

462 of the bill blocks EPA from implementing its utility MACT rule to control air toxics emissions, as well as the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule controlling interstate transport of nitrogen oxides and particulate matter emissions from power plants. This provision interferes with the long-delayed implementation of major air pollution rules covering pollution from power plants.

Mountaintop Mining Coordination and Guidance. Section 433 of the bill prohibits implementing or enforcing an EPA/Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)/Office of Surface Mining coordination Memorandum of Understanding and EPA guidance on the Clean Water Act/National Environmental Policy Act and mountaintop mining. This issue is currently undergoing judicial review and should be allowed to conclude without congressional intervention.

Clean Water Act. Section 435 of the bill would stop an important Administration effort to provide clarity around which water bodies are covered by the Clean Water Act. The Administration's work in this area will help to protect the public health and economic benefits provided to the American public by clean water, while also bringing greater certainty to business planning and investment and reducing an ongoing loss of wetlands and other sensitive aquatic resources. The existing regulations were the subject of two recent Supreme Court cases, in which the Court itself indicated the need for greater regulatory clarity regarding the appropriate scope of the Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

Outer Continental Shelf Drilling. Section 443 of the bill limits EPA's Clean Air Act permitting authority for Outer Continental Shelf drilling and would eliminate the Agency's discretion in considering human health and environmental protections when issuing these permits.

Integrated Risk Information System. Section 444 of the bill withholds funding for EPA to take administrative action following its assessment of risk for certain chemicals. This provision would delay scientific assessment of environmental contaminants and could delay regulatory or other Agency actions designed to protect public health.

Limiting Compliance of the Endangered Species Act. Section 447 of the bill would prevent EPA from implementing a biological opinion related to pesticides if the opinion identifies modifying, canceling, or suspending registration of a pesticide registered under FIFRA. This could undermine efforts to protect species from being put into jeopardy from a Federal project and could stop development and delay issuance of permits.

Lead Renovation and Repair Rule. Section 450 of the bill prohibits funding for EPA to implement the 2008 Lead Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) rule, as amended, until after industry develops and EPA approves different lead paint test kits. This would undermine efforts to protect sensitive populations from exposure to lead, a known toxin to children and developing fetuses, during home renovation projects. The currently available test kits allow renovators to comply with the 2008 rule.

Reducing Emissions from Cement Facilities. The language would prevent common sense deployment of technology that has been around for decades that will improve public health by reducing emissions of pollutants, including known carcinogens such as dioxin, from cement facilities.

Fighting Fraud, Waste, and Abuse. Sections 449 and 451 of the bill fall short of their intended purposes of protecting the interest of the Nation's taxpayers. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to achieve the common goal of fighting fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal contracts, grants, and other Federal assistance.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress as the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process moves forward to ensure the Administration can support enactment of the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the esteemed chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I rise today to commend this bill to our colleagues and urge that it be passed. It includes \$27.5 billion in Federal spending. That's a reduction of \$2.1 billion below last year, \$3.8 billion below the President's request.

Some have complained that these cuts are too much, too fast. But it's important to remember that these agencies and programs have seen unprecedented massive increases in spending in recent years. This sort of excess has contributed to our astronomical debt and is threatening our recovery. We simply can't fund unnecessary and ineffective programs when we are borrowing 42 cents on every dollar we spend. We just simply can't afford it.

This legislation makes smart, significant cuts across each and every agency funded by this bill. The bill still adequately funds the agencies that are important to the health of our citizens, the stability of our economy, and the preservation of our environment, but we've made some priority adjustments in areas that can and should withstand lower budgets.

Some areas that will see bigger reductions include climate change programs, which are trimmed 22 percent from last year, and land acquisition funding, which is at a level nearly 79 percent lower than last year.

Frankly, many of the cuts in this bill are just plain common sense, particularly when it comes to the Environmental Protection Agency. The reductions and provisions in this bill were made with very good reason—to rein in unparalleled, out-of-control spending and job-killing overregulation by the EPA.

Though we all appreciate the core mission of the EPA, this agency has

lost grips with economic reality and has become the epitome of the continued and damaging regulatory overreach of this administration. We can't allow an agency to circumvent the authority of Congress, especially when it has such destructive effects on our Nation's economic recovery.

I'd like to say that we've heard from Americans all across the country and across every sector of the economy who attribute harsh regulatory burdens to their economic uncertainty, uncertainty that's crushing job growth.

It's my hope that this legislation sends the message loud and clear: Legislation by regulation must stop. We've restricted funding for EPA personnel, as well as addressed EPA's flawed greenhouse gas regulations and de facto moratorium on mining permits in Appalachia. It's my hope that provisions like these will return the EPA to a better working order, facilitating a more effective government, sending money where it really needs to go, and removing burdensome barriers to job creation to clear the way for economic recovery.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member MORAN, the subcommittee, and all of the staff for all their hard work on this very tough bill. Chairman SIMPSON has led the way on an excellent bill, I think, that makes good on our promise to reduce government spending with real significant spending reforms.

His subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, held 22 oversight hearings, more than any other of the 12 subcommittees on Appropriations. I'm confident that they've gone above and beyond their duty to ensure that these cuts come from wasteful and redundant programs. I know these decisions were not made lightly, were not made easy, but they are responsible, and will help us move in the right direction.

Although it's been difficult at times, the House should be proud to be moving this year's appropriations process in regular order, the first time in years. With this bill we will have finished more than half of the fiscal 12 appropriation bills before the recess. And nearly all of the bills have been moved through subcommittee or full committee, and therefore are on cue to come to the full body. This return to regular order has contributed to thoughtful, collaborative appropriations bills that reflect the will of the American people and will help get our Nation's finances in order.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the very distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise to state my opposition to H.R. 2584, the FY 2012 Interior and Environment appropriations bill.

But before I state the reasons for my strong opposition, I want to, again recognize Chairman SIMPSON, Ranking Member MORAN and their staffs for all the hard work that was necessary to put together the FY 2012 Interior and Environment appropriations bill. I also want to repeat my gratitude to the majority for being inclusive when developing this bill.

That being said, however, the low allocation foisted on the Interior Subcommittee made it impossible to develop a bill that is responsible and reasonable, so it is no surprise that the resulting bill will harm the environment and our ongoing efforts to preserve America's natural heritage. Two key examples of this potential damage are that the bill includes the lowest level of spending in the Land and Water Conservation Fund in more than 40 years, and funding levels for EPA not seen in more than a decade.

