Pennsylvania Avenue has to have Congress pass a law to get him to do what he says is the moral and fair thing to do? Come on. Are we in that bad a shape now?

I have had one of the smarter economists in the country, Art Laffer, Ronald Reagan's economic adviser—what a great guy. Served us good spaghetti and meatballs at his home in Nashville. I personally got to try them out. Wonderful family, delightful family, a brilliant economist.

I have had him explain to me how anybody who says we're going after the rich, we're going to go after the rich, and we're going to make them pay

their fair share, is probably not being honest. They're just probably not being honest, because if they think through their proposal, if they will look at current history, if they will look at immediate past history and long past history, what they find is this. If you're a union worker, if you're a mechanic, if you're working on an oil well somewhere, if you're working as a waitress, you're working in a restaurant, you're working in a pharmacy, you're working in any of millions of businesses across America, and you're not rich, you're part of the working middle class, you cannot move if you get taxed a higher amount because you are reliant on that job.

Taxes, no matter what kind of tax you put in place, it's most likely only going to affect those who are in the middle class, no matter what else you do, because only the wealthy are not tied to a restaurant, to a car company, to an auto manufacturer, to an auto repair place, they are not tied to those. They can own them, and they can live in the next State or the next country, but they don't have to actually live at the place of business they're making money from.

When you go after the wealthiest in America and want to make them do the morally fair thing because, without Congress passing a law, these wealthiest among us can't make themselves do the moral and fair thing, according to their own words—Gee, we can't do it unless Congress makes us—what you do is tell the wealthy, we're going to slap a big old tax on you, and the wealthy can say, no thank you. I look stupid, perhaps, but I'm not that stupid. That's how I have either gained or been able to hold on to my wealth. So I'm moving. I'm voting on where I want to live with my feet, and they pick up and they go to where there are less taxes.

We've seen it in the wealthiest moving from country to another country, or island, or buying an island. We have seen that repeatedly. If the government says, gee, well, we'll outsmart the wealthiest among us. They've moved to another country, so we'll figure out a new way to go after the wealthiest. And every time it fails to work.

So after a while you get the idea, wait, let's look historically, every time a city, state, or nation goes after the wealthiest people in the world to make them pay higher taxes, unless the whole world collaborated at the same time to make it happen, they will simply move.

□ 2130

The middle class cannot do that. The middle class does not have that luxury. If you're very wealthy and gas goes to \$4 or \$5 a gallon, it's an inconvenience and you can't be tied up with trivial details like gas going up \$1 a gallon or \$2 a gallon or, like it has under this President, go from \$1.80-or-so up to \$4. And now we're heading toward \$5. And

in some places I have seen \$5—certainly, over \$5 for some time this year in some of the premium gasoline lines.

The wealthiest, they're not really bothered. It's an inconvenience. They can choose to live in an estate out in the country. They can choose to live in a town home worth millions in the middle of town, or they can choose to live on an island. They can choose to live anywhere. Because of the Internet, the telephone, Internet meetings, the wealthiest among us can do their business from anywhere.

So it becomes very clear that the only reason somebody really intelligent that understands what is going on and is willing to look at historical precedent, anybody that's really going to be fair, will realize the only reason they would say we're going after the wealthiest among us is for political gain, because they're going to drive them out of the country otherwise, or drive them out of the State or city where the taxes are going to be raised dramatically.

The thing to do that's fair for those of us who want those making more money to pay more and those who are making less money to pay less, those of us that feel that way, many of us have begun to say, To do that, let's have a flat tax. Some, like Steve Forbes, have been saying it for a long time.

The Heritage Foundation has got a new flat tax proposal that looks to have wonderful merit. There are a number of flat tax proposals. Steve Forbes was at a 17 percent flat tax, it doesn't matter how much you make. In my conversations with Art Laffer, he said you can have a flat tax and actually even be lower than 17 percent—I'm looking forward to getting the full details—and have two deductions, one for home mortgage interest and one for charitable contributions. I'm not talking about when you give underwear to some charity and say, Congratulations, you've now got my undergarments. I'm talking about real charitable contributions.

