

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to remain competitive in the global economy, we must invest in clean energy innovation.

San Diego has 767 clean energy companies, and has become an innovation hub, especially in solar power, energy storage and advanced biofuels. According to the San Diego Association of Governments, the algae energy section alone—one energy section—provides the region with 410 direct jobs and \$108 million in economic activity each year.

Unfortunately, the appropriations bill we're voting on this week cuts solar energy research by more than one-third; decreases biomass research by \$33 million; and cuts \$80 million from funding for breakthrough domestic clean energy innovators.

We can't hold back the companies that have come up with the answers to our serious energy problems. I hope my colleagues will join me in fighting for cleantech and biotech innovation by opposing this damaging bill.

PUTTING PARTISANSHIP ASIDE TO CREATE JOBS FOR THIS NATION

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, we are now on day 191 of the new Congress. Sadly, I must report to the people of my congressional district and to this Nation that we have done absolutely nothing with regard to creating jobs. Rather than spending time trying to blame George Bush and Barack Obama, I think we ought to utilize every moment we have to create opportunities to work.

We are in a crisis: 9.2 unemployment overall, 16.2 African American unemployment. If you add what the Labor Department does, which is something called U-6, African American unemployment is at 30 percent.

This Congress owes it to this Nation to move the partisanship aside and to create jobs for this Nation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2354 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337 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. 2354.

□ 1239

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. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 13, 2011, the bill had been read through page 62, line 2.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairman, title V of the Energy and Water bill that is before us today robs Peter to pay Paul.

Title V takes funds which were appropriated 2½ years ago for transportation purposes and moves part of those funds to the Corps of Engineers in today's Energy and Water appropriations bill. Title V specifically rescinds all awarded but unobligated high-speed rail dollars from the Recovery and Reinvestment Act and moves those dollars to respond to the unprecedented flooding this spring in many States for work to be done as it is designed and executed by the Corps of Engineers.

Effectively this is a backhanded increase in allocation to the Energy and Water Subcommittee for this bill at the expense of transportation purposes.

I don't contend or even suggest that the Energy and Water bill is well-funded. In fact, the allocations for the Energy and Water Subcommittee and for the Transportation and HUD Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, are both totally inadequate. But I do object to killing projects in transportation that will create construction jobs in the severely depressed construction industry and provide a valuable transportation alternative in heavily congested corridors among our largest metropolitan areas all over the country. And I do absolutely support making the repairs to flood control systems as quickly as they can be designed and built. That's an obligation.

In my 20 years, 10½ years under Democratic Presidents, 9½ years under Republican Presidents and under the control in the Congress of either party—because it switched back and forth in those 20 years—we have dealt with natural disasters on a bipartisan basis, on an emergency basis, every single year. Most famously, that includes, in September '05, the Katrina disaster which resulted in \$15 billion for recovery of New Orleans and the gulf coast on an emergency and on a

totally bipartisan basis. But this section takes from projects planned, applied for and awarded but not yet obligated and kills those projects.

Roughly \$6 billion of the \$8 billion appropriated for intercity passenger rail and high-speed rail projects in the Recovery Act are already obligated, and half of those are already in construction. The Recovery Act itself allowed until the 30th of September of 2012, the end of the '12 fiscal year, to obligate those dollars. Of the roughly \$2 billion unobligated, 80 percent of those dollars arises from the single decision just 3 months ago of the Governor of Florida to refuse the \$1.6 billion previously applied for and awarded for a project to build true high-speed rail on a dedicated corridor between Orlando and Tampa.

Now, Orlando lies roughly equidistant from Jacksonville, Tampa and Miami. Those four, Jacksonville, Tampa, Miami and Orlando, are four of America's 40 largest metropolitan areas. All have over 1½ million people, all are growing by between 15 and 30 percent, and they are among our fastest growing metropolitan areas. They represent a prime example of the opportunity that high-speed rail offers in carefully selected high-population corridors around the country to reduce congestion and expedite travel.

When that money was refused by Florida, the Federal Rail Administration re-awarded the \$1.6 billion to projects in other States, including, as examples, in the Northeast Corridor, which carries half of all intercity rail passengers in America every day, nearly \$800 million for work in that Northeast Corridor, and that work would bring the speed up to 160 miles per hour in parts of New Jersey, and the work would be done in New York and New Jersey. So that is \$800 million.

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

Mr. OLVER. I ask unanimous consent to be given 1 additional minute.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Secondly, in the high-speed corridors that are based on Chicago as their hub, to go to Detroit, to go to St. Louis, to go to Indianapolis, to go to Milwaukee, for equipment that will allow those high-speed corridors to function better.

Thirdly, in projects on the west coast as well. All of those projects are jeopardized by this provision in this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chair, I am opposed to the misguided cuts to high-speed rail funding in this bill that

will eliminate thousands of jobs, halt a large number of rail projects across the country—and we are way behind every other nation almost, industrialized nations, anyway—and hurt local and State economies. This is the latest in the majority's agenda that can best be described as penny-wise and pound-foolish.

In their Pledge to America, the majority made a promise to the American people. "We will fight efforts to use a national crisis for political gain," they declared. Sadly, that's what they're doing today. Using the tragedy of natural disasters in America's heartland as a political tool to try to eliminate a job creation program, one of the very few we have, is just wrong. Thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in economic investment are at stake, and yet this fight brought to us today is little more than an unnecessary ideological battle.

The high-speed and intercity passenger rail program is critical to our country's competitiveness. It puts Americans back to work, revitalizes our construction and manufacturing sectors, boosts the domestic economy, and helps end U.S. dependence on foreign oil. It is both unwise and ineffective to cut important funding from one project in order to pay for disaster relief. We are a Nation that should be able to both build for the future—in fact we must—and provide for our fellow citizens in need today.

High-speed rail creates jobs. Every \$1 billion of high-speed rail and intercity passenger rail construction funding supports 24,000 jobs. High-speed rail creates short-term jobs in construction, long-term jobs in ongoing maintenance and operation, and indirect jobs by providing regions with access to a larger labor pool and driving economic development.

In my home State of New York, the United States Conference of Mayors estimates at least 21,000 new jobs and \$1.1 billion in new wages with the construction of high-speed rail along the Empire Corridor from Buffalo to Albany.

High-speed rail also creates the economic corridors of the future. A high-speed rail line in western New York as currently planned would reduce travel time significantly and expand the western New York labor market to 955,562 workers. This would make us the 26th largest metro area in the Nation, and that means new businesses will be drawn to the area as we connect our cities to Montreal, Toronto, New York City and the rest of the eastern seaboard; and for the first time in many areas, we may even be able to go west.

In New York, high-speed rail will be our next Erie Canal. Nationally, it is rightfully being compared to our national highway system. Both spurred local development and brought millions of jobs to our State and the Nation. At this point in time, we must not let this opportunity slip away.

What's more, rescinding funds for high-speed rail now, after \$5.68 billion

have already been obligated by the Federal Railroad Administration, will negate the unprecedented work already being done by the FRA and its partners.

FRA, the States, Amtrak, and infrastructure-owning railroads have made significant progress in reaching service outcome agreements to ensure that intended project benefits are realized, while protecting the public's investment and the railroads' operating interests.

The attempt to rescind this money is nothing but an opportunistic attempt to gain politically from a human tragedy. The flooding that has occurred in our Nation's heartland is being used as an excuse to eliminate an investment in our transportation network of the future.

□ 1250

This is morally reprehensible and economically irresponsible.

If we are to be a competitive global economy in the years to come, we must dedicate ourselves to building the infrastructure that we will need to compete. To rescind these funds now after so much progress has been made and at a time when investments in our own infrastructure and our country are so sorely needed is quite simply an act of foolishness.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the rescinding of unobligated high-speed rail funds in the bill that we are considering today.

During the full committee markup of the 2012 Energy and Water appropriations bill, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN offered an amendment providing \$1.028 billion in emergency funding to the Army Corps of Engineers to repair damage caused by recent storms and floods and to prepare for future disaster events. It makes sense to spend money on that; we have always given money for emergencies. But the funding is offset in the chairman's amendment by a rescission of all the remaining unobligated high-speed rail funding that was originally approved in the American Recovery Act.

The language of the amendment would rescind all unobligated high-speed rail funding as opposed to just \$1.028 billion to be spent for the emergency. This provision jeopardizes several important projects that are already underway, already in the planning stages, that support good jobs and will make long-overdue improvements to our rail system.

Last May, the Department of Transportation awarded some of these high-speed rail funds for major improvements on the Northeast Corridor, such as \$449 million for catenary improvements, which would allow trains to reach 160 miles per hour on certain seg-

ments, and \$294 million for the Harold Interlocking in Queens, which would reduce delays for Amtrak and on the Long Island Railroad.

I've heard a lot of people complain about the trip times and reliability on the Northeast Corridor and complain that even the Acela is not true high-speed rail, and they're right. But these are the kinds of projects that have to be done to prepare to make significant improvements in the corridor and to prepare the way for true high-speed rail later.

Make no mistake: These are projects that are happening now. This is not money just sitting there waiting for a visionary high-speed rail system to come about. This is money going to real infrastructure investments now that support real jobs now and support real economic development when we need it most.

I share the chairman's desire to provide funding to the Army Corps to repair storm damage, but this is not the way to go about it. This is a perfect example of why we have—or used to have—different rules for emergency spending. If something unexpected happens, massive storms and floods, we should be able to respond without jeopardizing other funding. We always said that emergency funding didn't have to be paid for by offsetting other reductions in worthy programs.

I am very concerned about the underinvestment in transportation and infrastructure that seems to have taken hold on the other side of the aisle. We have always had bipartisan agreement that investing in roads, rails, bridges, highways, tunnels and transit is an essential government function. And historically, it's what made the economy grow. From Henry Clay's American system and the internal improvements and Abraham Lincoln's transcontinental railroad, from the Erie Canal of DeWitt Clinton, in more recent times the interstate highway system of Dwight Eisenhower, the economy of the United States was built on these infrastructure developments.

As the Nation is embroiled in negotiations over the debt limit now and how to address the long-term deficit, this is yet another example of the misguided thinking that cutting government spending is somehow the answer to these long-term economic challenges. It is unfathomable that we would pass anything that would eliminate good jobs, and not just the direct transportation and construction jobs but all of the jobs dependent on the connectivity and efficiency of our transportation system.

We need to make the investments necessary to put America on a path toward long-term economic growth. We should be providing a lot more money for high-speed rail, which is one of the connection systems of the future. This bill that we will be considering today takes an extra step backward by revoking funds already allocated—not necessarily obligated, but allocated and

announced—for ongoing projects that are moving ahead. I urge my colleagues to fix this provision.

Emergency funding is obviously warranted for the floods, but it should not be done by eliminating already allocated funds for high-speed rail in an area where we very much need those improvements on the current transportation system.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, we must fund the Army Corps of Engineers to repair damage caused by recent storms and floods and to prepare for future disaster events, there is no question about it. But doing so by cutting long-term investments in high-speed rail makes absolutely no sense, and I rise in strong opposition to this offset. This reckless rescission will eliminate thousands of jobs, halt a large number of rail projects across the country, and hurt local and State economies.

The program is critical to our country's competitiveness by putting Americans back to work, revitalizing our construction and manufacturing sectors, boosting the domestic economy, and ending the United States' dependence on foreign oil. And it flies in the face of President Obama's stated goal of connecting 80 percent of America by high-speed rail in the next 25 years.

Should this rescission pass in this House, the Capital Region of New York State alone stands to lose three critical projects, thousands of jobs, and millions in investments. Specifically, the bill, as written, would eliminate over \$150 million intended for the Empire Corridor Capacity Improvements project, the Empire Corridor South: Albany to Schenectady Second Track project, and the Empire Corridor South: Grade Crossing Improvements project. This would lead to the loss of some 4,223 jobs.

Plain and simple, Madam Chair, we cannot afford these cuts at this time.

Just a few weeks ago, the local chambers of commerce from the capital region of upstate New York flew down to Washington, DC, to meet with Members of Congress to discuss their areas of interest and attention. It turns out that one of their top priorities was high-speed rail. Why is that? It's plain as day. High-speed rail investments create jobs. Jobs are the building block of our recovering economy, and a strong economy leads to a reduced Federal deficit.

Madam Chair, why is it that Europe, Japan, China and other countries can invest in 200-plus-mile-per-hour trains, but when the United States wants to simply lay additional track, upgrade some crossings, and guarantee timely, affordable, relatively average speed trains, we are left out in the cold?

Let's not let shortsighted politics trump our long-term economic viabil-

ity. These are commonsense investments that have already been committed to, have already increased reliability in our rail system, and have already created jobs. Let's not pull the rug out from the feet of our job creators, not now. We simply cannot afford it. We cannot afford to deny the hope for jobs. We cannot afford to deny the American pioneer spirit.

I would like to thank my colleague, Representative SLAUGHTER from New York, for her tireless advocacy on this issue and for having the vision and determination to make high-speed rail in upstate New York and across this State and country a reality.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the rescission of funds from the high-speed rail program that was unwisely included in the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water bill reported from the Appropriations Committee.

My home State of North Carolina has been working for many years to advance the Southeast High-Speed Rail Corridor from Charlotte to Raleigh and Richmond, and ultimately linking the southeastern States with Washington, D.C. and providing a connection to rail service in the Northeast.

Over the last 15 years, North Carolina has invested approximately \$300 million in State intercity rail service capacity, including the construction of new train stations and track improvements. These strategic investments have already helped reduce travel time between Raleigh and Charlotte by 1 hour. But over the last two decades, the Federal investment in the Southeast or other high-speed rail corridors has been very, very modest. The burden fell almost completely on the States. In light of the enormous capital investments needed, while our progress has been steady, it has also been very slow.