Overall, the allocation for the bill is 7 percent below the amount enacted in the current year, a level that will have a negative impact on our natural resource agencies and on the Environmental Protection Agency. After the EPA took a substantial cut of 16 percent in the current fiscal year, 2011, the Republican majority is now proposing a further reduction in the agency's budget of 18 percent. You add that together, it's a 34-percent reduction in just this year.

This bill would substantially diminish the capacity of EPA to carry out its responsibilities, which may actually be the goal of some of my colleagues on the other side. But the repercussions will be felt across the Nation, including an ever-growing backlog of water treatment infrastructure projects and a decline in air and water quality.

As was pointed out in a recent Washington Post article, the vast majority of the EPA's funds pass through to States and localities that are already squeezed by budget cuts.

□ 1420

These infrastructure projects create jobs in communities all across the country and provide one of the most basic services taxpayers expect—clean water. The Bush administration's EPA administrator estimated that there was a \$688 billion nationwide backlog of clean water infrastructure projects, and that total is even larger today. That backlog will not disappear if we just ignore it, but as we have seen in so many cases this year, the majority has decided to push this problem further down the road.

In addition to the clearly insufficient levels of funding across the board in this legislation, we were surprised that the majority also included a wish list of special interest riders to the bill that will handcuff the EPA and the Department of the Interior. These types of riders are largely ideological, have no impact on deficit reduction, and will be rejected by the Senate and the President, hopefully.

It seems that special interest riders have become the new earmarks—and I support earmarks. This bill was made even worse when the majority adopted more special interest riders with amendments that were approved at full committee, and I fear that there will be more policy amendments offered on the floor as we consider this bill.

One of the riders is language that would effectively block any funding to the Fish and Wildlife Service for new listings under the Endangered Species Act. As Mr. MORAN said, there are 260 candidate species waiting to be listed, and they will not receive the protection of the Endangered Species Act.

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

Mr. MORAN. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Here is the situation that the Fish and Wildlife Service faces in the administration of the ESA. Speaking of that 260, of that total, there are just under 30 species that are poised for listing in the near future. The spending provisions in this bill would block further activity to protect these declining species. And remember, if you delay listing too long, a species will go extinct, thus making recovery impossible.

I also will be strongly supporting the amendments that aim to remove these riders. These amendments include an attempt to protect Grand Canyon National Park and the folks who depend on the Colorado River for drinking water from the potential danger from new uranium mines. Another amendment that I strongly support will increase funding for sanitation facilities for Native American communities.

In closing, I do want to reiterate my praise expressed at subcommittee mark for Chairman SIMPSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COLE and other subcommittee members for the funding levels for programs serving American Indians. It is gratifying that this subcommittee's bipartisan commitment to tribal programs forged over the last few years has been continued by the new majority.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for the purpose of colloquy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, 2 months ago, the Secretary of the Interior announced that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would remove gray wolves from the Endangered Species Act list in areas covering the northern Rocky Mountain States and roughly the easternmost one-third of the State of Washington, the eastern quarter of the State of Oregon, and a small piece of Utah. I understand that H.R. 2584 also would exempt from judicial review any final rule issued by the Secretary that delists wolves in the State of Wyoming and the western Great Lakes. So I commend the chairman for your leadership to see that these States are

given a chance to succeed in their management of species.

As with other decisions, the Secretary of the Interior's May announcement does not resolve the problem for many agricultural areas in States that don't fit neatly within the Fish and Wildlife Service's arbitrarily set geographical boundaries, and it reverses a policy that the Fish and Wildlife Service itself implemented by regulation in 2003 in which wolves were delisted in all of the State of Washington and other areas with appropriate State recovery measures in place.

Under the current administration's policy, in my own district in central Washington, wolves will be delisted on the eastern side up to a highway that cuts through a heavy agriculture area. Wolves on one side of the highway will be listed, the other side not. The same is true in Oregon and Utah.

I appreciate the steps the gentleman has included in this bill to create a more rational approach toward delisting these recovered wolves by allowing the States to manage the populations using sound wildlife management principles. I want to confirm my understanding that the bill and accompanying report language on page 10 is intended to include all States in their entirety within the northern Rocky Mountain area, including Washington, Oregon, and Utah.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes. Our intent is to make it clear that States with approved management plans should be given authority to manage delisted wolf populations in their States. The language in the bill ensures that delisting decisions are made by scientists on the ground, not judges in courtrooms.

The report language clarifies that similar bill language should apply to areas where wolves have expanded beyond their original population boundaries once State management plans are in place and the Fish and Wildlife Service determines that the population should be delisted. That language is intended to address States that currently face mixed management challenges, like Washington, Oregon, and Utah.

I know your concern about this issue, and Representative WALDEN from Oregon has shared with me similar concerns as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

As we both know, the problem goes far beyond wolves. The ESA has nearly 1,400 listed species in the U.S. and hundreds of millions of dollars being spent by local, State, Federal, and private entities on ESA activities; yet Federal agencies are being regularly sued for poor science and poorly drafted regulations, and only 20 species have been recovered.

Do you agree with me that the Endangered Species Act is broken and needs to be modernized and updated?

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, today's ESA is so highly contentious, political, and litigious that it has become a failure of public policy. Funding authorization for ESA programs expired nearly two decades ago, but because we have continued to fund them, ESA reform continues to stay on the back burner.

This bill calls for a "timeout" for unauthorized funding of new critical habitat or ESA listing decisions in order to encourage authorizers and stakeholders to come to the table to bring the ESA into the 21st century, which it is not now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, a couple of weeks ago Secretary Salazar acknowledged, "There are changes and improvements that can be made to how we deal with endangered species" and that "we need to have an endangered species program that does, in fact, work." I couldn't agree more with the Secretary's statement.

The Natural Resources Committee that I chair has jurisdiction over ESA, as well as NOAA and the Fish and Wildlife Service, and we will be working in coming months to conduct robust oversight and look at much needed proposals to update this law. I appreciate your leadership and look forward to working with you on this very important issue.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

It is important that authorizing committees like yours be able to modernize landmark laws like the ESA—laws that were widely supported when they were passed but no longer work as Congress originally intended. No less than 56 agencies or programs in this bill have expired authorizations, and stakeholders and interested Members of Congress should know that these programs are also at risk of defunding if they are not reauthorized. Our bill, hopefully, will provide incentive for stakeholders who have been unwilling to participate in the reform process to finally entertain serious reform of the ESA, which I am sure your committee will actively pursue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, that certainly is the intent that we tend to pursue.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority would respectfully request of the majority that such colloquies, including the one that just transpired, as well as future ones, be shared with the minority. They are meant to be a clarification of language and funding in the bill. And they may very well prompt actions on our part to strike language if we don't fully understand what the intent was, and that may very well apply to the delisting of wolves. So we would appreciate, when the majority

engages in colloquies, sharing that language with the minority.