Make those things deductible, but otherwise eliminate all the loopholes, whether it's 12, 17, and the economy would explode. There would be more jobs available. And at this time when there are so many that are just on the edge of desperation, when they don't know what they're going to do, they can't keep paying \$4 a gallon for gas, for those who have been looking so long, the millions that are out of work because they just got tired of looking so they're not counted in the unemployment numbers.

So we realize, gee, the unemployment is probably much, much, much worse than the administration is telling folks. For those folks, I would like to provide a little hope. It won't be under this administration; but if we have a different President and we get a different majority in the Senate, it truly ought to be spring time in America, figuratively, as it is literally right now.

We now know, many of us, we can be energy independent. Seven years ago, when I got to Congress, I didn't think so. The natural gas we've found is extraordinary. And how have we done it? The technology has gotten so good at slanting holes, the technology has gotten so good in sealing the hole and fracking a formation. And for those that understand how it works, if you do not have a sealed formation there, and you frack, then you have lost the formation. There will be no pressure to bring the oil or gas up.

We've also had hearings in Natural Resources—and Chairman DOC HASTINGS has done a great job there—we've had hearings and we've discussed a lot of these things. And we have some Chicken Littles in the Interior Department, Energy Department, and the EPA running around saying, gee, hydraulic fracking keeps polluting drinking water. They've shut wells down. And each time when they've brought in the scientific study to actually analyze—because there has been some drinking water polluted by something—but when they analyze, they find there is not anything that was utilized in the hydraulic fracking process that was able to make its way through the thousands of feet of rock formation to get to the drinking water and that there is nothing in the polluted drinking water that could possibly have come from the fracking.

Yet this President keeps saying, I'm for all of the above. And the best I can figure is when he says I'm for an all-of-the-above energy process, it means: I'm for anything we don't get out of the ground. So we'll give hundreds of millions, actually billions, of dollars to dear friends who have bundled money for the President's reelection and original election and we'll give them those billions of dollars and say, Go try to make solar panels, even though it's not financially feasible. It's not a viable enterprise. Go do it and I will help you by giving billions of dollars—42 percent of which we're having to borrow. We'll give them all that money.

Some day we should be able to use solar energy; but for heaven's sake, we should not be depriving our Social Security funds of money while this President is giving away billions of dollars to cronies for energy ideas that don't work and that are not feasible and that are bankrupting America. And yet that's what's been happening. A 2 percent payroll tax cut for workers to divide Americans.

Seniors have been told, You don't have to worry. This Democratic administration is going to make sure we take care of our seniors. And the very times that's being said, they are gutting the Social Security trust fund. Even though it's IOUs going in there, there's Social Security tax money that has been coming in since the 1930s in enough sufficiency to pay for the outgoing checks. It was not supposed to be for many years that we were supposed to reach that point where there was

more Social Security money going out than Social Security tax money coming in.

Well, this President doubled down, and in what is a divisive—I guess, to use his terminology—divisive, dismissive gesture from this administration, we have undercut our seniors. This administration has been pushing to gut the Social Security trust fund. And it has done so.

Now, the friends in the mainstream media, trying to cover for the President, are not talking about the fact last year there was 5 percent of Social Security payments that we didn't have money to pay from the Social Security trust fund payments coming in. So we had to borrow around 42 percent of the rest, and we had to take tax money to make up the rest. And there's projections that though it was a 5 percent shortfall last year, it will likely be 14 or 15 percent this year. That's not a good road to stay on.

□ 2140

It is a road to Greece. It is a road that will so undercut our senior citizens, who deserve better from every administration, including this one. Seniors have been hurt by this administration, 5 percent last year, 15 percent this year, and if we don't get a different administration and a different majority in the Senate, it's going to be worse after that. It will be 45 percent the next year. If it triples in 1 year, it could triple again. We're in trouble if we continue the policies of this administration.