Madam Chair, this has been an area where President Obama has demonstrated strong leadership, making major Federal investment in high-speed rail one of his top priorities.

Competition for the billions of dollars allocated under the Recovery Act was intense, and ultimately funds were distributed to 31 States, with half a billion dollars awarded to North Carolina. These funds will help our State achieve a goal set long ago—2-hour train service from Raleigh to Charlotte—and I'm happy to report that work is already well underway. And we know what comes next: Raleigh to Richmond.

□ 1300

These planned rail investments will relieve congestion, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, make our neighborhoods more livable and environmentally sustainable, make our communities more attractive places to live and do business in the long term, and

create well-paying construction and manufacturing jobs in the near term—20,000 jobs in North Carolina alone, as a matter of fact.

Rescission of these funds is penny-wise and pound-foolish. It undermines an infrastructure project that would create jobs and pay dividends for years and years in the future. If we want to stay competitive in the international economy, we cannot continue to lay behind countries like China in developing a 21st century infrastructure. Rather than cutting funds for high-speed rail, we should be investing further in a high-speed rail network that will enhance our Nation's overall transportation system, moving us forward the way the highway system drove us forward in the mid 20th century.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to an offset included in this bill that would rescind all unobligated high-speed rail funding. I support the gentleman from New Jersey's efforts to address the flood, but it should not be taken from such an important investment in the economic strength of our country. It is also an investment in moving us to energy independence.

I would like to address my comments particularly to the Northeast Corridor, that is the corridor between New York and Washington and New York and Boston. This corridor is the most heavily traveled not only in the United States but probably in the world. And the MTA says that the corridor between New York and Boston, on day one, if we had high-speed rail, hundreds of thousands of people would travel it, and it would absolutely be a positive revenue source. It would literally make money because of the ridership that is in that area and also in the area between New York and Washington.

In the money that was allocated, the MTA is focusing on high-speed rail between New York and Boston. And they are supporting the \$294 million for the Harold Interlocking Amtrak Bypass Routes, which would create, according to analysis, well over 9,000 jobs immediately, as it is shovel-ready and ready to go. This is an investment towards high-speed rail, but it's needed right now to move three lines: the Long Island Railroad, Amtrak, and the New Jersey Transit. In this one area, the Interlocking has over 783 trains moving through this each day from the three different transit systems. So this obviously needs to be upgraded to take care of delays and to be able to move people and commerce faster. Because of the way the Harold Interlocking is currently constructed, conflicts among

the three rail lines are frequent and result in delays, disruptions at Penn Station, and over the entire northeast corridor.

So this critical funding will be used to construct a bypass that would allow these trains to move conflict-free and quickly. It is fully designed, has undergone extensive environmental review, including a final environmental impact statement. This project is shovel-ready and will be completed—if not interrupted by this action on the floor—by 2017, and will, very importantly, move us towards high-speed rail between two of the major commerce centers in our country, between Boston and New York. It would literally make money. To rescind this money would be penny-wise, pound-foolish, and would move us backwards. We should be investing in the economic corridors of our country, which is our rail, our high-speed rail.

I strongly, strongly support the high-speed rail and urge my colleagues for the economic strength of our future to vote against this amendment, this section that would rescind the money for the very needed high-speed rail that would move us into the 21st century to be able to compete and win in the 21st century, move our people, move our commerce, create jobs not only in the railroad but in the commerce that is between the two centers. We cannot afford to fall behind in our transportation system. It's one of the things that made this country great. It is an important investment. It is an investment that would literally make money in the Northeast Corridor, and it would be absolutely tremendously foolish to rescind this investment towards the economic future of our country.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. EMERSON. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chairwoman, first let me say that I deeply respect the words that all of my colleagues have talked about with regard to high-speed rail. And I understand very much the concerns that the funding for emergency flood restoration and rebuilding would come at a cost to future years of high-speed rail development, keeping in mind that this money has not been specifically obligated.

But first, let me talk about the flooding that's started in North Dakota, going all the way down to Louisiana, down the entire Missouri River system and the entire Mississippi River system. We're talking about more than one-third of the entire watershed of the United States of America. We're talking about farmers. We're talking about the people who work for the farmers. We're talking about the hardware stores and the implement dealers and all of the communities that have been devastated by flooding. And these folks have no recourse.

We're talking about billions of dollars in lost economic activity, and

we're talking about the safety and the protection of people, their families, their children, and the folks who worship with them at church. If we don't have the emergency ability to make it possible for these people to regain their lives and their livelihoods, then we're talking about billions of dollars of lost economic activity for this country. And for people who say, Well, you know, it's farmland, and it's not important. We're talking about farmland. Well, guess what, people, we have the most abundant, safest food supply in the world. We pay less money than any person in any country of the world for our food policy. We pay 9 cents on the dollar. And if we don't restore the livelihoods of these people, if we don't restore our levees and our bridges and our roads and the economic activity of these communities, then we're going to be paying a whole lot more for food, and people are going to be screaming about that. But at the end of the day, isn't the government's role to protect the lives of people?

I just want to say that it wasn't an easy decision for the subcommittee to make, to be able to protect people's lives. But when we're talking about money that is unobligated, that has been returned to the Treasury, and it's that pot of money that can help people be safe, safe from water, safe from flooding so that they could be rebuilding their homes and producing a lot of economic activity—and, yes, a lot of jobs, because there is not a lot of difference between farming and hiring of people and producing and the ripple effect on the economies, and a factory. It's the same thing. It's just a little different.

So I have great respect, as I said earlier, for the arguments that my colleagues are making. But at the end of the day, I think that it's critical that people's lives and people's livelihoods be protected. We must rebuild and we must restore these levees before the next big flood comes again so we can protect our wonderful food source in the United States.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1310

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. I rise in strong opposition to the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which includes an amendment that would rescind the remaining unobligated high-speed rail funding that was originally approved in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

In listening to my colleague who just spoke, I don't think anyone here on this floor disagrees that we support the farmers, we support the people who have been impacted by flooding. But the question is whether these particular funds are the appropriate funds

that should be dedicated to address that particular issue.

I would venture to say that while I believe it's important that the Army Corps of Engineers has access to funding necessary to prepare for future disasters, I would say that because I am the ranking member of Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications. But when you consider our long overdue efforts to be able to develop a high-speed rail network that would create jobs and bring rail infrastructure into the 21st century for the United States, that also is a priority as well.

I am proud to be vice chair of the bicameral High-Speed Rail and Intercity Passenger Rail Caucus, and I am glad that we are working to increase the visibility on this issue. I have long fought for bringing transportation systems into the 21st century. After all, that's important to Americans' lives as well. Because if we're not able to traverse from one side of the country to the other, if we're not able to do it in an efficient manner, eventually we will also find ourselves without more jobs and without being able to have appropriate living conditions.

Consider that high-speed rail pays for itself, significantly reducing \$700 billion a year of oil purchased that could be dealt with regarding our trade deficit. High-speed rail pays for and saves lives. We are talking about lives. What about the 43,000 Americans who die each year in car accidents? What happens when we talk about that high-speed rail pays for its efficiency and mobility by being able to move people and goods without delay and waste? And also when you consider that high-speed rail pays by improving air quality, which also helps and saves lives.

Thirteen countries around the world are investing hundreds of billions of dollars into their systems. And for years the United States has failed to keep up. Finally, we have an administration that is actually focused on this issue and has made a commitment to this funding. However, when you consider that in the United States we only have one high-speed rail corridor, that's the Acela Express, operated between Boston and Washington, D.C., and even in our one corridor the trains only reach 150 miles per hour, far below what we would really call a true world class high-speed rail.

So when we consider being in the High-Speed Rail Caucus and what our efforts are today, thankfully we are looking at a situation where we do have funding that's been allocated. So when we say it's unallocated funds, let's talk about that. Actually, what's happened is the administration has done an excellent job in considering areas that have said they are not ready to do high-speed rail at this time. So rather than our wasting money as we did in the past, years in the past, of building bridges to nowhere, what we've said is, if a particular area is not ready, let's put the money back where it can now be reallocated.

So it's not that the funds are totally unobligated. We are now in the process of putting them in the areas that are ready to build high-speed rail now. We must be forward thinking and proactive to position our country to compete in the global economy. That's about American lives as well. Nowhere is it more important than in the area of high-speed rail to take that broad step.

It will cost about \$40 billion to bring high-speed rail to areas like mine in California. But with it comes really a revolution in travel in a way that we have not touched before.

Madam Chairwoman, I cannot support this bill in its current form in light of the amendment that's been brought forward, and I urge my colleagues to vote against these draconian cuts. We had an opportunity to do more funding for Army Corps, and on this very floor many of my colleagues chose not to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Chairman, the question is, just how important is the Mississippi River? The Mississippi River system connects approximately 30 States in our Nation's heartland with the international markets. Sixty percent of all U.S. grain exports are shipped from the Mississippi River. Twenty-five percent of all large commercial bulk ships that arrive in the U.S. come to the mouth of the Mississippi River. U.S. Customs and Border Protection estimates that the river system facilitates between \$85 billion and \$104 billion annually in foreign trade through the Mississippi River system. And one-third of the Nation's oil comes up the river to refineries in Louisiana.

This year's historic flooding carried an estimated 60 million cubic yards of sediment down the Mississippi River. This sediment doesn't just float on out into the gulf; it settles. It settles all along the river, from Missouri to Lake Providence, Louisiana, on down to New Orleans, where currently 5 extra feet of sediment has built up over the normal levels. Five feet. And for every foot that's taken away from the draft of a ship, it costs that ship \$1 million. Madam Chairman, one doesn't have to be a mathematician to tell that that's pretty expensive to our economy.

The flood has not only highlighted a need for dredging, it has also damaged levees and floodways all along the Mississippi. The Corps of Engineers estimates that on the river alone it will have to spend an additional \$1 billion to \$2 billion to repair levees and floodways damaged by the recent floodwaters. This is work that must be done to allow these levees to again protect Americans from future floods.

Madam Chairman, I know that there aren't many out there speaking against

the Mississippi River and the need for maintenance. They are just arguing that the money does not need to be offset since we could call it emergency funding. And yes, we could go that route. But as we are in the middle of negotiations and debate about raising the debt ceiling, the last thing we should be thinking of is adding more to the pile of debt. We cannot continue to do this, Madam Chairman, especially when we have seen the national debt increase at an average of \$3.9 billion per day, especially when the Treasury Department now projects that the U.S. debt will exceed the GDP by the end of this year.

The Congressional Research Service study reports that if supplemental operations had been fully offset over the last three decades, the Federal debt could have been reduced by at least \$1.3 trillion. That translates to a reduction of public interest payments of \$57 billion per year. Ignoring the need to offset spending is a mistake, Madam Chairman, a mistake that our children cannot afford for us to make.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. DeLAURO. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Chairman, included amongst a multitude of misguided policies in this bill the Republican majority has on the floor today is the rescinding of high-speed rail funds that would otherwise create good middle class jobs, strengthen our economy, allow us to build a 21st century infrastructure that we need to compete with the other economic power centers around the world.

Over 6 months in the majority and my Republican colleagues have proved very capable of ending Medicare, rolling back health care reforms, namely for women, and choosing to reduce the deficit on the backs of working middle class families and the most vulnerable.

One thing they have chosen to do is to zero out job creation. And, in fact, by cutting funding for high-speed rail projects in this bill, the majority is threatening as many as 60,000 jobs. This is the majority's answer to last week's extremely disappointing jobs report that showed that we are mired in unacceptably high 9.2 percent unemployment after adding only 18,000 jobs in June, with a construction sector that has 16.3 percent of its workers unemployed.

□ 1320

This is the majority's answer to the 14 million unemployed in this country, real people, real families looking to wait their way through this crisis.

In Connecticut, the majority's decision to rescind a \$30 million investment—and I might tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—this \$30 million has been obligated. It is an investment in the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield line and would seriously

limit the ability to expand one of the best intercity passenger rail networks in the country. The line represents a critical component of a larger regional plan for passenger rail to integrate the New England rail system, connect it to New York, the middle-Atlantic States and to Canada.

The improvements that would be made with the investments my colleagues on the other side are seeking to eliminate are essential to meeting the needs of the entire region and achieving the benefits of the Federal and State investments that have already been made there.

High-speed rail is desperately needed in Connecticut. This is the most heavily trafficked commuter region in the country. New England's traffic has increased two to three times faster than its population since 1990, and 80 percent of the Connecticut commuters drive to work alone.

When it's completed, the line is expected to reduce the number of vehicles on the road by approximately 4,000 cars a day, saving a billion gallons of fossil fuel a year and reducing carbon emissions over that time by 10,000 tons.

Just as important, the line has been a high priority for Connecticut, for its Representatives on both sides of the aisle for many years. It means opportunities for economic development and expansion throughout our State.

But expanding the economy, creating jobs is simply not a priority for the majority. They appear perfectly content to allow us to fall behind our global competitors like China, with its plan to invest a trillion dollars in high-speed rail, highways and other infrastructure in 5 years.

And the short-sightedness is further exemplified by what has been put forward this week in a \$230 billion 6-year surface transportation bill that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce calls unacceptable as the cuts will destroy, rather than support, existing jobs, which would be devastating to construction and related industries, leading to a less competitive economy and a drag on the GDP due to underperforming infrastructure.