Would the gentleman like to respond? I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have no problem sharing with you the colloquies that we engage in.

Mr. MORAN. Good. So we would like a copy of the colloquy that just transpired.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member of the Financial Services Appropriations Committee.

□ 1430

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012. First, however, I would like to acknowledge both Chairman SIMPSON and Congressman MORAN, who have worked in a bipartisan and collaborative way throughout the lengthy hearing and markup process. It has been a pleasure for me to serve as a member of this subcommittee.

Unfortunately, this subcommittee's insufficient spending allocation has resulted in deep cuts in funding for important agencies and programs. In addition, numerous anti-environmental riders have been attached to this legislation.

Although there are many to choose from, I would like to mention a few of these cutbacks and what their impact will be on specific agencies and programs. For example, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is crucial in helping to fund land acquisition and in protecting threatened and endangered species, was funded at \$66 million, which is \$834 million below the budget request.

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants, which play an important role in making sure that we have strategic and effective wildlife conservation programs, were funded at \$22 million, or \$73 million below the request.

The Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, is funded at \$7.1 billion, which is \$1.8 billion below the request. At this funding level, the EPA will be prevented from accomplishing many of its missions to protect our environment.

There are so many destructive riders attached to this legislation that it is difficult to figure out which ones to highlight during my brief remarks. One that specifically harms my State of New York was added during full committee markup. This rider prevents the Great Lakes States from receiving any EPA funding if they have implemented ballast water rules that have stronger timeliness or standards than the Federal or international requirements that are currently in effect. Because New York has been at the forefront of efforts to require ships to treat their ballast water before discharging it into New York's waterways, our State will be immediately affected. States should

have the right to protect their own waters from dangerous aquatic invasive species.

Another particularly harmful rider would stop the EPA from limiting greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources for a 1-year period. Overall, 69 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States come from stationary sources, such as our electric utilities and petroleum refineries. This rider, which prevents the EPA from acting, will have far reaching and devastating consequences on our Nation's air quality. In particular, my Bronx congressional district, which has one of the highest asthma rates in the Nation, will continue to suffer from poor air quality.

Because of the sharp reductions included in this bill to the programs and agencies that protect our environment, enrich our lives through the arts, and increase recreational opportunities; and because of the riders that harm our wildlife, our land, our water, and our air quality, I will be voting against this bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Fiscal Year 2012 Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member MORAN for being excellent leaders on the subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to work with both of them. I especially commend the 22 oversight hearings that our subcommittee held this year. The subcommittee works hard, and we have done our due diligence in putting this bill together.

The FY 2012 Interior and Environment Appropriations bill recognizes the current economic environment and the past 4 years of out-of-control spending. It is \$2.1 billion below last year's level, and \$3.8 billion below the President's 2012 request. It is a focused and lean bill which supports funding for duties which are clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government and makes tough decisions about how we allocate taxpayers' dollars.

The bill fully funds Federal firefighters and Forest Service Wildland Fire Management. It ensures our national parks, which belong to the American people, remain fully operational in 2012. And it includes \$30 million for diesel emissions reduction grants to retrofit old diesel engines with cleaner burning ones, a program that has been successfully implemented across the United States and is contributing to cleaner air.

The bill also reduces the EPA inflated budget back down to the 2006 level and cuts \$46 million in requested funding for burdensome regulation of greenhouse gases, which means control of carbon dioxide, a regulation unilaterally adopted by the administration

that is making the U.S. less competitive in the world and sending American jobs overseas.

Finally, yes, Mr. Chairman, there are many spending reductions in this bill, including programs I support. However, we have to start somewhere to bring economic sanity back to the budgeting process, and this is one of the first of many steps to come.

In conclusion, I am pleased to support this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Interior Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, I have great respect for Chairman SIMPSON, Ranking Member MORAN, and the staffers on both sides of the aisle.

One important aspect of this bill is Chairman SIMPSON and Representative COLE have worked together with Democrats to protect critical education and health care investments in Indian Country as part of our trust relationship with the 565 tribes in this country. Native American children, families and elders will all benefit as a result of our efforts.

However, on virtually every other aspect of this bill, particularly on the environment, this appropriations bill is a radical attempt to take America backwards from 40 years of bipartisan progress in protecting human health and our environment.

There are nearly 40 special interest policy riders in this bill. It is outrageous that these riders protect corporate polluters while attacking clean water, clean air, our public lands, and wildlife conservation. Representatives WAXMAN, MARKEY and RUSH, as ranking members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and Natural Resources Committee have sent letters expressing their grave concern about these extreme, destructive policy riders that have no business being on an appropriations spending bill.

This abuse of the legislative process to further Republicans' radical agenda on behalf of polluters and special interests should not be tolerated. These policy riders put the public health of Americans at risk and will imperil America's natural heritage for future generations. In particular, Republicans have chosen to mount an unprecedented assault on the Environmental Protection Agency, an agency created by President Richard Nixon.

Clearly, Republicans have now come full circle and this bill makes House Republicans the most polluter-friendly Congress in nearly two generations. In addition to gutting EPA's budget, Republicans have added 10 policy riders that will make the air we breathe dirtier and eight policy riders that will make the water we drink more polluted and toxic. The Republican riders halt the EPA's work under the Clean Air Act to protect the public health from impacts of carbon dioxide pollution,

mercury emissions, sulfur dioxide, soot and smog. This will jeopardize the health of millions of children suffering from asthma and put more Americans at risk for strokes, heart disease, and other respiratory and cardiovascular diseases.

In 2010, the EPA found the Clean Air Act saved 160,000 lives nationwide. That's equivalent to the entire population of Tempe, Arizona. By 2020, that number is expected to grow to 230,000 lives saved, leading to \$2 trillion in economic benefits.