Now, since hydraulic fracking has brought us 100 to 300 years of natural gas, even at vastly expanded rates of usage, we could be energy independent, we could put not merely city buses on natural gas, but move cars to natural gas. At the same time, the Bakken play up in North Dakota has found a huge amount of oil we didn't realize we had. And in northeast Utah, northwest Colorado and southwest Wyoming, we are told there are tremendous amounts of energy. We're told there's clean coal technology.

And what's the answer from this administration? Let's shut down any use of coal. Why? Because this administration has "all of the above" as their energy policy, which means they're not going to use coal because it comes from underground.

We in the United States have been blessed beyond measure. We have more natural resources and more energy than any nation in the world. China, Russia, you name it—we've got more natural energy than anywhere. And this administration has continued to put our energy off limits. The second-largest coal deposit in the world is in Utah, we are told, and it was put off-limits by President Clinton.

This administration, of all the campaign promises you would hope the administration would break, you would hope they would break the promise to see energy prices "necessarily sky-

rocket." I would love to have seen that promise broken, yet that seems to be one of the very few that's been kept. Energy prices have necessarily skyrocketed. And then we find out today, because hydraulic fracking has delivered the ability for this Nation to become energy independent, today, the EPA has declared war on hydraulic fracking.

People are desperate. The rich—we've seen how this works. The President calls the wealthiest among us, the Wall Street folks "fat cats." All they have to endure is a little name calling from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and in return, they get richer than they've ever been. Most people can endure a little name calling by an individual when they know the individual is going to see that they're wealthier than ever. Wall Street has done pretty well under this administration. It's done a lot better than most of America.

Americans deserve better. The President says he's going after Big Oil, declaring war on Big Oil. Well, this is one of the few areas where the President actually does have a substantive plan to go after what he calls "Big Oil." Well, we've learned from the way Wall Street has been handled, call them names but make them richer than ever. Say you're going to war against Big Oil, and what happens? We get this proposal in writing from the President, this is his Jobs Act, and subtitle D of the President's job act is entitled, "Repeal Oil Subsidies."

Well, that word is extremely disingenuous. The President uses it all the time, but the word, if you look it up, means a grant or gift of money. There is no grants or gift of money. There are tax deductions for expenses. So he says he's going after Big Oil, but if you look at the specific deductions that he now has in print that he is going after Big Oil with, what do you find? You find out these deductions don't help Big Oil companies. It's so marginal, it's a drop to them. Who it will devastate and put out of business are the independent oil and gas operators who drill 95 percent of all the oil and gas wells in the continental U.S. There is a repeal in here by the President of the deduction for intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells. There is a repeal of the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells, there is a repeal of the deduction for injectants, and there is a repeal of the oil and gas working interest exception to passive activity rules.

Now, if anybody is interested in really finding out the truth, they can go to major oil companies and ask them, would these repeals of these deductions really hurt you as a major oil company in the world? And the answer would be, no, not really. You can go to the accountants, as I have, for independent oil and gas operators and say, if these are repealed, would it affect independent oil and gas operators who drill 95 percent of the oil wells in the continental U.S.? And the answer is, it will

devastate them. Not only is he going after the deductions that keep them afloat, they're going after the investment in oil and gas wells by the mainstream public.

Now, if you're British Petroleum or Exxon, you don't put out a proposal that says, we're drilling a well, and here's the proposal, here's the geology, here's the other wells in the area, here's what we think it will do. And if you invest X amount of dollars, then we will give you X percentage amount of the working interest in this well. That's the kind of proposal independent oil and gas companies have to make to get investments for people to invest in their oil well. If they hit a gusher, hit a huge well, then those who invest and take a percentage of the well will do very well. If they hit a dry hole, then they lose money. And when you invest in a dry hole and it costs you money, you would hope you would be able to deduct your expenses of the investment that failed.