Now, I want to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I have a great appreciation for disaster assistance, a great appreciation for the commercial value of the Mississippi River. I am there. I have been there for disaster assistance.

Now, if you don't want to do an emergency declaration, then let me tell you where you can get some of the money from in order to do this: \$40 billion to the oil industry every year in a tax subsidy. Nobody here believes that they are suffering as the farmers in our country are suffering. They don't need money for the levees. They don't need any money at all; but, no, the other side doesn't want to take any money from that \$41 billion to do something about those who are suffering in these States due to natural disaster.

Or what about the \$8 billion we provide to multinational corporations to

take their jobs overseas? Let's take that money and use it for the people of this great Nation who are in difficult straits, difficult times and their jobs, yes, and their levees need to be dredged. Let's get that money to the Army Corps of Engineers.

Finally, we support Brazilian cotton farmers. We give them \$147 million every single year. I suggest we take that money from the Brazilian cotton farmers and spend it on the folks in our country who are in desperate need.

Don't take it from high-speed rail. Don't commit us to planned obsolescence.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I would like to congratulate the Appropriations Committee and the chairman for their fine work on making some difficult choices.

Obviously, our budget times are tight. We have to prioritize our spending, and we have some emergencies here in this country which are abnormal, extremely abnormal from the standpoint that our weather patterns have changed dramatically this past year and as a result we have a lot of our citizens that are really suffering right now.

In my district, I have the Mississippi River along the one side, I have the Missouri River running through the area as well, so both of those have been dramatically impacted by the massive rain storms that have run through the area as well as some of the tornados that have gone through the area as well.

So I want to put a face on some of this for just a moment. You know, we have today a number of farmers who no longer can drive to their homes. They have to take a boat to their homes. They have 5 feet of water. Some of them are looking at the roofs instead of their homes, and their crops are gone. And when they are gone, whenever a flood occurs, it doesn't just occur and wipe out that year's crops. Quite often times it takes 2 or 3 or 4 years. And sometimes the ground is damaged to the point where it can never be reclaimed.

The gentlewoman from the southeast portion of our State, some of her area that was devastated by some of the levees that were blown up, those crop lands may never return to fertile ground because of what happened. Again, well, people say, well, it's just farm land. No, it's not. This is the business of farming. This is their business location.

And if you look at their farms, it's not just land that's laying out there. They have irrigation systems, they have thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars in irrigation systems and the berms and the ground that's been cultivated and excavated in a way that it can utilize all the waters that they irrigate with or whatever.

So they have a huge investment in this property. It's not just land. It's a huge investment in their business. We are interested in continuing to help those folks rebuild those levees, rebuild their lives, rebuild their businesses because this is what they are about.

One of the things that has happened in my area right now is with, basically, a tsunami coming down the Missouri River basin. In Montana they had an unusual amount of snow that fell this year, a late snow melt. And then on top of that they had a whole year's worth of rain in a 2-week period, and we have literally a tsunami coming down the Missouri River basin.

Fortunately, we had a flood control set of dams in there that have minimized it; but even at that, this is a 100- to 500-year flood that is devastating everything in its path. And so those folks, in fact, right now from Kansas City on north, there isn't a single private levee that isn't either breached or topped.

Let me repeat that: There isn't a single private levee north of Kansas City that is not breached or topped. That's how severe and how devastating this situation is this year.

When we start talking about the uses of the river, it's important to note that barge traffic on rivers—the gentleman from Louisiana a moment ago talked about the usage of how much corn and grain goes up and down the Mississippi. The normal barge can carry 900 trailer loads of grain, 900 trailer loads of grain.

Think of all the vehicles we are taking off the roads. Think of the environmental impact of none of those vehicles being on the road. It's very significant.

Yet, in our area, the Missouri River is being underutilized because of some of the new mandates that are being put on it by different bureaucrats here in D.C. with regards to trying to worry about a fish or a bird that lives along the shore and/or for recreational purposes.

So we have some interesting debates going on right now. Those we will decide at a later date, but the problem we are facing today is the devastation that it has had to life and property and the safety of those. We believe that these funds are necessary for people to recover from this devastation that has occurred.

And just as a side light here, we also would like to thank the Appropriations Committee for not only finding a way to do this, prioritizing Federal funds without adding to our debt, but there is an interesting fact here as well. I want to note, it was from a report back in January of 2009 with regard to the Congressional Research Service that said had supplemental appropriations been fully offset—which this is since 1981—Federal debt held by the public could have been reduced by at least 23 percent, or \$1.3 trillion. This could have reduced interest payments to the public by \$57 billion a year.

I think while it's difficult, I know that our friends across the aisle and some of the folks here discussing the prioritization this morning are not happy with this. I think these are difficult times. We all have to realize that reprioritizing things sometimes is not easy.

But in this situation I believe that it's justified, and we certainly support what fine work the Appropriations Committee has done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, it is just a matter of time before we will rue the day that we did not build out the infrastructure across the length and breadth of our country. Our President has proposed that we have an infrastructure bank such that we can take care of the needs on this side as well as the needs on this side. We will rue the day that we did not build out our transportation infrastructure.

One example, in 2005, in Houston, Texas, Rita hit the gulf coast. We had thousands of people being evacuated from a major urban area, and as they were moving away, the highways became clogged. They were stopped on the highways. People spent nights on the highways. Trains are a part of the emergency evacuation system in this country, and we need more rail so that we can evacuate people in times of emergencies.

9/11/01, who can forget? The skies were clear. There was a full ground stop. More than 4,000 planes were grounded. No one could fly. Trains became a part of the emergency evacuation system so that people who could not fly could still make their destinations.

It is time for us to wise up and realize that the President is right. It is time for us to, in the parlance and vernacular of those in the streets of life, to 'fess up and tell the truth. We should not put Peter ahead of Paul. We should not rob one to pay the other. It is time for us to take a holistic approach and show some vision.

Let's move to create jobs across the length and breadth of the country with this infrastructure program. Let's give architects who have offices and business and laborers and engineers jobs. Let's give them jobs to do.

And the good news is you cannot export these jobs overseas. You don't have to worry about them being outsourced, because they will all be done right here in the United States of America.

Let's rebuild this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, I first want to congratulate and thank the chairman of the Energy and Water subcommittee for setting as a priority making sure that our waterways, especially the Mississippi River, are restored after the devastating floods that we experienced throughout our country. It wasn't just in a few States; it was throughout many parts of the Midwest, South, and other parts of our country that experienced tornado damage and experienced unprecedented flooding going back to 1927.

But now if you look at where we are and you look at what is being done here, this is not money that is adding to the deficit. We are at a point right now as we face this debt ceiling—and there is a divide in Congress; there is a divide in Washington. And the question is: Are we going to start living within our means and truly setting priorities in this country or just continue going down this spending binge acting as if nobody is going to pay the tab?

And, of course, I think what the chairman, the full chairman of Appropriations and so many other members of this new majority have said is that game is over. The game of spending money we don't have is over, and we've got to make the tough choices of setting priorities in this country.

So if you look at some of the money that was moved over from high-speed rail—and there were billions of dollars set aside in the stimulus bill that was such a failed disaster, over \$787 billion of money that we don't have with the promise that unemployment wouldn't go over 8 percent. It's very clear that that failed. But what we're saying is let's take some of that money and move it over into something that's much more important right now, and that is getting our economy back on track, getting people back on track and getting their families back together.

Look at what happened on the Mississippi River. Just a few weeks ago, I flew over the Morganza Spillway and looked at the Atchafalaya Basin where some of that flooding happened where you literally had people who were in harm's way and their areas were flooded to keep other people from flooding. And it was one of those terrible choices no one wants to have to make, but those families were put in that situation and their communities were flooded so other communities wouldn't.

The extra silt that came down the Mississippi River now threatens to impede the ability for us to move commerce through 30-plus States of this country so that we can get those exports, so that we can create more jobs and be able to be competitive with foreign countries. If you're a farmer in Iowa, if you're trying to move commerce in Missouri down the Mississippi River, if you don't have the ability now because we're not able to dredge the

river, all of a sudden now Brazil is going to get that contract for that product because you can't be competitive anymore.

Not only are we talking about tens of thousands of jobs, but we're talking about priorities. If you look at the high-speed rail projects, many States have turned the money down. Why? Because they realize it's a money loser. They lose money on the deal because it just doesn't pay for itself. Of course, States have balanced budgets. Most of those States have to balance their budget every year, so they can't just take what looks like free money to go and engage in a process that's ultimately going to cost them money every year that they don't have. But because they have to balance their budget, many of them have turned that money away.

And so you look here in Washington, there is no balanced budget requirement, and it shows you, frankly, one of the reasons why we need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution so that we are forced to live within our means, too, so we can't just keep spending money as if there is no consequence, because there is consequence. Our children and our grandchildren are counting on us to make those responsible decisions and to set the priorities. We cannot just tell everybody that comes in the door, You've got an idea, here's some money; you've got an idea, here's some money. Nobody has the money. We'll just go print it, raise the debt ceiling and just keep giving it as if it's not going to have an effect. At some point, it has a real effect; it has a real impact. And so we've got to make the tough choices and set the priorities.

So there was devastating flooding throughout our country. You had so many States that saw tornado damage and flooding damage, and they're trying to get back on their feet. And then there is this high-speed rail money. And so much of the money in the stimulus bill went to waste and was squandered. We have nothing to show for it. The promise of no more than 8 percent unemployment didn't work. It was a failure, and everybody recognizes it. And so we're saying we're going to make those tough choices.

None of these choices are easy, but we didn't come up here to make easy choices. We came up here because we've got to set the priorities of this country, and that means balancing our budget and not just saying everything can get all the funding it wants. If something is a priority, then that means we've got to find the money somewhere else. And so that's what's being done here. And that's why I commend the chairman for making that tough decision. And, yes, we're going to have to have a fight over this. We're going to have to have a discussion over this, as we should. This is the people's House.

That's what this discussion is about. It's about setting our priorities and

shifting from the old way of doing business of just spending more money we don't have on every idea that sounded good. We can't keep doing that. So that's why I support what the chairman is doing.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. First of all, I want to be clear that I support the funding to protect the citizens of the Midwest from flooding. And, in fact, Louisiana has gotten more money than probably anybody else.

I come from Florida. We have disasters, natural disasters, all of the time. But the reason there is no funding for flood protection is because the Republican leadership cut the funding and the Republican Members supported it.

Let me be clear. I support the funding for the disaster. As the ranking member of the Transportation Subcommittee on Rail, I find that these funding cuts which would block all of the remaining unobligated high-speed rail funding approved by the economic stimulus entirely unacceptable.

And I am sick and tired of Members coming to the floor saying that the stimulus money was a disaster. It is not a disaster that we put people to work in Florida and throughout this country. And, in fact, if it wasn't for the stimulus dollars, teachers would have lost their jobs. In one area, we kept firefighters and police officers employed. And that is a job while this economy is turned around.

And let's not forget how we got in this mess. Institutional memory is in order. When you have your head in the lion's mouth, you pull it out, you ease it out. What happened? How did we get here? When Bill Clinton left, we were operating with a surplus. But we had 8 years of Bush and two wars. And do you think this mess started 18 months ago? No, it did not.

□ 1340

We have been practicing what I call reverse Robin Hood for 8 years. Nobody remembers that, when you kept giving tax breaks to the rich and billionaires. What happened here in December? Almost \$800 billion that you gave to the not just millionaires, billionaires. And yet you come up saying in June and April, we can't send the pension checks.

Yes, we're spending money up here, but it's the priorities you have. You don't have the priorities of taking care of the elderly people. You want to cut Medicaid and Medicare and Social Security while you give billionaires—billionaires—tax breaks, and millionaires. And now you want to cut money for high-speed rail. But we know for every billion dollars that we spend for high-

speed rail, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs. But yes, we have some Governors that are shortsighted, like my Governor Rick Scott of Florida that sent back almost \$3 billion. We have 11 percent unemployment. What was he thinking about? I guess he was thinking he didn't want to see those people going to work and making Barack Obama look good, even though we have the most congestion in that area, and that our competition is there. If you look at Spain, if you look at France, you look at Germany, 200 miles, 1 hour and 15 minutes. That is the future of our country. But we have some shortsighted people here, people who only want to see, you know, well, we need to balance the budget. Well, where were you when they were giving tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires? And you do it over and over again. That's the sad thing.

If you put it on the board, put it on the board today, you would have the same vote. You would have the exact same vote. And every opportunity you have to vote, you vote to give millionaires and billionaires tax breaks. So, you know, we started the rail system, and we are now the caboose, and we don't even use cabooses any more.

I am hoping that the American people will wake up. It is shameful that over and over again in the people's House, in the people's House, we attack the people who do not have lobbyists on Capitol Hill. And so I yield back the balance of my time, but I do know that elections have consequences. The American people are watching you. I have voted five times to raise the debt ceiling. Why did I do it under Bush? Because I knew it was in the best interest of this country and not the politics of the time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOMACK. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chairwoman, I think we are going to have to extend the space shuttle for an extra day to retrieve the thought process, it got so far out there in orbit. Let me just be very clear, to kind of bring this back to the subject matter at hand.

We're talking about taking funds that have been designated for a project in the future, near term or long term, but in the future, to satisfy an emerging issue that is in the present. Future versus present.

In my district of Arkansas, the cresting of the Illinois River has ripped apart roads, washed out bridges. Floods have taken the lives of constituents of mine, young people who will grow up without a mother or father. We have people living in tents. We have an urgent issue that is facing us today. The flooding has done damage across our entire State, leaving hundreds of Ar-

kansans without homes, and crop losses estimated at over \$500 million. It has even been asserted by the other side that it is "just farmland." Just farmland.