Republican riders also stop EPA's work under the Clean Water Act to clean our rivers, streams, lakes, and to protect our drinking water from the impacts of coal mining, storm water discharge, and toxic nutrient pollution and pesticides.

Essentially, House Republicans are telling the American people that protecting public health and the environment from corporate polluters is no longer important. And despite the Tea Party Republicans' supposed ban on earmarks, this bill is loaded with earmarks for a few privileged polluters and special interests.

□ 1440

Here are just four out of a dozen Republican earmarks contained in this bill:

An earmark for foreign companies to allow for uranium mining adjacent to the Grand Canyon, one of America's most treasured places;

An earmark for Shell Oil to ignore environmental regulations to drill offshore in the Arctic Ocean;

An earmark for a few sheep farmers subsidized by U.S. taxpayers on U.S. land so they can evade environmental laws that protect bighorn sheep;

A special earmark for the State of Texas to continue its illegal air permitting program in violation of the Clean Air Act.

These dirty, toxic, and dangerous earmarks to a few special interests come at the expense of cleaner water, healthier air, our cherished national parks, and endangered wildlife. Minnesotans are deeply troubled by this reckless bill that endangers the health of our communities while destroying our natural resources that are our children's inheritance. This is one of the most extreme pieces of anti-environmental legislation to ever come to the floor of the House. As far as the American people are concerned, H.R. 2584 should be declared a toxic Superfund site that is so dangerous to human health and the environment that it needs to be remediated rather than passed into law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and its abandonment of 40 years of progress we have made in protecting the American people's health and the American national heritage.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to an esteemed colleague and member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the Chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I want to praise the process by which we arrived at this. This is probably the hardest-working subcommittee on a very hard-working Appropriations Committee; 22 separate hearings, a very open process. I think even the minority that disagreed with some of the decisions that were made would agree that they were made fairly, openly, transparently, and by votes. And the American people can look at what we did.

Usually, when you come to this floor, you come to debate and to disagree. We're certainly going to have a great deal of that over the course of the next several days as we work through the main legislation and the many amendments which undoubtedly will be offered. But I want to focus today on an area of bipartisan agreement, and that's the decisions that were made regarding funding in Indian Country and Native American programs.

Mr. Chairman, our chairman generously mentioned, and appropriately mentioned, the hard work that Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS did in setting the foundation for the progress that's being built upon this year. What he was too modest about was his own role, first as a ranking member and then as the chairman, and also seeing that an appropriate focus was placed on Indian Country. Frankly, while I disagree with the administration in many places, I want to thank them as well because in many cases, they had great suggestions, they certainly put forward serious proposals, and they've been very easy to work with in Native American issues. So there's a lot of praise here to go around.

Most importantly, I think from an appropriations standpoint, the numbers speak for themselves. The Bureau of Indian Affairs funding was cut, but actually cut less than the President requested. The Indian Health Service got a 9 percent increase—almost \$400 million. You can run through the program. IHS staffing for new facilities, \$63 million. Fully funded at the President's request. Road maintenance, \$25 million. Funded at the President's request. Indian guaranteed loan program, something to help tribes as they move into private industries, actually funded above the President's request. Contract support costs, fully funded, \$228 million. Indian Health Service, fully funded, \$574 million.

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

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

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman.

Contract support, again, fully funded or funded at very near what the President requested. Most importantly, language put in to make sure that those contracts are actually fully funded by the BIA, something that has not always happened in the past. Again, important language on joint ventures

whereby we encourage tribes to take some of their revenue, work with the Federal Government, reinvest in health care facilities, other needed infrastructure improvements in Indian Country.

I say all this just to point out that while we have serious disagreements and serious debates, and while we made very hard decisions, overall funding is, as Chairman SIMPSON suggested, down 7 percent from last year and certainly well below the request that the President made. In this area, defending one of the most challenged populations in the country, Republicans and Democrats alike can be exceptionally proud of what was done and the priorities when we put, again, the most challenged people that we deal with on that committee in the most favored position. That hasn't always happened. I want to thank my friend Chairman SIMPSON for making sure it happened and my friends Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS for doing the same.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the FY 2012 Interior appropriations bill in its current form. Not only am I deeply troubled by the bill's lack of infrastructure investment that would create jobs, grow the economy, and protect public health, but it is unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee has included several dozen egregious special interest policy earmarks in the bill that will undermine our Nation's commitment to clean water, clean air, and the environment, which are fundamental to local economies like the one I represent.

We've heard from our friends on the Appropriations Committee that we must make difficult decisions in these trying economic times. I couldn't agree more. Furthermore, we've heard from the chairman of the subcommittee that he believes that many of the programs that are cut are good programs, but that we must be willing to make cuts to reduce our growing debt.

Consider this: The bill cuts \$2.1 billion from 2011 levels for the Department of the Interior, EPA, and other agencies. However, if we were to eliminate the Bush tax cuts only for those households earning more than a million dollars per year, we could save the revenues necessary to preserve these critical agencies in less than 18 days. The bill provides \$1.4 billion less for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, a fund that is critical to both environmental protection and economic development. If we were to eliminate the Bush tax cuts, we could reestablish our commitment to clean water within 12 days, affecting only those tax cuts from people who make a million dollars a year or more. That's a reasonable price to pay for the economic development that would result.

Over the past several months we have heard repeatedly that we must do all

that we can to prevent taxing our Nation's job creators, a sentiment with which I agree in principle. However, in my district and districts all across this country, it is the environment that is the job creator. The economy of my district depends on clean water, clean air, and safe, swimmable beaches. The cuts in this bill place all of these in jeopardy. If the Republican priorities in this bill prevail, we could put an effective tax rate of zero on the small businesses in my district and it wouldn't help at all because they would have no income—and no income means no jobs.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield 2 minutes to the esteemed former chairman of the full committee, the member emeritus of several subcommittees, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the ranking member, especially for the number of public hearings they had reviewing all of the programs of this subcommittee, taking us back to regular order in almost unprecedented form, making sure the public had a chance to talk to us about their view as to how these programs were working.

As we meet today, the country is faced with a crisis regarding our debt. Should we raise the national debt ceiling or not? That debate is swirling around whether we should reduce spending or we should increase taxes to fund additional spending desired by the administration and the former majority. It's very, very important to know that we are at a crisis point in terms of spending. With that backdrop, we can hear the same debate taking place in this very committee discussion. People complaining about not enough money for EPA, for example.