What this President is doing not only is going to destroy the independent oil companies by taking away deductions that keep them afloat and keep them able to keep drilling another well, he is going after their investments.

So once you begin to see these specifics, you realize—and there are some other things in here, repeal marginal well production, repeal of enhanced oil recovery—when you see the specifics, you realize, oh, wow, maybe he doesn't know that he will destroy oil and gas independent operators. Maybe he doesn't know. But it doesn't take a genius to realize if you put oil and gas operators out of business who are the independents, who are not big enough to have all the employees they need to do the drilling, who have so many subcontractors who go out and eat and go to the entertainment places and they go invest in things around town, and they go buy clothes—those people, those subcontractors, their subcontractors, all of those people will be without anything to do because this administration says he's declared war on major oil, but instead, it's really a war against independents.

If he stops 95 percent of the drilling for oil and gas in the continental U.S., then what happens to major oil? You've eliminated all of their competition among the small independents. Well, what does that mean? Well, there are only a small number of massive international oil and gas companies comparatively, and you've wiped out their competition in America. It means they will charge more for gasoline, more for diesel, and there's nothing we can do about it because they're the only ones that have any energy.

□ 2150

Right now, before this President finishes driving or trying to put independents out of business, we've got to stop this train wreck that's coming.

This should be springtime in America. It should be a time of renaissance.

People shouldn't have to pay \$4 a gallon. And as soon as this President takes substantive actions, just to announce that he's going to take substantive actions, not to declare war on hydraulic fracking as they have now, not to declare war on oil companies in North Dakota because there have been eight mallards that died that had some oil on them and, therefore, they have the Justice Department under the President's thumb who is prosecuting the oil companies for violations of the Migratory Bird Act even though they've got windmills they support that are chopping them up by the thousands and thousands.

No, don't go after the windmills. They're above. So when the President says he's for all of the above, that includes all of the wind being generated here in Washington and other places where there are windmills that are driven by the hot air.

It's time to start saying what we mean, so that when this President tells the leader of Israel, "I have your back," the leader of Israel doesn't realize he's got to put on something that will stop a knife coming from the back. It's time for our allies to know we support our friends, and we're going to stop supporting and trying to buy off our enemies. It's time to bring peace and prosperity back to the continental U.S., all 50 States, all our territories, by truly having an all-of-the-above energy policy. And if we want to pursue renewables, don't be letting the Social Security trust fund or the tax money dry up and leave seniors so vulnerable. Don't take away \$500 billion from Medicare and hurt the seniors like that as ObamaCare has done. Don't do those things.

If you want to go spend billions giving it to your friends in solar energy, for heaven's sake, let's start leasing the Federal land like it used to be done, and then use 25 percent royalty, use part of our royalty, to throw away on the President's friends, not be borrowing from China, not be taxing people to give to his buddies, and we can return to springtime in America.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for April 16 and today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 18, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5658. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Office of Policy and Program Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to the Schedule of Operations Regulations [Docket No.: FSIS-2010-0014] (RIN: 0583-AD35) received March 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5659. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus pumilus* strain GHA 180; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0536; FRL-9343-1] received March 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5660. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Private Transfer Fees (RIN: 2590-AA41) received March 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5661. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Regional Haze [EPA-R01-OAR-2010-1043; A-1-FRL-9652-1] received March 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5662. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Amendment to HFO-1234yf SNAP Rule for Motor Vehicle Air Conditioning Sector [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0776; FRL-9651-3] (RIN: 2060-AR20) received March 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5663. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Quality Assurance Requirements for Continuous Opacity Monitoring Systems at Stationary Sources [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0873; FRL-9653-3] (RIN: 2060-AH23) received March 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5664. A letter from the Assistant Director, Policy Division, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Iranian Transactions Regulations received March 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5665. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability by Public Accommodations and in Commercial Facilities; Swimming Pools [CRT Docket No.: 122; AG Order No. 3326-2012] (RIN: 1190-AA68) received March 16, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5666. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement [USCBP-2012-0007] (RIN: 1515-AD86) received March 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5667. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of Notice 2008-40; Deduction for Energy Efficient Commercial Buildings [Notice 2012-26] received March 30, 2012, 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 3 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 3523. A bill to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 619. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4348) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law preauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-446). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 620. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for domestic business income of qualified small businesses (Rept. 112-447). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1505. A bill to prohibit the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture from taking action on public lands which impede border security on such lands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-448, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committees on Agriculture and Homeland Security discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1505 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