Well, let me say to the people who make that argument, don't make that argument with your mouth full.

It has also caused about \$100 million in damage to dams, parks, roads, and waterways under the control of the Army Corps of Engineers, and if left unrepaired, will only result in additional devastation in the next season.

But it isn't just about what happened in Arkansas; the entire Mississippi River and its tributary system has been imperiled by these tragedies. They are the lifeblood of our Nation's commerce, and bordering farmlands are rich with fertile soil able to provide food for so many of the American people. Allowing these lands to be so vulnerable to future flooding will only imperil our Nation's food supply.

Offset or not to offset; it is an emerging issue. And on offsets, as you have already heard from my colleague from Louisiana, my colleague from Missouri, that supplemental appropriations, if fully offset over the last three decades, would have reduced by at least \$1.3 trillion the debt and reduced the public interest payments on this debt of \$57 billion a year. Now, my friends, \$57 billion in interest payments would build a lot of high-speed rail.

I congratulate the chairman for his work on this Energy and Water bill. I support it. It is prudent. It is wise. It is necessary. And I commend it to the leadership and to this entire House to pass it and restore the fiscal integrity of our country and give relief to the people who need it so desperately.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HONDA. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chair, I have a written prepared statement I will include for the RECORD. It talks about California and the need for investments, and I don't think anybody is going to argue with the need for this country to invest in its country or its infrastructure. We have had that argument.

I'm trying to figure out a way how to make my comments without making anybody wrong. The chairman is faced with a difficult task of trying to balance a budget. He faces that challenge with limited funds. It is a terrible job. But I think we ought to look at the process and be thoughtful and explain to the people out there who are watching us, the young people here who are watching us, that we can be smart. We can be compassionate, and we can do that without allowing ourselves to be fighting among ourselves and trying to make decisions between jobs, the economy, infrastructure, and taking care of those who need to get back on their feet. I have no arguments with that.

My mother used to say when unexpected guests came to our house during dinnertime, you don't turn them away, you just add more water to the soup, and then you enjoy each other's company.

Congress is a living organism responsible for its past, its present, and its future.

In the past, according to the GAO, we spent about \$150 billion just on Katrina. In Afghanistan, we spend \$325 million a day. And in Iraq, we spend about \$100 million a day. That's almost a \$1 billion a day. We are talking almost a billion dollars in light rail. We can be both right and smart and compassionate if we do the right thing.

In our budgeting process, we should have a fund for unforeseen circumstances. We should learn from Katrina. We are looking at about \$4 billion in terms of the Army Corps of Engineers. I think our leaderships need to get together and just say "we can do this" without fighting among each other, without making each other wrong, because that's wrong. In the eyes of the public, they want us to do the job that needs to get done and have our leadership do that.

So my plea is that we can be fiscally responsible and we can be compassionate, and we do that with good planning and good budgeting processes, including having contingency funds that should have been there. And so we have an opportunity right now to show the public that we can do all of these things and still come out winners for those who need the help, and those who need jobs, and still take care of the Nation's infrastructure needs. That's what America is all about. It's a can-do spirit without having to fight within our own families.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition of the underlying bill that rescinds over one billion dollars in high-speed rail investment to pay for emergency disaster relief due to storms and flooding in the Midwest—emergency disaster relief that should be funded through emergency appropriations.

The Majority appears proud to say they are offsetting the funds needed to help our citizens in the Midwest recover from the storms and floods that have devastated their communities.

But what the Majority is doing is really not something to be proud of.

The Majority is offsetting jobs and offsetting investments into our Nation's infrastructure.

Put bluntly, Madam Chair, with this bill the Majority is offsetting our Nation's future.

This bill would specifically rescind \$68 million intended for the Next Generation Passenger Rail Equipment Purchase in my State of California. During these difficult economic times, rescinding these funds would result in the loss of as many as 1,892 jobs.

Earlier this year, the President released his annual budget request for Fiscal Year 2012, which calls for a \$53 billion, 6-year investment in high-speed rail. I applaud the President's vision for a sustainable future.

Every other industrialized country in the world, except the U.S., has shifted its intermediate range travel, or 50 to 600 miles, to

high speed trains. Are they all wrong and only the U.S. right?

Madam Chair, polls show over 70 percent of Californians support the 800-mile, double-track, grade-separated, fast, clean, quiet, and safe high speed trains that will link San Jose with Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego. California must lead the Nation into the future.

Let's not forget, Californians voted for \$9.95 billion for this project in 2008, a major reason over \$3.7 billion in Federal funding has been granted for our State's starter project. Those funds, with the President's proposal and private investments in discussion, could kick-start the Silicon Valley extension, the first major job destination for California's system.

The investment proposed by the President directly impacts my constituents in Silicon Valley. Those funds could bring the California High-Speed Rail Authority's starter construction project, already-funded between Bakersfield and Fresno, through the Pacheco Pass to Silicon Valley.

Benefits to Silicon Valley are profound; mobility, employment, cleaner air, and international competitiveness.

Mobility: California's high speed rail project connects to many feeder modes at the Diridon Station, across from the HP Pavilion and the proposed A's baseball park in the heart of the Silicon Valley. When finished by 2020, the Diridon Station will be one of the Nation's largest multimodal hubs, with over 600 trains per day including high speed rail, BART, CalTrain, the Capital Trains, Altamont Express, Amtrak, light rail, bus lines, an automated shuttle to the Mineta International Airport, and more.

Employment: Return-on-investment is the first rule for Silicon Valley. Research proves investments in high speed rail return more than twice the cost, in tax revenue, over the life of the projects. And, with 30% construction unemployment, investment in high-speed rail means jobs, right now, in our State. Engineers estimate the project will create over 160,000 construction jobs, for as much as 30 years. An additional 450,000 jobs will be stimulated by the economic vitality created around the 26 down-town stations. Those jobs are in California, for Californians, and cannot be offshored.

Clean Air: Research indicates over 90% of the future riders currently use single passenger cars or short-hop airlines, both major polluters. The electric trains are committed to use non-polluting renewable energy. The U.S. comprises 4% of the world's population but creates almost 25% of the world's greenhouse gasses. High speed rail is a powerful tool the rest of the world is already using to fight climate change.

Competitiveness: The emerging economic engines in Europe and Asia are rapidly overtaking the U.S. and California. They move people to work and products to the market more efficiently. China invested over \$80 billion in high speed rail last year alone, over \$1 trillion in the last decade, completing over 7,500 kilometers of their planned 13,000 kilometer system in just 9 years. The EU's dozen lines are similarly successful, and Japan is also expanding its system dramatically. Many of those systems are now operated profitably by private companies.

How is it possible for every other industrialized country, and many emerging economies, to afford state-of-the-art high speed rail

systems and claim that the world's richest country cannot?

Madam Chair, Americans support investments in our county's transportation infrastructure. A recent Rockefeller Foundation survey found 91% of the national sample agreeing that, "our generation has a responsibility to the future to invest in America's infrastructure—just as our parents and grandparents did."

The foresight of our forefathers, who ensured that our highways, waterways, and railways promoted our economy, must not be lost now. We too must be good ancestors. High-speed rail is the future. The time to invest in that future is now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1350

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. I want to thank the subcommittee chairman and the committee chairman for bringing this bill forward in the way that they've done it.

I particularly want to thank them for the fact that this bill provides \$1 billion in emergency funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to repair the damage caused by recent storms and floods and to prepare for future disaster events. This funding is offset by a rescission of the remaining emergency high-speed rail funding that was originally allocated in the stimulus bill.

Our friends on the other side have told us they're not opposed to the emergency funding because of the storms and floods—they just don't like the offset. In fact, I've heard it said, We've always done it this way. When an emergency comes up, when a disaster occurs, we've always just funded it without a spending offset.

Madam Chairman, on April 26, 2011, the people of Smithville, Mississippi, had hopes; they had dreams and they had plans. Some of those plans were budgetary and financial, but on April 27, at approximately 3 p.m., those plans changed. They changed drastically. When an historically devastating storm swept through the Southeast, Smithville, Mississippi, was struck by an EF5 tornado, and was literally wiped off the face of the Earth.

Let me make it quite clear. The people of Smithville are very grateful for the outpouring of food, of supplies, of materials that have come from around the Nation. They're grateful for the outpouring of help that has come from the various agencies of the Federal and State governments, but those same people have also redirected plans and priorities in their own lives. They didn't proceed forward with the plans that they had the day before.

Madam Chairman, if the men and women in Smithville, Mississippi—many of whom are living in trailers, many of whom have seen their lives disrupted and houses destroyed—are making the difficult choices in their

own lives, they have every reason to expect their government to do the exact same thing.

That's the basis for budgeting: deciding how to allocate available resources for both planned and unplanned events. They continue to say, But we've never done it that way.

Madam Chairman, over the past three decades, if we'd had leadership in this body like that of the leader of this subcommittee and the chairman of the committee and if we had done it in the way that they're doing it today, our national debt would be at least \$1.3 trillion lower, and we would not even be in this debate about considering to raise it.

I want to thank the chairmen for their leadership, and I urge the passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COSTA. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COSTA. I rise in opposition to the underlying bill and to a provision of this bill that, I think, is highway robbery, plain and simple.

Once again, my friends on the other side of the aisle are ignoring an opportunity to invest in their infrastructure, to create more jobs and to build a modern, 21st century system of transportation that utilizes our highways, our air transportation system and, yes, our rail in the state of high-speed rail systems that are part of America's future.

I support providing, like I think the majority of my colleagues do, the funding for the Mississippi Delta—we should and we must—as we have with every area that has experienced a disaster over the history of our Nation, but there are other ways to provide that funding.

In May of this year, Secretary Ray LaHood—a colleague of ours, a Republican—announced that \$368 million of our tax dollars would go to California to invest in the San Joaquin Valley in order to construct the Nation's first true state-of-the-art high-speed rail system. It's a system in California that the people support. In 2008, Californians went to the polls, and voted overwhelmingly for a \$9 billion bond measure to construct high-speed rail that will create hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout the State and that will create economic opportunities not only in the San Joaquin Valley but throughout California.

But this provision steals that money and the promise of new jobs right from the hands of the people it is intended to benefit.

The Great Recession hit my region of the country probably harder than almost any other place in America, with double-digit unemployment levels that exceed 20 percent. Too many people can't find jobs to keep roofs over their heads or can afford decent, healthy diets; but at a time when everyone in Washington says we should be focused

on job creation, this provision is the only one I can see that's about job destruction.

High-speed rail will create over 600,000 construction jobs over the life of the project over the next 10 to 20 years in California, but this provision says "no."

High-speed rail will create 450,000 permanent jobs over the next 25 years, but this provision just says "no."

High-speed rail will spur economic development by connecting our San Joaquin Valley with the Bay Area and southern California to create a system that will provide high-speed rail for 80 percent of California's population, but this provision just says "no."

High-speed rail will improve our air quality and will reduce traffic that clogs our freeways. Of course, this provision just says "no."

High-speed rail has proven to be a smart investment over the five decades that it has been developed in Europe and Asia, but this provision says "no" to America and "no" to California.

High-speed rail will ensure that California is competitive well into the 21st century, but this would attempt to block that area to move into the next phase of a 21st century system of transportation.

The people of California want high-speed rail—they voted for it and the jobs that it will create—but this provision, of course, just says "no."

Now, we've talked about our current financial situation. These are difficult times for America. There is no doubt about that. We must focus on our deficit, and we must come together in a bipartisan fashion. Yet I submit to any of you to tell me that we have a more difficult time today than we had in the 1860s, when our Nation was being torn apart by the Civil War—when inflation was running rampant, when deficit spending made our situation today look tame by comparison, when we had the first issue of paper money, and when a lot of people doubted the credibility of that paper currency.

Yet we had a great Republican President, the Emancipator, during that time in our Nation's history when our country was being torn apart—who had boldness and a vision and who had decided we were going to build a railroad across the country and invest in our Nation even though we were in that Civil War. That's what he did.

So this provision attempts to take on an effort, notwithstanding the difficult financial challenges that we have, to in essence say what President Lincoln said in the 1860s: We can do better. We can build a transcontinental railroad.

President Obama believes we can get ourselves out of this financial situation by working together and, at the same time, by investing in our Nation's infrastructure, just as President Eisenhower did in the 1950s when he decided to embark upon the effort to build interstate freeway transportation that we all benefit from today.

This provision was slipped into law. So, ladies and gentlemen, I ask that we

defeat this provision and that we keep our faith to the voters of California.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. CRAWFORD. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to congratulate and recognize the tremendous work of the Appropriations Committee in responding to the flooding disasters during a time of tight budget restrictions. There were tough choices that had to be made, but I believe the committee effectively prioritized the needs of the American people.

Madam Chair, my district in Arkansas was severely impacted by the recent floods that wrought devastation in the Mid-South and the Lower Mississippi Valley. Preliminary estimates of crop damage surpassed a half a billion dollars, and communities were evacuated because the levees struggled to retain the floodwaters.

□ 1400

The St. Francis levee district suffered the most damage because the water levels were so high the water enclosed entire areas and almost completely flooded Cross and Woodroof Counties in my district. In St. Francis County alone, hundreds of homes were underwater and tens of thousands of acres of farmland were flooded as well.

In another part of my district, heavy flooding devastated all areas of Des Arc in Prairie County. The community of Spring Lake, which is home to 32 families, was completely flooded with several feet of water. So far, only three of those families have moved back into their homes. The community of Smith Road, which is home to 18 families, was completely flooded as well. So far, not one of those families has been able to move back to their homes. On top of the damage to these communities, more than 50,000 acres of farmland were flooded. The entire corn crop was wiped out and most of the rice crop as well.