The fact is that most of these programs are over-funded relative to just a few years ago, and the debate and the concern is an expression about a desire for more spending or a lack of increased funding above and beyond the wish list of many around here. The fundamental issue ought to be discussed in terms of how programs have worked and not worked.

I've heard many complaints about air quality questions today by the other side. It was, Mr. Chairman, my privilege to write the toughest environmental laws in the country relative to improving air quality. Years ago, as we discussed implementing those policies in my State of California, the center of the discussion was to make sure we focus upon the real problems.

□ 1450

We can solve the problems of stationary sources, we said then, very quickly, very easily—up to 97 percent-plus of their pollution. The real problem lies with the automobile, doing something serious about that. What people do driving their cars is the key to the question.

The EPA has failed us in many, many a way in dealing with these major challenges, and I would suggest that any number of issues that might be raised is illustrated by the one endangered species I'd mentioned. That endangered species is the desert tortoise.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEWIS of California. We could have solved that problem years ago by planting endless numbers of eggs in the East Mojave. Instead, the EPA decided to ignore and the environmentalists decided to ignore that potential, saying it took too long to plant those and have them grow to adulthood. The fact is, over the last 15 years, had we done that, we would not have that endangered species any longer. Recently, we learned the only healthy population of the desert tortoise was on the National Training Center Army base where they took care of the animals versus what we did in the environment. Indeed, the EPA deserves some serious review as well as reauthorization.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), an extraordinary champion of the environment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I am uncomfortable coming to the floor and having to speak against this bill. There is nobody in Congress I have more respect and affection for than the subcommittee chairman; but this bill is an example of why the Republican budget gimmick last week was a fool's errand. If ever enacted, the public would be outraged.

These critical programs of EPA are not overfunded. Just talk to anybody in your home community who is dealing with things like the revolving fund for sewer and water.

This bill is not balanced. There are opportunities where there could have been fees and charges from people who profit from the activities of this bill. But no. Instead, we are shifting costs to the public and damage to the environment. We are actually giving more money to some of the special interests that profit from these activities.

We are slashing things that matter to most Americans—the ability of the EPA to protect our families and their environment and land acquisition to protect American treasures. It's going to cost hundreds of thousands of jobs in rural and small town America where people rely on our open spaces, our public lands, our parks and recreational activities.

It shortchanges America's future.

The jihad against climate change continues from my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, and it's ironic. When people can barely walk outside in Washington, D.C. and when we're dealing with drought, flood, wildfires, the extreme weather events across the country, the scientists tell

us that it's related to human activity, and this budget reduces our ability to deal with climate change and extreme weather events.

I agree that the subcommittee has a very difficult job, in part, because of the unrealistic numbers that were given to them; but sadly, if you look at the bill in its entirety, I must take gentle exception to Chairman ROGERS saying we all support the core mission of EPA. Sadly, anybody who reads this bill understands that that's not the case and that it's being brought to us in a way that simply undermines that core mission that means so much to Americans, to our environment, and to our future.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the reality is that this is a bad bill. There may be some good people who have been involved in putting it together. I like the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, but the fact is that this would severely restrict our government's ability to improve the quality of our air and water. It would substantially cut programs that, I think, many of the American people take for granted. Our environment will be despoiled by this bill if it becomes enacted, so I would strongly urge that this body vote against it.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. In closing, I thank the Members for the debate that has gone on with regard to this bill.

I notice that Members on the other side of the aisle continually refer to some of the policy provisions that are in this bill as policy rider/special interest legislation. In fact, they were called "earmark legislation" in this bill, but they are special interest.

Let me tell you that the only special interest that I care about right now are the unemployed people in this country who are looking for a job. If you talk to any business in this country, the one thing they will tell you is the uncertainty created by the potential regulation and proposed regulation by the EPA is stopping them from expanding their businesses because they have no idea—no idea—what it's going to cost to hire a new employee.

They are the biggest wet blanket on our economy that we have today, so we need to do something about it. We need to rein them back in because they are totally out of control. That's what this bill does.

This is under an open rule. That means Members will have the opportunity, if they have different ideas and if they can get a majority of the votes, to remove some of these things. If so, they can remove them, but I'd suspect more are going to be added rather than removed as this bill moves through its full consideration.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this Rule and this incredibly short-sighted legislation before us today. The underlying bill is a direct attack on the environment and as a result an assault on public health and our economy.

The programs included in the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill affect so many aspects of our lives including clean air, clean water, public health and support for the arts.

Unfortunately, at the funding level provided, the Environmental Protection Agency will be fundamentally dismantled, making the agency unable to implement its core mission of protecting the environment and promoting public health.

The bill also removes funding for programs that help modernize buildings and other infrastructure and funding for innovative projects that are helping communities implement smarter water management solutions that protect clean water and save consumers money.

In my district, the Sacramento and American Rivers provide 85 percent of drinking water to those that live in the City of Sacramento that is over 400,000 of my constituents. Mr. Speaker, we rely on federal support to ensure the water we drink is safe. Without the proper level of funding I am very worried that we are going down a path of unknown consequences.

This bill also hurts Sacramento by slashing funds for the EPA's Office of Smart Growth which has worked closely with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments to ensure sustainable, positive growth in our region. In a time when local governments are suffering massive cuts, the investment in the Office of Smart Growth offers our communities assistance that will help them grow and revitalize their local economies.

Mr. Chair, the Sacramento area is on a path to become a national leader in the green economy, with over 230 companies, and 14,000 jobs. It is critical that we support policies that foster new innovation, and job growth in the green economy. Unfortunately, this bill does not do that!

What's more, this bill would cut the National Endowment of the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities by 13 percent. Both NEA and NEH grants are essential for our local economies. This funding is fundamental to supporting a thriving arts scene in my district, creating jobs and inspiring local students. As a former docent of the Crocker Art Museum in Sacramento, I can tell you firsthand the effect that an individual piece of art or a trip to a museum can have on a child. These are cuts we cannot afford to make.

In previous years, the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill has provided an opportunity to move our nation forward and make progress in areas as diverse as climate change to water use efficiency. But in this Congress, this Majority is forcing us to take a huge step backwards.

As a whole, this legislation has an unprecedented number of special-interest policy riders that endanger public health and go beyond the scope of the legislation.