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. ISSA (for himself, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 4363. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow Federal employees to continue their public service while partially retired; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MICA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 4364. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to specify further conditions under which payment for the services of a recess appointee may not be made from the Treasury; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BUERKLE (for herself and Mr. ROSS of Florida):

H.R. 4365. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that accounts in

the Thrift Savings Fund are subject to certain Federal tax levies; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 4366. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants for science, technology, engineering, and math education programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4367. A bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit the fee disclosure requirement for an automatic teller machine to the screen of that machine; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STARK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the release of Federal tax levies which cause business hardship; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUAYLE (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. ROSS of Florida):

H.R. 4369. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos, and the filing of such reports with the Executive Office for United States Trustees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 4370. A bill to require new policies and procedures to address duplication and inefficient spending in the Federal grants process; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4371. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve pensions for surviving spouses of World War II and Korean War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. REED, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 4372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the social security number of the student and the employer identification number of the educational institution for purposes of education tax credits, to permanently allow disclosure of return information from prison officials to prevent prisoners from filing false and fraudulent tax returns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4373. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the expansion of tax benefits for adoption enacted in 2001 and to permanently reinstate the expansion of tax benefits for adoption enacted in 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 4374. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the increased limitation on the cover over of the tax on distilled spirits to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4375. A bill to provide a taxpayer bill of rights for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 4376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny all deductions for business expenses associated with the use of a club that discriminates on the basis of sex, race, or color; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr.

FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. STARK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Res. 621. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month in May as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the Nation's history; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. ISSA:

H.R. 4363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

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. ISSA:

H.R. 4364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

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.

Art. II, Sec. 2

The President . . . shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law.

By Ms. BUERKLE:

H.R. 4365.

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. . .

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to act under Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H.R. 4369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 (To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States)

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 4370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14 and 18

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 4372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the 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. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4373.

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 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 4374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States provides that All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives and Section 8, Clause 1 grants Congress the 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.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 4376.

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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 59: Ms. BUERKLE and Mr. CRAWFORD.
- H.R. 139: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CROWLEY.
- H.R. 156: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 265: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 266: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 267: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 300: Mr. BACA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. WATERS.
- H.R. 466: Mr. BARTLETT.
- H.R. 576: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 589: Mr. COSTELLO.
- H.R. 601: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 616: Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 631: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 683: Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 718: Mr. CASSIDY.
- H.R. 719: Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. CANSECO.
- H.R. 769: Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 777: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. GIBSON.
- H.R. 808: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 831: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
- H.R. 860: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 912: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 933: Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 941: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. CARNAHAN.
- H.R. 1066: Mr. DEUTCH.
- H.R. 1131: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 1171: Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 1206: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. CRAWFORD.
- H.R. 1321: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 1360: Mr. DOLD, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. BOREN.
- H.R. 1385: Mrs. BLACK.
- H.R. 1404: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 1418: Ms. HIRONO.
- H.R. 1449: Ms. HAHN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1474: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. KLINE.
- H.R. 1477: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 1479: Mr. BARROW and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
- H.R. 1519: Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 1543: Mr. HANABUSA.
- H.R. 1564: Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 1588: Mr. REYES.
- H.R. 1639: Mr. FLORES and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 1653: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 1666: Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 1674: Mr. LATHAM.
- H.R. 1697: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
- H.R. 1742: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. STARK.
- H.R. 1756: Mr. RIGELL.
- H.R. 1802: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