Mr. Chair, the flood disasters across the Mid-South have taken a huge toll on our way of life and have touched nearly everyone in my district. We must ensure we retain the vital funding to the Corps of Engineers so that we can repair and reinforce our levees so that citizens in the lower Mississippi Valley and the Mid-South can live in safety and our economy can recover.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DOLD). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you.

This has been an interesting debate. I've been able to sit down here and listen to a lot of folks on both sides talk about really investments that we need to make in the United States. I'm glad that there are some investments that our friends on the other side actually think are important to the country, be-

cause it seems in many ways the national narrative is that there isn't anything the government can make investments in that is important for our country.

To hear some Members talk about natural disasters and to hear some Members talk about the barges going up and down and farmland, there's a huge subsidy program where billions of Federal dollars are spent to support farmers. There are obviously dams that need to be built, and that is Federal money. When it applies to certain Members' districts where they are actually affected and families affected, it's their responsibility to come to Washington, D.C., and advocate for those investments.

I think what you're seeing here on our side is that we have Members on this side of the aisle who believe that investments need to be made in our communities, too, and that over 30 years, if you take cities like Youngstown or Cleveland or Detroit, you will see cities that need investment. We may not have had a natural disaster, but over the last 30 years we have had an economic disaster where we have had a lack of private investment. I am rising here to say that high-speed rail can be a force multiplier in our economic improvement in our community and across the country.

The gentleman from California just cited the number of jobs, the billions of dollars that could be invested. In Youngstown, Ohio, we would be linked up to a Pittsburgh to Cleveland corridor that would then go over to Toledo and Detroit and that would make its way over to Chicago. This is essentially connecting the United States of America.

You would be taking an economic region like ours with two major powerhouses in education and in health care that would be connected by high-speed rail. In Ohio, we gave away the high-speed rail money, too. Our Governor gave it away. And there were hundreds of millions of dollars in private investment that was going to follow the public investment that needs to be made. But if we're going to connect, if we're going to try to resuscitate some of these older areas in our country, high-speed rail is a way to do it.

These are investments that can be made. We can connect the Cleveland Clinic with the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. We can connect Case Western Reserve with Carnegie Mellon, and they can partner in research, get on the train, and help lead some economic development and commercialization of products. You could take a region of our country and connect it through high-speed rail.

The problem is—and I will end with this—all of these investments need to be made. This is the dirty little secret in Washington, D.C. We're only spending 2 percent of our GDP on our infrastructure, while China and India are spending 10 percent of their GDP reinvesting back into their country. We

will lose the future if we do not make these investments. These are critical to the competitiveness of the United States. The dams that need to be built and the high-speed rail and the roads and the combined sewer and the airports and the ports and the highways and the bridges, we need to invest in all of these things.

Our country is crumbling. We can't have Members say, We only need to make this one investment for this one dam because it's in my district and because I know families who have been hurt. We've got to elevate ourselves and look at what needs to be done in the entirety of the whole country and how we are going to compete against China, how we are going to compete against India, how we are going to be globally competitive.

All of these investments need to be made, including the economic development and the private investment that can be drawn in through high-speed rail.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman, and I really do want to thank our appropriators. This is a tough, tough business. I certainly want to thank the ranking member whom I've had the privilege of working with and thank the chairman as well, because this is a tough dilemma that we are facing.

I think I come with a unique perspective. I live in hurricane and flood country. Houston is the site and was the recipient of hundreds of thousands of Katrina survivors coming in from New Orleans. We have faced our own ups and downs, most recently with Hurricane Ike, and I walked the beach with both former President Clinton and former President Bush when we went down to Galveston and looked at the amazing devastation.

So many of us were concerned about the tragedy in Joplin, Missouri, and other places, and then the constant flooding. I have talked to Members of Congress where there is flooding going on in their district as we speak. But here is the dilemma that we have and the reason that I rise to raise the question of the recapturing of already designated funds and to realize that these are not funds that were just sitting in a pile unused. These funds are not only already designated—I would like to say appropriated—high-speed rail dollars but, as well, these funds will generate thousands of jobs.

As I read the amounts of moneys that were designated, \$450 million were going to be utilized for necessary repairs in New Jersey. That means that my friends on the floor of the House have made a sacrifice, and I appreciate that, but high-speed rail is a valuable and necessary investment in America's future.

I truly believe that there could have been a compromise, where resources

could have been used for the flooding problems in the area that my colleagues have spoken about, the needy areas, and still leave an amount that would have been shared for high-speed rail. Let's create jobs together. That is the restoration of those flood areas, and I would almost ask the question without knowing as a member of the authorizing committee for Homeland Security, what other opportunities might have been in place to be able to utilize those dollars for the disaster that has occurred.

But I will tell you, it is no doubt as you go across Europe and see the value of high-speed rail, new technology, that America is far behind with its high-speed rail investment, the new technology, the new science, the new kinds of cars that are being produced that will create jobs, in essence putting the cars together, manufacturing the cars but then the assembling of the cars now being placed in cities around America. Those are real jobs, long-term jobs.

The decision that the administration made was a thoughtful decision. Let me thank Secretary LaHood for understanding the value of high-speed rail, and I would suggest that the proposal that we have for Texas does impact rural Texas. It is a proposal for high-speed rail from Houston to Dallas, going through our rural communities, creating the opportunities for jobs but creating the opportunities for investment in the purchase of land and the growth of business. All of that has an impact in creating jobs.

□ 1410

That's what we are all here for. We are here to be the rainy day umbrella for Americans who are in trouble, and as well we're here to create jobs, which Americans are so desperately in need of.

So I am disappointed that we didn't find the happy balance, and I believe that we could; that we couldn't measure the amount of resources that might have been able to be utilized for our friends that have just experienced a disaster and not completely gut monies that are already designated, appropriated. It's almost as if we came in and said there's a pile of cash, and I'm not going to bother to identify what it's supposed to be used for.

I would hope that there would be a method of reconsideration. These are fair gentlemen on the floor of the House. I've worked with all of my colleagues here. And I would just raise the question of why would we, in essence, zero out high-speed rail, not only for our urban centers but for our mid-western areas that are desperately in need of jobs, and for the southern areas that now are looking to the future for high-speed rail to create jobs and to create the quality, excellent, superior mobility system that Americans deserve—not the country of America, but the people of America deserve.

I would argue vigorously for a reconsideration of the funding and the re-

structuring of the funding to ensure that we have high-speed rail, create jobs, and deal with our friends who are in need.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of funding for high speed rail, and the importance of ensuring that money designated for high speed rail by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is utilized to build high speed rail-ways.

I must express my concerns about the offset in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. There is no doubt that recent flooding in the Midwest has devastated communities and greatly impacted the region's economy.

The Army Corps of Engineers must have the resources to address the damage wrought by the flooding of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, but I urge my colleagues to consider the source of this funding.

The funding allocated for high speed rail in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will do more than update our Nation's transportation system; high speed rail creates jobs, increases tourism and is environmentally sustainable.

The Department of Transportation recently awarded \$15 million for a high speed rail project in Texas. The funding was awarded for engineering and environmental work to develop a high-speed rail corridor linking Dallas and Houston, where I represent the 18th Congressional District.

The demand for high speed rail in the state of Texas is significant. The second most populous state in the Nation, Texas' population is forecasted to grow by an additional 9.4 million people by 2035, a 38.9 percent increase over projected 2010 levels.

Additionally, the population growth is not going to be spread evenly across the state. According to the Texas State Data Center, 92 percent of the 2010–2035 population growth will occur in the existing metropolitan counties. High speed rail is an investment in the future of the state.

Receiving this funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was a tremendous opportunity for Houston, and the entire state of Texas. The award will allow our state to make critical investments in infrastructure that will increase mobility and allow for better commercial and private growth of our cities.

A long time supporter of high speed rail, I supported the Safe Highways and Infrastructure Preservation Act, and secured \$150 million dollars for the metro solutions light rail project because high-speed rail projects and other transportation investments represent the potential to create hundreds of jobs, enhanced mobility, and future economic development for Texas, and the entire Nation.

I commend the Chairman for recognizing the need for emergency funding in flood stricken areas. However, there are plenty of places from which my colleagues can offset funding. I cannot support an amendment that offsets funding from critical infrastructure projects that create jobs. I urge my colleagues in the Majority to explain why they would rather take funding from projects that create middle class jobs than raise taxes for billionaires.

We must repair the damage done by flooding, but we must also invest in the future of America. Other nations around the world have shown us that the future is high speed rail. It

is our responsibility to make critical investments in infrastructure projects, like high speed rail.

I urge my colleagues to think about the consequences of continuing to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans at the expense of middle class jobs and improvements to our Nation's infrastructure. Offsetting funding for high speed rail for emergency disaster relief is not a responsible course of action.

My Republican colleagues constantly talk about creating jobs, yet time and time again, they turn away from opportunities to do so. The time for rhetoric has passed; what the country needs, what our constituents need is action. Offsetting funding for high speed rail, slashing funds that will create jobs is the wrong action, and I urge my colleagues to reconsider.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am urging this House to spend the high-speed rail money on what it's designated for, high-speed rail projects.

Much of this money, or a good portion of it, was turned down by Governors of other States. So I'm here as a representative of Michigan's 13th District, and I want to go on the record right now of claiming that money because Michigan and metro Detroit, the district that I represent, we need jobs, jobs that will be created by the high-speed rail project, jobs that will be created when that high-speed rail that links Detroit to Chicago is tied into a regional transit system around metro Detroit. That's going to attract businesses all around that system. Companies and employers are more likely to stay in Detroit, move to Detroit when they realize they can have close access to Chicago and other midwestern areas. But jobs not only as an indirect result of this transit system and high-speed rail system, but by manufacturing the rails and the passenger cars that are going to be used. By creating jobs, that is the most effective way to create a long-term, resilient, enduring economy. And that's the best way to pay down our debt.

I understand the point that we should allocate a funding source to provide funding for the flood victims. Well, I would like to propose one.

Over the last 10 years, this Congress has authorized the spending of over \$50 billion—that's with a "b"—in economic aid to Afghanistan. Each fiscal year, including this current one, we're spending at least \$4 billion on economic aid in Afghanistan. I'm proposing let's just take a share of the money we're sending overseas to help serve and protect people in another country, let's redirect American tax dollars back to serve Americans.

And my fundamental point is this: We need to be more conservative with our tax dollars. Yes, there are needs all around the world, but our people need help right here. This budget choice that we're faced with right now under-

scores that. This is a choice that we should not have to make. We shouldn't have to choose between serving flood victims and providing for long-term jobs that we need in Michigan and metro Detroit through high-speed rail.

You know, there is another fairness issue. Folks where I live, the auto capital of the world, they can't afford an automobile because of the high cost of automobile insurance. They need high-speed rail and the synergy it will create with mass transit.

So again, I urge you, let's use this money for its intended purpose—to ultimately create jobs. That's the best way that we can pay down the Federal debt, and also it's the principle of it. In these tough economic times, let's redirect American tax dollars to serve Americans. High-speed rail in America will create jobs and make a difference for our people, a positive difference.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

An amendment by Mr. MATHESON of Utah.

An amendment by Mr. REED of New York.

Amendment No. 65 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 68 by Mr. ROYCE of California.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 257, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

AYES—168

Ackerman	Barrow	Bishop (NY)
Altmire	Bass (CA)	Blumenauer
Amash	Becerra	Boswell
Baca	Berman	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)

Brown (FL)	Heinrich	Payne
Butterfield	Higgins	Perlmutter
Capps	Himes	Peters
Capuano	Hinojosa	Peterson
Cardoza	Hirono	Pingree (ME)
Carnahan	Hochul	Polis
Carney	Holt	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Honda	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Rahall
Chaffetz	Inslee	Rangel
Chandler	Israel	Reed
Chu	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Clarke (MI)	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	(TX)	Ross (AR)
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly (VA)	Kind	T.
Conyers	Kissell	Sarbanes
Cooper	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Critz	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Crowley	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Sewell
DeFazio	Lujan	Sherman
DeGette	Maloney	Shuler
DeLauro	Markey	Sires
Deutch	Matheson	Slaughter
Dicks	Matsui	Speier
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Doggett	McCollum	Sutton
Doyle	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	McGovern	Tierney
Engel	McIntyre	Tonko
Eshoo	Meeks	Towns
Farr	Michaud	Van Hollen
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Filner	Miller, George	Walz (MN)
Frank (MA)	Moran	Wasserman
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Schultz
Gibson	Nadler	Waters
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Watt
Green, Al	Neal	Waxman
Green, Gene	Olver	Welch
Grijalva	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Gutierrez	Pallone	Woolsey
Hanna	Pascarell	Wu
Hastings (FL)	Paul	Yarmuth