In an austere budget environment, we can all agree that cuts need to be made but cuts to public health, cannot and should not be made just to give subsidies to Big Oil and Wall Street Executives.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to consider the dangerous and unprecedented ramifications this bill would have

on our constituents. I strongly reject this egregious proposal.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment printed in section 2 of House Resolution 363 is adopted. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2584

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIMPSON

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a manager's amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the amendment en bloc and at this point in the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 48, line 3, insert "all" before "funds".  
Page 48, line 5, strike "exhausted" and insert "obligated".

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,812,000)".

Page 81, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)".

Page 105, line 19, insert "to the National Endowment for the Humanities" after "available".

Page 125, lines 14 and 15, strike "may establish" and "programs".

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

Mr. SIMPSON. The manager's amendment before us makes several technical and conforming changes to the bill. These are all noncontroversial changes, and they have been shared with the minority. I believe the minority is supportive of the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLAY. I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member MORAN, for your leadership and for this opportunity to discuss an important and urgent matter.

As the chairman knows, there are two acts that seek to conserve marine mammals—the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. I am not here to debate the merits of those acts but to discuss an inadvertent and unexpected consequence of them.

□ 1500

There is what seems to be a contradiction when it comes to the protection of polar bears. Exactly the opposite may be happening.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

I am aware of this issue. This is one of those times when a law whose intent is to protect may be unintentionally causing harm.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, you are correct. This is an urgent issue, as we know, of polar bears, specific bears today that are in danger of being lost and which could be saved by importation into the United States. While it was the intent of Congress to protect these animals, the acts were never intended to be bureaucratic obstacles to common sense and to saving their lives.

Some brief background is in order. Mr. Chairman, section 101 of the Marine Mammals Protection Act established a moratorium on the importation of marine mammals. However, section 102 and 104 of the act allow for the issuance of permits for the importation of marine mammals under certain circumstances.

Now, the act generally prohibits permits from public display of marine mammals from a species of stock designated as depleted, which is defined as one that is listed as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

On May 15, 2008, the Secretary of the Interior listed the polar bear as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act; and since then, no permits for the importation of polar bears for the health and welfare of the animals or for the purposes of public display have been issued by the Secretary. The act does require that conservation plans for taking animals include proposals to enhance their habitat which, in this case, is impossible.

One of the main reasons the polar bear was listed as threatened is the loss of their habitat. It is not possible

to comply with this requirement, and we urge the Secretary to take this into consideration when making a final determination on these permits.

There is also a requirement that such takings be for scientific purposes. Mr. Chairman, I think you would agree that establishing successful captive breeding programs for a threatened species fits into the Congress's intent for scientific purposes. Declining habitat conditions for the polar bear and an increasing number of human-bear interaction have resulted in an increase in the number of polar bears brought into temporary or permanent captivity in Canada in recent years, including an increase in the number of non-releasable animals and orphaned cubs.

Canadian institutions cannot house all of these bears and any animals not placed in suitable facilities could be used, euthanized or left to die in the wild.

The Government of Manitoba, Canada, has passed legislation allowing such bears to be exported from Canada for purposes of captive maintenance and public display at accredited zoological institutions in the United States. These are institutions that have undergone a thorough and rigorous review and inspection process by zoological professionals to examine all aspects of an institution's operation.

Prior to issuing those permits, the Secretary of the Interior should determine the institution is accredited by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums and meets specific public display criteria as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify that it is your understanding that under these acts, the Secretary of the Interior may issue permits for the importation into the U.S. of live polar bears for the purpose of public display at appropriate accredited zoological institutions. Upon a finding that such importation of such will benefit the health and welfare of the animal or is otherwise consistent with the conservation of the polar bears, in addition with the other areas, the Secretary's authority is granted under the Marine Mammals Protection Act, section 102(b) and 104(c)(4)(A).

Again, I want to thank the chairman for this opportunity.

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

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLAY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri, and I want to be clear. I hope the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service hear us clearly when we say that it is the sense of the committee that under these acts the Secretary of the Interior may issue permits for the importation into the United States of live polar bears for the purposes of public display

at appropriate accredited zoological institutions upon a finding that such importation will benefit the health and welfare of the animal or is otherwise consistent with the conservation of the polar bear.

I thank the gentleman for raising the matter and for working with me on this important issue.

Mr. CLAY. I thank the chairman, as well as Ranking Member DICKS for requesting additional time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau and the assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$918,227,000, to remain available until expended; of which \$3,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2012 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$18,663,000)".

Page 92, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$18,663,000)".

Mr. MORAN (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, as I noted previously, there are a lot of winners and losers in H.R. 2584.

Two of the winners are the oil and gas companies and the cattle grazers who use our publicly owned land. One of the losers is Indians who need Sanitation Facilities.

My amendment would do two things. First, it decreases funding from the increase in the bill for the BLM's oil and gas and grazing management programs. Second, the amendment would restore the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program by what it was cut below the current spending level. I find it ironic that the majority refused to allow the administration to collect an inspection

fee from the oil and gas industry but had no problem in providing more taxpayer subsidies for the oil and gas industry.

The oil and gas industry gets about \$4 billion in subsidies per year. Likewise cattle ranchers get about \$400 million in subsidies per year by paying their ridiculously low fee of \$1.35 per month per cow while States charge so much more. Texas, for example, charges \$65 to \$150 per cow per month to graze on State-owned lands, but the Federal Government charges only \$1.35. Well, in this bill, they would see an increase in taxpayer resources devoted to grazing management from \$75 million to \$90 million, a 20 percent increase. Why not ask them to at least pay the cost of administering their grazing subsidy?

If our national budget is truly about shared sacrifice, how about starting with the oil and gas companies that have profited so handsomely from the resources owned by the American public and from ranchers whose use of the public lands is heavily subsidized by the American taxpayer.

The second part of my amendment provides an additional \$18.6 million for the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program. It would simply restore funding to last year's level.

At the end of fiscal year 2010, there were about 230,000 Native American homes in need of sanitation facilities including 34,000 homes without running water. According to the Indian Health Service, Native Americans in these homes are at extremely high risk for gastrointestinal disease and respiratory disease at rates similar to Third World countries. Additionally, the Indian Health Service has noted that many of these homes without services are very remote with limited access to health care, which increases the importance of improving environmental conditions in these homes.

The least we can do is to provide the same level of funding that was provided this current year to the Indian Sanitation Facilities Program, which is an integral component of the Indian Health Service disease prevention activities.