- H.R. 1860: Mr. RIVERA, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 1862: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1876: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
- H.R. 1909: Mr. REED and Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 1955: Ms. SPEIER.
- H.R. 1996: Mr. BERG and Mr. GARDNER.
- H.R. 2032: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 2033: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
- H.R. 2051: Ms. HAYWORTH.
- H.R. 2088: Mr. WAXMAN.
- H.R. 2091: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2123: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2144: Mr. BACA and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 2182: Mr. FILNER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. BARROW.
- H.R. 2206: Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 2227: Mr. CHANDLER.
- H.R. 2245: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 2353: Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 2364: Mr. REYES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 2547: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 2568: Mr. RENACCI.
- H.R. 2569: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
- H.R. 2705: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 2721: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 2741: Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 2827: Mr. COLE and Ms. GRANGER.
- H.R. 2886: Mr. GIBSON.
- H.R. 2902: Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 2921: Ms. HAHN.
- H.R. 2962: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 3032: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3057: Mr. KISSELL.
- H.R. 3065: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 3144: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. GERLACH.
- H.R. 3145: Ms. DELAURO.
- H.R. 3173: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 3187: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DICKS, Ms. HOCHUL, and Mr. CARTER.
- H.R. 3236: Mr. OWENS and Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 3238: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
- H.R. 3252: Mr. TURNER of New York and Ms. BUERKLE.
- H.R. 3307: Ms. BUERKLE.
- H.R. 3324: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 3334: Ms. DELAURO.
- H.R. 3359: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 3364: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. CHANDLER.
- H.R. 3368: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3395: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. BACHUS.
- H.R. 3405: Mr. HOLT and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 3435: Mr. WAXMAN.
- H.R. 3486: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 3506: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HANABUSA, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 3523: Mr. McKEON.
- H.R. 3541: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. PALAZZO.
- H.R. 3561: Ms. MOORE and Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 3586: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
- H.R. 3591: Mr. HOLT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRIMM, and Mrs. MALONEY.
- H.R. 3595: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 3596: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 3609: Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 3658: Mr. DOLD and Mr. STARK.
- H.R. 3670: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.

- H.R. 3712: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 3728: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 3770: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 3803: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HECK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. HALL.
 H.R. 3821: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 3826: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 3831: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3875: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 3895: Mr. RIVERA.
 H.R. 3900: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 3903: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 3914: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3980: Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 3989: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3993: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 3994: Mr. CASSIDY.
 H.R. 4005: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 4017: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 4018: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 4032: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 4045: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 4055: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 4063: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 4070: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4081: Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 4124: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4128: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4132: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 4134: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 4157: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HURT, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. COLE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 4169: Mr. DOLD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 4170: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 4171: Mr. LANKFORD.
 H.R. 4189: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 4192: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4201: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 4222: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 4227: Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BACA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 4228: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 4237: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. CASSIDY.
 H.R. 4240: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
 H.R. 4256: Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 4259: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 4269: Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 4275: Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 4295: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 4297: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 4301: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 4313: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 4315: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4322: Mr. LANKFORD.
 H.R. 4325: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 4329: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4336: Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 4345: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 4351: Mr. FILNER and Mr. PETERS.
 H.J. Res. 88: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.J. Res. 106: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.J. Res. 107: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. BERG.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H. Res. 130: Mr. TOWNS.
 H. Res. 172: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 282: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H. Res. 521: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H. Res. 549: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Res. 560: Mr. STARK.
 H. Res. 564: Ms. WATERS.
 H. Res. 568: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H. Res. 583: Mr. DOLD.
 H. Res. 604: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JONES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

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. 3288: Mr. CHAFFETZ.