NOES—257

Adams	Cole	Graves (MO)
Aderholt	Conaway	Griffin (AR)
Akin	Cravaack	Griffith (VA)
Alexander	Crawford	Grimm
Andrews	Crenshaw	Guinta
Austria	Culberson	Guthrie
Bachmann	Cummings	Hall
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Hanabusa
Barletta	Denham	Harper
Bartlett	Dent	Harris
Barton (TX)	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Bass (NH)	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Benishek	Dold	Hayworth
Berg	Donnelly (IN)	Heck
Berkley	Dreier	Hensarling
Biggert	Duffy	Herger
Bilbray	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis	Duncan (TN)	Holden
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Black	Emerson	Huizenga (MI)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Hultgren
Bonner	Fincher	Hunter
Bono Mack	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Boren	Flake	Issa
Boustany	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Johnson (IL)
Brooks	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Jones
Bucshon	Foxo	Jordan
Buerkle	Franks (AZ)	Kaptur
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Kelly
Burton (IN)	Gallely	King (IA)
Calvert	Garamendi	King (NY)
Camp	Gardner	Kingston
Campbell	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Canseco	Gerlach	Kline
Cantor	Gibbs	Labrador
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Carter	Gohmert	Lance
Cassidy	Goodlatte	Landry
Chabot	Gosar	Langevin
Cicilline	Gowdy	Lankford
Coble	Granger	Latham
Coffman (CO)	Graves (GA)	LaTourette

Latta	Pastor (AZ)	Sensenbrenner	Braley (IA)	Hochul	Pingree (ME)	Dreier	Kingston	Rivera
Lewis (CA)	Paulsen	Sessions	Brown (FL)	Holt	Pitts	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
LoBiondo	Pearce	Shimkus	Bucshon	Honda	Platts	Edwards	Klaine	Rogers (AL)
Loeb sack	Pence	Shuster	Buerkle	Hoyer	Polis	Ellmers	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Lofgren, Zoe	Petri	Simpson	Hultgren	Pompeo	Pompeo	Emerson	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Long	Pitts	Smith (NE)	Hurt	Posey	Posey	Eshoo	Latham	Rohrabacher
Lucas	Platts	Smith (NJ)	Insee	Price (NC)	Price (NC)	Fattah	Latta	Rokita
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)	Israel	Quigley	Quigley	Flake	Lewis (CA)	Rothman (NJ)
Lummis	Pompeo	Smith (WA)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall	Rahall	Fleischmann	Loeb sack	Runyan
Lungren, Daniel E.	Posey	Southerland	Jackson Lee (TX)	Rangel	Rangel	Flores	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (OH)
Lynch	Price (GA)	Stearns	Johnson (GA)	Reed	Reed	Forbes	Long	Sanchez, Loretta
Mack	Quayle	Stivers	Johnson (IL)	Reichert	Reichert	Fox	Lucas	Speier
Manzullo	Rehberg	Stutzman	Johnson (OH)	Reyes	Reyes	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Schilling
Marchant	Reichert	Sullivan	Johnson (OH)	Ribble	Ribble	Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Schweikert
Marino	Renacci	Terry	Richardson	Richardson	Richardson	Gallegly	Mack	Scott, Austin
McCarthy (CA)	Reyes	Thompson (MS)	Richardson	Richardson	Richardson	Garamendi	Marino	Sessions
McCaul	Ribbble	Thompson (PA)	Richmond	Richmond	Richmond	Garrett	McCaul	Shimkus
McClintock	Rigell	Thornberry	Roe (IN)	Roe (IN)	Roe (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	McCotter	Smith (NE)
McCotter	Rivera	Tiberi	Rooney	Rooney	Rooney	Granger	McKeon	Smith (TX)
McHenry	Roby	Tipton	Ros-Lehtinen	Ros-Lehtinen	Ros-Lehtinen	Graves (GA)	McNerney	Smith (WA)
McKeon	Roe (TN)	Tsongas	Roskam	Roskam	Roskam	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)	Southerland
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Turner	Ross (AR)	Ross (AR)	Ross (AR)	Hall	Miller (MI)	Speier
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Upton	Ross (FL)	Ross (FL)	Ross (FL)	Hanabusa	Miller (NC)	Thornberry
Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky	Roybal-Allard	Royce	Royce	Harper	Miller, Gary	Tsongas
McNerney	Rohrabacher	Walberg	Rupp	Rupp	Rupp	Harris	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Meehan	Rokita	Walder	Ruppersberger	Ruppersberger	Ruppersberger	Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Visclosky
Mica	Rooney	Walsh (IL)	Rush	Rush	Rush	Heck	Neugebauer	Walberg
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh (IL)	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)	Hensarling	Noem	Walsh (IL)
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Webster	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sánchez, Linda T.	Herger	Nunnelee	Walz (MN)
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	West	Sarbanes	Sarbanes	Sarbanes	Herrera Beutler	Olson	Waters
Moore	Rothman (NJ)	Westmoreland	Schakowsky	Schakowsky	Schakowsky	Himes	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Mulvaney	Royce	Whitfield	Schiff	Schiff	Schiff	Pastor (AZ)	Pence	Whitfield
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Wilson (SC)	Schmidt	Schmidt	Schmidt	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Wittman	Schock	Schock	Schock	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)	Wittman
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Wolf	Schrader	Schrader	Schrader	Hunter	Quayle	Wolf
Noem	Scalise	Womack	Schwartz	Schwartz	Schwartz	Issa	Rehberg	Womack
Nugent	Schilling	Woodall	Scott (SC)	Scott (SC)	Scott (SC)	Jenkins	Renacci	Yoder
Nunes	Schmidt	Yoder	Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)	Kelly	Rigell	Young (FL)
Nunnelee	Schock	Young (AK)	Scott, David	Scott, David	Scott, David	King (NY)		Young (IN)
Olson	Schweikert	Young (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner			
Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)	Serrano	Serrano	Serrano			

NOT VOTING—6

Costa	Giffords	Pelosi
Ellison	Hinchee	Rush

□ 1442

Ms. MOORE, Messrs. AKIN, ROTHMAN, and STUTZMAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CRITZ, GUTIERREZ, AMASH, BISHOP of Georgia, and DOYLE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REED

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) 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 261, noes 162, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

AYES—261

Ackerman	Bass (NH)	Bishop (UT)
Adams	Becerra	Black
Baca	Benishek	Blumenauer
Baldwin	Berkley	Bono Mack
Barrow	Berman	Boswell
Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Bass (CA)	Bishop (NY)	Brady (TX)

NOES—162

Aderholt	Blackburn	Chu
Akin	Bonner	Coffman (CO)
Alexander	Boren	Cole
Altmire	Boustany	Conaway
Amash	Brooks	Cooper
Andrews	Broun (GA)	Costello
Austria	Buchanan	Cravaack
Bachmann	Burgess	Crawford
Bachus	Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Barletta	Calvert	Cuellar
Bartlett	Campbell	Culberson
Berg	Cantor	Davis (CA)
Biggert	Carter	Davis (KY)
Bilbray	Cassidy	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Donnelly (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Ellison	Hinchee	Moran
Fleming	King (IA)	Pelosi
Giffords	Maloney	

□ 1447

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. HONDA, WEBSTER, and CONYERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 575 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 65 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 261, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

AYES—164

Ackerman	Becerra	Blumenauer
Andrews	Berman	Boswell
Baca	Biggert	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Bass (CA)	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)

Butterfield	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)	Langevin	Palazzo	Scott (SC)	Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Pearce
Capps	Hultgren	Polis	Lankford	Pastor (AZ)	Scott, Austin	Costa	Jones	Pence
Capuano	Inslee	Price (NC)	Larsen (WA)	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Cravaack	Jordan	Pitts
Cardoza	Israel	Quigley	Latham	Pearce	Sessions	Denham	King (IA)	Poe (TX)
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rahall	LaTourette	Pence	Shimkus	Flores	King (NY)	Pompeo
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel	Latta	Peterson	Shuster	Farenthold	Kingston	Posey
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Reyes	Lewis (CA)	Petri	Simpson	Fincher	Kline	Price (GA)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson	LoBiondo	Pitts	Slaughter	Flake	Labrador	Quayle
Chu	Jones	Richmond	Loeb sack	Platts	Smith (NE)	Fleming	Landry	Ribble
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)	Lofgren, Zoe	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)	Flores	Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Roybal-Allard	Long	Pompeo	Smith (TX)	Foxx	Long	Rohrabacher
Clay	Kildee	Ruppersberger	Lucas	Posey	Smith (WA)	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rokita
Cleaver	Kind	Rush	Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Southerland	Gallegly	Lummis	Rooney
Clyburn	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)	Lummis	Quayle	Stearns	Gardner	Lungren, Daniel	Ross (FL)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Lungren, Daniel E.	Reid	Stivers	Garrett	E.	Royce
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes	Mack	Rehberg	Sullivan	Gibson	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Conyers	Levin	Schakowsky	Manzullo	Reichert	Terry	Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo	Scalise
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Schiff	Marchoant	Renacci	Thompson (PA)	Gohmert	Marchoant	Schmidt
Costello	Lipinski	Schrader	Marino	Ribble	Rivera	Goodlatte	Marino	Schweikert
Courtney	Lowey	Schwartz	McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Roby	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)	Scott, Austin
Crowley	Luján	Scott (VA)	McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Roe (TN)	Gowdy	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Lynch	Scott, David	McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Turner	Graves (GA)	McHenry	Sessions
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Serrano	McCotter	Rogers (MI)	Upton	Graves (MO)	McKeon	Shimkus
Davis (IL)	Markey	Sewell	McHenry	Rohrabacher	Walberg	Griffin (AR)	Mica	Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Matheson	Sherman	McKeon	Rokita	Walden	Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)	Stearns
DeGette	Matsui	Shuler	McKinley	Rohrabacher	Walsh (IL)	Grimm	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Sires	McMorris	Rokita	Walsh (MN)	Guthrie	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Deutch	McCollum	Speier	Rodgers	Rooney	Webster	Harris	Mulvaney	Tipton
Dicks	McDermott	Stark	Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	West	Hartzer	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Dingell	McGovern	Sutton	Miller (FL)	Ross (AR)	Westmoreland	Hensarling	Myrick	Walsh (IL)
Doggett	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)	Miller (MI)	Ross (FL)	Whitfield	Herger	Neugebauer	Webster
Doyle	McNerney	Thompson (MS)	Miller, Gary	Royce	Wilson (SC)	Huelskamp	Nugent	West
Duncan (TN)	Meehan	Tierney	Mulvaney	Runyan	Wittman	Hunter	Nunes	Westmoreland
Edwards	Michaud	Tonko	Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Wolf	Hurt	Nunnelee	Wilson (SC)
Engel	Miller, George	Towns	Myrick	Sánchez, Loretta	Womack	Issa	Woodall	Woodall
Farr	Moore	Tsongas	Neugebauer	Noem	Woodall	Jenkins	Paul	Yoder
Fattah	Filner	Moran	Noem	Nugent	Yoder	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Nadler	Nunes	Nunes	Young (AK)			
Fudge	Napolitano	Visclosky	Visclosky	Nunnelee	Young (FL)			
Green, Al	Neal	Wasserman	Olson	Schock	Young (IN)			
Green, Gene	Grijalva	Oliver	Waters	Schilling				
Grijalva	Gutierrez	Owens	Watt	Schmidt				
Gutierrez	Owens	Pallone	Waxman	Schock				
Hastings (FL)	Higgins	Pascrell	Welch	Schweikert				
Higgins	Himes	Paul	Wilson (FL)					
Hinojosa	Hinojosa	Payne	Woolsey					
Hochul	Holt	Pelosi	Perlmutter					
Holt	Honda	Peters	Peters					
Honda								

NOES—261

Adams	Coble	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Coffman (CO)	Gosar
Akin	Cole	Gowdy
Alexander	Conaway	Granger
Altmire	Costa	Graves (GA)
Amash	Cravaack	Graves (MO)
Austria	Crawford	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Critz	Grimm
Barletta	Cuellar	Guinta
Barrow	Culberson	Guthrie
Bartlett	Davis (KY)	Hall
Barton (TX)	Denham	Hanabusa
Bass (NH)	Dent	Hanna
Benishek	DesJarlais	Harper
Berg	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Berkley	Dold	Hartzler
Bilbray	Donnelly (IN)	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Dreier	Hayworth
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Heck
Black	Duncan (SC)	Heinrich
Blackburn	Ellmers	Hensarling
Bonner	Emerson	Herger
Bono Mack	Eshoo	Herrera Beutler
Boren	Farenthold	Holden
Boustany	Fincher	Huelskamp
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks	Flake	Hunter
Broun (GA)	Fleischmann	Hurt
Buchanan	Fleming	Issa
Bucshon	Flores	Jenkins
Buerkle	Forbes	Johnson (GA)
Burgess	Fortenberry	Johnson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Foxx	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Campbell	Gallegly	Kelly
Canseco	Garamendi	King (NY)
Cantor	Gardner	Kingston
Capito	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Carter	Gerlach	Kissell
Cassidy	Gibbs	Kline
Chabot	Gibson	Labrador
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Chandler	Gohmert	Lance
Cicilline	Gonzalez	Landry

NOT VOTING—6

Ellison
Giffords
Hinchey
Hirono
King (IA)
Meeks

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1451

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 576, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) 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 136, noes 291, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—136

Adams	Black	Calvert
Akin	Blackburn	Campbell
Amash	Bono Mack	Canseco
Bachmann	Boustany	Cantor
Barton (TX)	Broun (GA)	Chabot
Benishek	Buchanan	Chaffetz
Bilirakis	Burgess	Coble
Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)	Coffman (CO)