I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, the chairman suggested that there were no special interests. Well, this disproves that. There are special interests. Oil and gas companies already getting subsidies from the American taxpayer of about \$4 billion a year, they get increases in this bill. We're simply asking them to pay a little more towards the Federal Government's cost of managing the fees that they should be paying.

□ 1510

Just a little bit more, we're asking them to pay. And we're also asking the ranchers who, again, get special interest subsidies of about \$400 million in this bill, more money for the ranchers, more subsidy, more subsidy for the oil and gas companies; and yet at the same time, we cut the money that would

provide sanitation facilities for 230,000 Native American homes in need, and 34,000 of those homes are without even potable water. They are the losers. Oil and gas companies and the grazers are the winners in this bill. That's why I would urge support for the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Virginia.

Honoring our Nation's obligations to American Indians and Alaskan Natives is an unshakable bipartisan sentiment shared by Members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and is an accomplishment in this bill that I am most proud of. This bill increases funding for Indian Health Services by \$392 million over the current fiscal year while almost virtually everything else is being cut, a 10 percent increase that also happens to be one of the rare and, by far, the largest increases in this bill. This bill includes the same \$19 billion cut for sanitation facilities that was proposed by the President. And I note that the President's Indian Health Service budget was an additional \$162 million higher than this bill.

The problem is the offset. The BLM's management of land resources account has already been cut by \$43.5 million below the FY 2011 and \$15.5 million below the President's budget request. This account funds the management of the BLM's more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres. Further cuts to this account are not appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, am I proud of the increases we were able to provide in this bill and in previous bills by my predecessors Mr. MORAN and Mr. DICKS? You bet I am. Will I continue to fight for more funding for Indian country despite the attacks from virtually every other interest group who isn't happy with their share of the pie? You bet I will. Will I stand by and let my friend and colleague from Virginia continue to systematically dismantle the budget of the largest landowner in the West, the BLM? Absolutely not. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I support my friend from Virginia's (Mr. MORAN) amendment which would increase funding for the Indian Health Service sanitary facilities construction program. The amendment would provide \$18 million for this important health program, which would bring the funding level back up

to the enacted level for this year. The offset for this increase comes from a couple of programs that help support the private sector energy and livestock industries.

I think this amendment is a very good deal for the American taxpayer. And, by the way, if you've ever been out in Indian country, one of the problems that they have is a lack of sanitary facilities. I can think of the Skokomish Indians in my district in Mason County, Washington, where they have a very serious need for new sanitary facilities. And across Indian country, this is still a major problem. In fact, there was a group of scientists a few years ago who were asked, What was the greatest thing that happened in the 20th century to improve health care? They came up with sewers and sanitary facilities as the thing that improved health care around the world the most substantially.

The Indian Health Service program to construct sanitary facilities that would benefit from this amendment improves the lives of some of our poorest fellow citizens. The Indian Health Service program provides funding for people who often lack basic sanitary facilities, such as the delivery of potable water to their homes. For me, the choice is simple. I urge my colleagues to choose to help provide basic sanitation to Native Americans by making small cuts to programs that assist the energy and livestock industries. This is a good amendment and should be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to also support the Moran amendment for providing more access to clean drinking water.

And to Chairman SIMPSON's point, we did do a good job working together to significantly improve the quality of life in Indian country, and we did that working together. But one area in which some of us felt we could have done a little better is in the area of Indian sanitation. We're seeking to put the funding level back to where this Chamber had it in FY 2011, not a cut. And the way that we're asking to do that—and I will speak to the issue of grazing because I offered the amendment in the full Appropriations Committee—is to ask cattle ranchers to pay a fair fee to graze their cattle. A fee of \$1.35, as Mr. MORAN pointed out, is less than what most States are charging for the use of their public lands. And it is significantly less, as I found in some information gathering that I did, than the private sector charges for the use of their lands.

When we have our lands at \$1.35, not only is it not of benefit to the taxpayers, but it leads to overgrazing of our lands, which does nothing to help improve the quality of public lands for



future generations of cattle ranchers. Fifteen million dollars to grazers in this bill, \$4 million to oil and gas. And the numbers again: 230,000 Native American homes without sanitation facilities; 34,000 homes without clean, safe drinking water.

No infant and no child in this country or in Indian country should be at risk of gastrointestinal disease rates that are found in Third World countries. Let us provide the same level of funding that we had in the FY 2011 bill for Indian sanitation. Let us support clean drinking water for our children.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$70,000,000)".

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,880,000)".

Page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$85,000,000)".

Page 9, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$11,804,000)".

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,047,000)".

Page 10, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 10, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$120,000)".

Page 14, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000)".

Page 15, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$32,000,000)".

Page 32, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

Page 39, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$47,000,000)".

Page 65, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$150,000,000)".

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$900,000,000)".

Page 66, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$16,000,000)".

Page 68, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$771,000,000)".

Page 68, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$344,000,000)".

Page 68, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$427,000,000)".

Page 76, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$78,000,000)".

Page 78, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,500,000)".

Page 88, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$432,000,000)".

Page 96, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000)".

Page 103, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,000,000)".

Page 105, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$135,000,000)".

Page 105, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$135,000,000)".

Page 105, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$125,000,000)".

Page 105, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 105, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,000,000)".

Page 158, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,231,000)".

Mr. HUELSKAMP (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Today I rise on behalf of the Republican Study Committee to offer an amendment to bring the Interior appropriations bill in line with the RSC budget.

Mr. Chairman, credit rating agencies around the country are threatening to downgrade our debt, and not because we won't pass a debt ceiling increase but more so because we have not passed a credible plan to pay that debt back. Every child born in America today owes the Federal Government over \$46,000, and that bill rises every day.

The times we are in demand that we look at the effectiveness of every Federal dollar we spend, and that is why I offer this amendment today. This amendment makes cuts across the bill, but the biggest cuts come from the EPA. In my opinion, no agency in our Federal Government has done more to negatively impact our economy than the EPA.

In my district in western Kansas, EPA foot-dragging and redtape is delaying the construction of a new power plant. The construction of the plant would create 1,900 construction jobs and 261 permanent jobs, yet they cannot even break ground. Region VII is asking for changes. Environmental groups continue to file lawsuits based on EPA rules, exacting a death-by-litigation strategy against the rural electric cooperative members seeking to build this plant.

□ 1520

According to a study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 351 proposed solar, wind, wave, biofuel, coal, gas, nuclear and energy transmission projects have been delayed or canceled due to significant impediments, such as regulatory barriers, including inefficient review processes and the attendant lawsuits and threats of legal action.