Ackerman	Crawford	Heinrich
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler
Alexander	Critz	Higgins
Andrews	Crowley	Himes
Austria	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Baca	Culberson	Hirono
Bachus	Cummings	Hochul
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Holden
Barletta	Davis (IL)	Holt
Barrow	Davis (KY)	Honda
Bartlett	DeFazio	Hoyer
Bass (CA)	DeGette	Hultgren
Bass (NH)	DeLauro	Inslee
Becerra	Dent	Israel
Berg	DesJarlais	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	Diaz-Balart	Deutch
Berman	Dicks	Jackson Lee
Biggert	Dingell	(TX)
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Dold	Johnson (IL)
Blumenauer	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, E. B.
Bonner	Doyle	Kaptur
Boren	Dreier	Keating
Boswell	Duffy	Kelly
Brady (PA)	Duncan (SC)	Kildee
Brady (TX)	Edwards	Kind
Braley (IA)	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Brooks	Emerson	Kissell
Brown (FL)	Engel	Kucinich
Bucshon	Eshoo	Lamborn
Buerkle	Farr	Lance
Butterfield	Fattah	Langevin
Camp	Filner	Lankford
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Capps	Fleischmann	Larson (CT)
Capuano	Forbes	Latham
Cardoza	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Latta
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Lee (CA)
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Levin
Carter	Garamendi	Lewis (GA)
Cassidy	Gerlach	Lipinski
Castor (FL)	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Chandler	Gonzalez	Loeb sack
Chu	Granger	Lofgren, Zoe
Cicilline	Green, Al	Lowey
Clarke (MI)	Green, Gene	Lucas
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Luján
Cleaver	Guinta	Lynch
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Maloney
Cohen	Hall	Markey
Cole	Hanabusa	Matheson
Connolly (VA)	Hanna	Matsui
Conyers	Harper	McCarthy (NY)
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Costello	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Courtney	Hayworth	McDermott
	Heck	McGovern
		McIntyre
		McKinley

NOES—291

McMorris	Richmond	Southerland	Gohmert	Lamborn	Rokita	Nunes	Rogers (KY)	Stark
Rodgers	Rigell	Speier	Goodlatte	Landry	Rooney	Nunnelee	Rogers (KY)	Stivers
McNerney	Rivera	Stark	Govdy	Long	Ross (FL)	Olson	Rogers (MI)	Sullivan
Meehan	Roby	Stivers	Graves (GA)	Mack	Royce	Olver	Ros-Lehtinen	Sutton
Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan	Green, Gene	Manullo	Ryan (WI)	Owens	Roskam	Terry
Michaud	Rogers (KY)	Sutton	Griffith (VA)	Marchant	Scalise	Palazzo	Ross (AR)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (NC)	Rogers (MI)	Terry	Guthrie	Marino	Schmidt	Pallone	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (MS)
Miller, George	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)	Harris	McClintock	Schweikert	Pascrell	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (PA)
Moore	Roskam	Thompson (MS)	Hartzler	McHenry	Scott (SC)	Pastor (AZ)	Runyan	Thornberry
Moran	Ross (AR)	Thompson (PA)	Hensarling	Mica	Scott, Austin	Pausen	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Murphy (CT)	Rothman (NJ)	Tiberi	Herger	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Payne	Rush	Tierney
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Tierney	Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Sessions	Pearce	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Napolitano	Runyan	Tonko	Huizenga (MI)	Miller, Gary	Southerland	Pelosi	Sánchez, Linda	Towns
Neal	Ruppersberger	Towns	Hunter	Mulvaney	Stearns	Pence	T.	Tsongas
Noem	Rush	Tsongas	Hurt	Murphy (PA)	Stutzman	Perlmutter	Sanchez, Loretta	Turner
Olson	Ryan (OH)	Turner	Issa	Neugebauer	Tipton	Peters	Sarbanes	Upton
Olver	Sánchez, Linda	Upton	Jenkins	Nugent	Walsh (IL)	Peterson	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Palazzo	T.	Van Hollen	Johnson (OH)	Paul	Webster	Petri	Schiff	Velázquez
Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Velázquez	Johnson, Sam	Pitts	West	Pingree (ME)	Schilling	Visclosky
Pascrell	Sarbanes	Visclosky	Jones	Pompeo	Westmoreland	Platts	Schock	Walberg
Pastor (AZ)	Schakowsky	Walden	Jordan	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)	Poe (TX)	Schrader	Walden
Payne	Schiff	Walz (MN)	King (IA)	Quayle	Woodall	Polis	Schwartz	Walz (MN)
Pelosi	Schilling	Wasserman	Kline	Ribble	Yoder	Posey	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Schock	Schultz	Labrador	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)	Price (NC)	Scott, David	Schultz
Peters	Schrader	Waters				Quigley	Serrano	Waters
Peterson	Schwartz	Watt				Rahall	Sewell	Watt
Petri	Scott (SC)	Waxman				Rangel	Sherman	Waxman
Pingree (ME)	Scott (VA)	Welch				Reed	Shimkus	Welch
Platts	Scott, David	Whitfield				Rehberg	Shuler	Whitfield
Polis	Serrano	Wilson (FL)				Reichert	Shuster	Wilson (FL)
Polis (NC)	Sewell	Wittman				Reynolds	Simpson	Wittman
Quigley	Sherman	Wolf				Reyes	Sires	Wolf
Rahall	Shuler	Womack				Richardson	Slaughter	Womack
Rangel	Shuster	Woolsey				Richmond	Smith (NE)	Woolsey
Reed	Simpson	Wu				Rigell	Smith (NJ)	Wu
Rehberg	Sires	Yarmuth				Rivera	Smith (TX)	Yarmuth
Reichert	Slaughter	Young (AK)				Roby	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Renacci	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)				Roe (TN)	Speier	Young (FL)
Reyes	Smith (TX)							
Richardson	Smith (WA)							

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Ellison
Hinchey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1454

Ms. PINGREE of Maine changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 99, noes 328, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

AYES—99

Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)

Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)

Conaway
Cravaack
Duncan (TN)
Flake
Fleming
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)

NOES—328

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson

Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda

Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem

NOT VOTING—4

Ellison
Giffords
Hinchey
LaTourette

□ 1458

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 213, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—214

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)

Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen

Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold

Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)	Rahall	Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman	Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Schweikert
Doyle	LaTourette	Rangel	Neugebauer	Rogers (MI)	Sullivan	Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Scott (SC)
Duncan (TN)	Lee (CA)	Reichert	Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Terry	Jones	Paul	Scott, Austin
Edwards	Levin	Reyes	Nugent	Rokita	Thompson (PA)	Jordan	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Nunes	Rooney	Thornberry	Kingston	Pearce	Sessions
Eshoo	Lipinski	Richmond	Nunnelee	Ros-Lehtinen	Tjiberi	Kline	Petri	Smith (NE)
Farr	LoBiondo	Ross (AR)	Olson	Roskam	Tipton	Labrador	Pitts	Southerland
Fattah	Loeb	Rothman (NJ)	Palazzo	Ross (FL)	Towns	Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stearns
Filner	Lofgren, Zoe	Royal-Allard	Pastor (AZ)	Royce	Turner	Latta	Pompeo	Stutzman
Fincher	Lowe	Ruppersberger	Paul	Runyan	Turner	Long	Price (GA)	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	Lujan	Rush	Paulsen	Ryan (WI)	Velázquez	Mack	Quayle	Tipton
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (OH)	Pearce	Scalise	Visclosky	Marino	Rigell	Walberg
Fudge	E.	Sánchez, Linda	Pence	Schilling	Walden	Matheson	Roe (TN)	Walsh (IL)
Garamendi	Lynch	T.	Pitts	Schmidt	Walberg	McClintock	Rohrabacher	Webster
Gerlach	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta	Poe (TX)	Schrock	Walsh (IL)	McHenry	Rokita	West
Gibson	Manzullo	Sarbanes	Pompeo	Schweikert	Waxman	Mica	Rooney	Westmoreland
Gonzalez	Marino	Schakowsky	Posey	Scott (SC)	Webster	Miller (FL)	Ross (FL)	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Markey	Schiff	Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland	Miller, Gary	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Green, Al	Matheson	Schrader	Quayle	Serrano	Whitfield	Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
Griffith (VA)	Matsui	Schwartz	Reed	Sessions	Wilson (SC)	Murphy (PA)	Schmidt	Young (IN)
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)	Rehberg	Shimkus	Wittman			
Gutierrez	McCaul	Scott, Austin	Renacci	Shuster	Wolf			
Hanabusa	McCollum	Scott, David	Ribble	Simpson	Womack	Aderholt	Dicks	Lance
Harris	McDermott	Sewell	Rigell	Smith (NE)	Yoder	Alexander	Dingell	Landry
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Sherman	Rivera	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)	Altmire	Doggett	Langevin
Heck	McIntyre	Shuler	Roby	Southerland	Young (FL)	Austria	Dold	Lankford
Heinrich	McNerney	Sires	Roe (TN)	Stearns	Young (IN)	Baca	Donnelly (IN)	Larsen (WA)
Higgins	Meeks	Slaughter	Rogers (AL)	Stivers		Bachus	Doyle	Larson (CT)
Himes	Mica	Smith (TX)				Baldwin	Dreier	Latham
Hinojosa	Michaud	Smith (WA)	Ellison	Green, Gene	NOT VOTING—4	Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Lee (CA)
Hirono	Miller (NC)	Speier	Giffords	Hinchee		Barrow	Edwards	Levin
Hochul	Miller, George	Stark				Bartlett	Ellmers	Lewis (CA)
Holden	Moore	Sutton				Bass (CA)	Emerson	Lewis (GA)
Holt	Moran	Thompson (CA)				Bass (NH)	Engel	Lipinski
Honda	Murphy (CT)	Nadler	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR			Becerra	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Hoyer	Napolitano	Neal	The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).			Berg	Farenthold	Loeb
Inslee	Oliver	Oliver	There is 1 minute remaining in this			Berkley	Farr	Lofgren, Zoe
Israel	Owens	Van Hollen	vote.			Berman	Fattah	Lowe
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Walz (MN)				Biggart	Filner	Lucas
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Wasserman	□ 1501			Bilbray	Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer
Johnson (IL)	Payne	Schultz	So the amendment was agreed to.			Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Lujan
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Waters	The result of the vote was announced			Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	Lummis
Jones	Perlmutter	Watt	as above recorded.			Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel
Kaptur	Peters	Welch	Stated for:			Blumenauer	E.	Lynch
Keating	Peterson	West	Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, on			Bonner	Fudge	Maloney
Kildee	Petri	Wilson (FL)	recall No. 579, had I been present, I would			Boren	Gallely	Manzullo
Kind	Pingree (ME)	Woodall	have voted "aye."			Boswell	Garamendi	Markey
Kinzinger (IL)	Platts	Woolsey				Boustany	Gardner	Matsui
Kissell	Polis	Wu	AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF			Brady (PA)	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Yarmuth	GEORGIA			Braley (IA)	Gibbs	McCarthy (NY)
Lance	Quigley		The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished			Brown (FL)	Gibson	McCaul
Langevin			business is the demand for a recorded			Buchanan	Gonzalez	McCollum
Larsen (WA)			vote on the amendment offered by the			Buchson	Gowdy	McCotter
			gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN)			Burgess	Granger	McDermott
			on which further proceedings were			Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	McGovern
			postponed and on which the noes pre-			Calvert	Green, Al	McIntyre
			valled by voice vote.			Camp	Green, Gene	McKeon
			The Clerk will redesignate the			Capito	Griffin (AR)	McKinley
			amendment.			Capps	Grijalva	McMorris
			The Clerk redesignated the amend-			Capuano	Grimm	Rodgers
			ment.			Cardoza	Guinta	McNerney
			RECORDED VOTE			Carnahan	Guthrie	Meehan
			The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote			Carney	Gutierrez	Meeks
			has been demanded.			Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Michaud
			A recorded vote was ordered.			Carter	Hanna	Miller (MI)
			The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-			Cassidy	Harper	Miller (NC)
			minute vote.			Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
			The vote was taken by electronic de-			Chandler	Hastings (WA)	Moore
			vice, and there were—ayes 114, noes 309,			Chu	Heck	Moran
			not voting 8, as follows:			Ciilline	Heinrich	Murphy (CT)
			[Roll No. 580]			Clarke (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Myrick
			AYES—114			Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Nadler
						Clay	Himes	Napolitano
						Cleaver	Hinojosa	Neal
						Clyburn	Hirono	Noem
						Coble	Hochul	Nunes
						Cohen	Holden	Nunnelee
						Cole	Holt	Olson
						Connolly (VA)	Honda	Oliver
						Conyers	Hoyer	Owens
						Cooper	Inslee	Palazzo
						Costa	Israel	Pallone
						Costello	Issa	Pascrell
						Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
						Crawford	Jackson Lee	Payne
						Crenshaw	(TX)	Pelosi
						Critz	Johnson (GA)	Pence
						Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
						Cuellar	Kaptur	Peters
						Cummings	Keating	Peterson
						Davis (CA)	Kelly	Pingree (ME)
						DeFazio	Kildee	Platts
						DeGette	Kind	Polis
						DeLauro	King (IA)	Posey
						Denham	King (NY)	Price (NC)
						Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley
						Deutch	Kissell	Rahall
						Diaz-Balart	Kucinich	Rangel

Reed Schiff Tierney
 Rehberg Schilling Tonko
 Reichert Schock Towns
 Renacci Schrader Tsongas
 Reyes Schwartz Turner
 Ribble Scott (VA) Upton
 Richardson Scott, David Van Hollen
 Richmond Serrano Velázquez
 Rivera Sewell Visclosky
 Roby Sherman Walden
 Rogers (AL) Shimkus Walz (MN)
 Rogers (KY) Shuler Wasserman
 Rogers (MI) Shuster
 Ros-Lehtinen Simpson Schultz
 Roskam Sires Waters
 Ross (AR) Slaughter Watt
 Rothman (NJ) Smith (NJ) Waxman
 Roybal-Allard Smith (TX) Welch
 Runyan Smith (WA) Wilson (FL)
 Ruppertsberger Stark Wittman
 Rush Stivers Wolf
 Ryan (OH) Sullivan Womack
 Sánchez, Linda Sutton Woolsey
 T. Terry Wu
 Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (CA) Yarmuth
 Sarbanes Thompson (MS) Yoder
 Scalise Thompson (PA) Young (AK)
 Schakowsky Tiberi Young (FL)

Dicks King (NY) Richardson
 Dingell Kingston Rigell
 Dold Kinzinger (IL) Rivera
 Donnelly (IN) Kline Roby
 Doyle Labrador Roe (TN)
 Dreier Lamborn Rogers (AL)
 Duffy Lance Rogers (KY)
 Duncan (SC) Landry Rogers (MI)
 Duncan (TN) Lankford Rohrabacher
 Ellmers Larsen (WA) Rokita
 Emerson Latham Rooney
 Farenthold LaTourette
 Fattah Latta Ros-Lehtinen
 Fincher Lewis (CA) Roskam
 Fitzpatrick Lipinski Ross (AR)
 Flake LoBiondo Ross (FL)
 Fleischmann Loeback Royce
 Fleming Lucas Runyan
 Flores Luetkemeyer Ruppertsberger
 Forbes Lummis Ryan (OH)
 Fortenberry Lungren, Daniel Ryan (WI)
 Foxx E. Sarbanes
 Franks (AZ) Mack Scalise
 Frelinghuysen Manullo Schilling
 Gallegly Marchant Schmidt
 Gardner Marino Schock
 Garrett McCarthy (CA) Schrader
 Gerlach McCarthy (NY) Schwartz
 Gibbs McCaul Schweikert
 Gibson McClintock Scott (SC)
 Gingrey (GA) McCollum Scott (VA)
 Gohmert McCotter Scott, Austin
 Goodlatte McHenry Scott, David
 Gosar McIntyre Sensenbrenner
 Gowdy McKinley Sessions
 Granger McMorris Shimkus
 Graves (GA) Rodgers Shuler
 Graves (MO) McNeerney Shuster
 Green, Al Meehan Simpson
 Green, Gene Mica Slaughter
 Griffin (AR) Michaud Smith (NE)
 Griffith (VA) Miller (FL) Smith (NJ)
 Grimm Miller (MI) Smith (TX)
 Guinta Miller (NC) Sutherland
 Guthrie Miller, Gary Stearns
 Hall Mulvaney Stivers
 Hanna Murphy (CT) Stutzman
 Harper Harper, PA) Sullivan
 Harris Myrick Sutton
 Hartzler Neugebauer Terry
 Hastings (WA) Noem Thompson (PA)
 Hayworth Nugent Thornberry
 Heinrich Nunes Tiberi
 Hensarling Nunnelee Tipton
 Herger Olson Tonko
 Herrera Beutler Owens Turner
 Higgins Palazzo Upton
 Himes Paulsen Van Hollen
 Hochul Pence Visclosky
 Holden Perlmutter Walden
 Huelskamp Peterson Walsh (IL)
 Huizenga (MI) Petri Webster
 Hultgren Pingree (ME) Welch
 Hunter Pitts West
 Hurt Platts Westmoreland
 Inslee Poe (TX) Whitfield
 Issa Pompeo Whitson (SC)
 Jenkins Posey Wittman
 Johnson (IL) Price (GA) Wolf
 Johnson (OH) Price (NC) Womack
 Johnson, Sam Quayle Woodall
 Jordan Quigley Reed
 Keating Kelly Yarmuth
 Kelly Rehberg Yoder
 Kildee Reichert Young (AK)
 Kind Renacci Young (FL)
 King (IA) Ribble Young (IN)

Johnson, E. B. Moran Schiff
 Nadler Serrano
 Kaptur Napolitano Sewell
 Kissell Neal Sherman
 Kucinich Olver Sires
 Langevin Pallone Smith (WA)
 Larson (CT) Pascrell Speier
 Lee (CA) Pastor (AZ) Stark
 Levin Paul Thompson (CA)
 Lewis (GA) Payne Thompson (MS)
 Lofgren, Zoe Pearce Tierney
 Long Pelosi Towns
 Lowey Peters Tsongas
 Luján Polís Velázquez
 Lynch Rahall Walz (MN)
 Maloney Rangel Wasserman
 Markey Reyes Schultz
 Matheson Richmond
 Matsui Rothman (NJ) Waters
 McDermott Roybal-Allard Watt
 McGovern Rush Waxman
 McKeon Sánchez, Linda Wilson (FL)
 Meeks T. Woolsey
 Miller, George Sanchez, Loretta Wu
 Moore Schakowsky

NOT VOTING—4

NOT VOTING—8
 Ackerman Giffords Marchant
 Andrews Hinchey Speier
 Ellison LaTourette

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1504

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.
 The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
 The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
 A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 297, noes 130, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]
AYES—297

Adams Bono Mack Chabot
 Aderholt Boren Chandler
 Akin Boswell Clay
 Alexander Boustany Coble
 Altmire Brady (TX) Coffman (CO)
 Amash Braley (IA) Cohen
 Andrews Cole
 Austria Broun (GA) Conaway
 Bachmann Buchanan Cooper
 Bachus Bucshon Costa
 Barletta Buerkle Costello
 Barrow Burgess Courtney
 Bartlett Burton (IN) Cravaack
 Barton (TX) Calvert Crawford
 Bass (NH) Camp Crenshaw
 Benishek Campbell Critz
 Berg Canseco Cuellar
 Biggart Cantor Culberson
 Bilbray Capito Davis (KY)
 Bilirakis Cardoza Denham
 Black Carney Dent
 Blackburn Carter DesJarlais
 Bonner Cassidy Diaz-Balart

NOES—130

Ackerman Chu
 Baca Cicilline Filner
 Baldwin Clarke (MI) Frank (MA)
 Bass (CA) Clarke (NY) Fudge
 Becerra Cleaver Garamendi
 Berkeley Clyburn Gonzalez
 Berman Connolly (VA) Gutierrez
 Bishop (GA) Conyers Hanabusa
 Bishop (NY) Cummings Hastings (FL)
 Bishop (UT) Davis (CA) Heck
 Blumenauer Davis (IL) Hinojosa
 Brady (PA) DeFazio Hirono
 Brown (FL) DeGette Holt
 Butterfield DeLauro Honda
 Capps Deutch Hoyer
 Capuano Doggett Israel
 Carnahan Edwards Jackson (IL)
 Carson (IN) Engel Jackson Lee
 Castor (FL) Eshoo (TX)
 Chaffetz Farr Johnson (GA)

Crowley Giffords
 Ellison Hinchey
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.
 □ 1508
 So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.
 The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
 The Clerk redesignated the amendment.
RECORDED VOTE
 The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
 A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 239, not voting 5, as follows:
 [Roll No. 582]
AYES—187
 Adams Campbell Franks (AZ)
 Akin Canseco Gallegly
 Amash Cantor Gardner
 Bachmann Carter Garrett
 Bartlett Cassidy Gibbs
 Barton (TX) Chabot Gingrey (GA)
 Bass (NH) Chaffetz Gohmert
 Benishek Coffman (CO) Goodlatte
 Berg Cole Gosar
 Biggart Conaway Granger
 Bilbray Cravaack Graves (GA)
 Bilirakis Culberson Graves (MO)
 Bishop (UT) Davis (KY) Green, Gene
 Black Dent Griffith (VA)
 Bono Mack DesJarlais Grimm
 Boustany Diaz-Balart Guinta
 Barton (TX) Duffy Hall
 Brooks Duncan (TN) Hanna
 Broun (GA) Ellmers Harris
 Buchanan Farenthold Hayworth
 Bucshon Flake Heinrich
 Buerkle Fleming Hensarling
 Burgess Flores Herger
 Burton (IN) Forbes Herrera Beutler
 Calvert Fortenberry Huelskamp
 Camp Foxx Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren	Mica	Royce	Reyes	Scott (VA)	Towns
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Runyan	Ribble	Scott, David	Tsongas
Hurt	Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Richardson	Serrano	Turner
Issa	Miller, Gary	Scalise	Richmond	Sewell	Van Hollen
Jenkins	Mulvaney	Schilling	Roby	Sherman	Velázquez
Johnson (IL)	Murphy (PA)	Schmidt	Rogers (AL)	Shimkus	Visclosky
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Schock	Rogers (KY)	Shuler	Walz (MN)
Jones	Neugebauer	Schweikert	Ross (AR)	Shuster	Wasserman
Jordan	Nugent	Scott (SC)	Rothman (NJ)	Simpson	Schultz
King (NY)	Nunes	Scott, Austin	Roybal-Allard	Sires	Waters
Kingston	Olson	Sensenbrenner	Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Watt
Kinzinger (IL)	Paul	Sessions	Rush	Smith (NE)	Waxman
Kline	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Welch
Labrador	Pearce	Smith (TX)	Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Lamborn	Pence	Southerland	T.	Stark	Womack
Lance	Perlmutter	Stearns	Sanchez, Loretta	Sutton	Woolsey
Landry	Peters	Stivers	Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Wu
Lankford	Petri	Stutzman	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Latta	Pitts	Sullivan	Schiff	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Lewis (CA)	Poe (TX)	Terry	Schrader	Tierney	Young (FL)
LoBiondo	Polis	Thornberry	Schwartz	Tonko	
Long	Pompeo	Tiberi			
Lucas	Posey	Tipton			
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Upton	Ellison	Gutierrez	Marchant
Lungren, Daniel E.	Quayle	Walberg	Giffords	Hinchez	
Mack	Reichert	Walden			
Manzullo	Renacci	Walsh (IL)			
Matheson	Rigell	Webster			
McCarthy (CA)	Rivera	West			
McCaul	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland			
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Rogers			
McCotter	Rohrabacher	Whitfield			
McHenry	Rokita	Wilson (SC)			
McKeon	Rooney	Wittman			
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf			
Rodgers	Roskam	Woodall			
	Ross (FL)	Yoder			
		Young (IN)			

NOES—239

Ackerman	DeLauro	Kind
Aderholt	Denham	King (IA)
Alexander	Deutch	Kissell
Altmire	Dicks	Kucinich
Andrews	Dingell	Langevin
Austria	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Baca	Dold	Larson (CT)
Bachus	Donnelly (IN)	Latham
Baldwin	Doyle	LaTourette
Barletta	Dreier	Lee (CA)
Barrow	Duncan (SC)	Levin
Bass (CA)	Edwards	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Emerson	Lipinski
Berkley	Engel	Loebsack
Berman	Eshoo	Loftgren, Zoe
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Lowey
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lujan
Blackburn	Filner	Lummis
Blumenauer	Fincher	Lynch
Bonner	Fitzpatrick	Maloney
Boren	Fleischmann	Marino
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Markey
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	Matsui
Braley (IA)	Fudge	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	McCollum
Butterfield	Gerlach	McDermott
Capito	Gibson	McGovern
Capps	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Capuano	Gowdy	McKinley
Cardoza	Green, Al	McNerney
Carnahan	Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Carney	Grijalva	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Guthrie	Michaud
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	Miller (NC)
Chandler	Harper	Miller, George
Chu	Hartzler	Moore
Cicilline	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Clarke (MI)	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (CT)
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Nadler
Clay	Higgins	Napolitano
Cleaver	Himes	Neal
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Noem
Coble	Hirono	Nunnelee
Cohen	Hochul	Olver
Connolly (VA)	Holden	Owens
Conyers	Holt	Palazzo
Cooper	Honda	Pallone
Costa	Hoyer	Pascrell
Costello	Inslee	Pastor (AZ)
Courtney	Israel	Payne
Crawford	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Critz	(TX)	Pingree (ME)
Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Platts
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Price (NC)
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Rahall
Davis (IL)	Keating	Rangel
DeFazio	Kelly	Reed
DeGette	Kildee	Rehberg

There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 350

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Mr. Courtney.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 2354 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 337, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except: pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees for the purpose of debate; amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 21, 26, 27, 53, 63, 66, 67, 70, 75, 76, 80, and 81; an amendment by Mrs. ADAMS regarding limiting funds for a Department of Energy Web site that disseminates information regarding energy efficiency and educational programs to children or adolescents; two amendments by Mrs. BLACKBURN regarding across-the-board cuts; an amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia regarding limiting funds for certain programs, projects or activities in Energy Programs-Science; two amendments by Mrs. CAPPs regarding limiting funds for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant; an amendment by Mr. COHEN regarding funding levels for the Solar Energy Program; an amendment by Mr. DENHAM regarding limiting funds to implement section 10011(b) of Public Law 111-11; an amendment by Mr. ENGEL regarding limiting funds for lease or purchase of new light-duty vehicles; an amendment by Ms. ESHOO regarding limiting funds for contracts with business entities that do not disclose political expenditures; an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding limiting funds for Advanced

NOT VOTING—5

Ellison
Giffords
Gutierrez
Hinchez
Marchant

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1512

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD, 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. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Ethics:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I write to inform you that I have notified Chairman Bonner and Ranking Member Sanchez of my resignation from the Ethics Committee of the House of Representatives.

It is because of my high regard for the Ethics Committee and its vital, non-partisan role enforcing the standards of official conduct in the House of Representatives that I make this decision. Having recently announced my candidacy for the United States Senate, I want to ensure my status as a candidate for higher office does not in any way cause the work of the Ethics Committee to become fodder for politics or partisanship.

It has been a privilege and an honor to serve on this committee.

Sincerely,

MAZIE K. HIRONO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.