The study found that these projects would produce 1.9 million new jobs during construction and almost 800,000 jobs on an ongoing basis. These jobs are simply in limbo when our economy sorely needs them. In fact, not a week seems to go by without the EPA issuing a new rule or regulation that increases costs to businesses and consumers. BoilerMACT, water cooling intakes for power plants, interstate air

quality, dust and other particulate matter, ozone, and the list goes on and on.

These actions not only drive up costs but they create higher degrees of uncertainty in our fragile economy. And when the EPA isn't hampering our economy at home, they are sending our tax dollars abroad. Nearly \$1.3 billion was sent to China in grants over the past 2 years. Yes, that's right, these grants were sent to the China Coal Institute, the China University of Petroleum, the China Urban Construction Design and Research Academy, and the China Association of Rural Energy Industry. I guess the hundreds of billions of dollars of debt we owe them is not enough.

The EPA has long given up sound scientific methods to ensure a clean environment for a left-wing agenda that heaps billions in costs on our economy in exchange for nearly immeasurable incremental changes in our water and air quality.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also zeroes out funding for the NEA and the NEH. Federal spending on the arts and humanities has long been controversial, not only for the nature of some of the grants but also for the fact that I believe the Federal Government should not play such a role in our society and certainly should not at a time when we are facing an impending debt crisis. If we cannot make relatively easy decisions to eliminate this funding, how can the American people expect us to make the harder decisions necessary to balance our Federal budget?

Mr. Chairman, the amendment also ends funding for National Heritage Area grants. This provision was included as a result of the YouCut program where the American people could vote on a government program to cut, and this is the one they selected. Federal funding for heritage areas was supposed to be seed capital to get them up and running for the States, localities, and private sector who requested them. Many of the grants have exceeded their original 10-year limitation. Even the President recommended a 50 percent cut in his budget for them, which was included in the bill; but in this time of much needed Federal spending restraint, it is time to cut them altogether.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to pass this amendment and help put us on a track to balance our budget in the next decade.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts every environmental, conservation, and cultural program across the bill, totaling \$3 billion in cuts, and then puts those funds in the spending reduction account.

The funding in the bill is already grossly inadequate, and this amendment would cut the bill by more than

10 percent. The amendment zeroes out U.S. Fish and Wildlife construction by cutting \$12 million. It zeroes out U.S. Fish and Wildlife land acquisition by cutting \$15 million. It zeroes out Forest Service land acquisition. It zeroes out the National Endowment for the Arts. It zeroes out the National Endowment for the Humanities. It cuts State and local water infrastructure by \$770 million, 30 percent, even though the infrastructure needs across this country, as Mr. DICKS has stated, is \$688 billion.

This amendment goes on to cut the National Park Service, the Office of the Secretary, Wildland Fire Management, EPA Science and Technology, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, we should all oppose these draconian cuts. They don't make sense. I don't think the gentleman proposing them necessarily knows what the full impact would be. I suspect, though, that if his constituents, let alone the American people, knew what was being attempted, they would agree with me that this amendment should be soundly defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join with my good friend from Virginia in speaking against this amendment, although I do appreciate my friend from Kansas in offering it, because this is precisely what would be required if the budget gimmick that was offered by the Republicans last week to restrict funding to 1966 levels, a budget level that was never met by Ronald Reagan, who never proposed a budget that was less than 21 percent, but this is exactly what would be required. It's why the House is going to demonstrate the schizophrenia on the part of my friends on the other side of the aisle, because this amendment is going to be rejected, I predict. It will be rejected, even though that is what they would wish on the American public.

Zeroing out the resources for the National Humanities, for the NEA, things that, when push comes to shove, the American public embraces, supports, have dramatic economic impact at home, that leverage private dollars, but this is just the tip of the iceberg. I appreciate it being offered. I wish that people would look at it closely because this is what is being proposed by our Republican friends in their effort going forward.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I will yield back, but I do hope people pay close attention to what is embodied here, because this is a taste of what people have in store for the American public.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and while I appreciate my good friend from Kansas's passion for cutting spending, the reality is that this is exactly what we're doing. This bill comes in under the allocation. We passed the budget earlier this year on the floor—we're the only body to have passed a budget, actually. The Senate has not passed one yet. We were given an allocation, and this bill comes in under that allocation.

We all know that we cannot balance this budget simply by cutting, but we also know that reducing Federal spending is a necessary priority and a first step toward getting us toward a balanced budget.

I think that this amendment goes too far. It would take \$3 billion from the numerous accounts in this bill, including the BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, NEA and NEH, as was mentioned, and transfer it to the budget reduction account.

While I appreciate the gentleman's concern that he expressed about the impact that the EPA is having in this country on job creation, and I have said repeatedly that when I go out and give a speech somewhere to a chamber of commerce or Lions Club or whatever, I'll talk about the Interior bill and the agencies that we fund, and when I get to the EPA, someone in the audience will say, Just defund it, get rid of it, and it's the first applause line in the speech. That's the reputation the EPA has out in the public, and that's the concern that the public has about the direction that the EPA is headed.

So I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the EPA; but as I try to explain to people, you can't just do away with the EPA because if you're out there and you have a business and the underlying law requires you to get an air quality permit or a water permit or something like that and you call the EPA to get your air quality permit and no one's there to answer the phone, to help you with that, then you've got a problem. We don't want to eliminate the EPA. What we want to do is rein the EPA back in, because I think they've got an overly aggressive agenda; and, as I have said, I think they're the biggest wet blanket on the growth in our economy that there is.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I would hope that my colleagues would oppose the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I move to strike the last word to oppose this amendment.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, what the American people want from their leaders in Washington can be summed up in a single word: jobs, J-O-B-S. The Republicans have now controlled the House for more than 200 days, and they haven't lifted a finger to address the single overriding priority of the people we work for, that is, jobs.

□ 1530

It's a gross failure of leadership.

Instead, what's on their agenda this week? Only the biggest assault on environmental protections in several decades.

I have yet, Mr. Chairman, to see a poll where Americans are clamoring for the Congress to undermine pollution controls, damage public health, and unravel a 40-year bipartisan conservation consensus. I can't think of a single environmental program or initiative that is spared under the base legislation, and this amendment makes it even worse.

The base bill would mean more toxic mercury, arsenic and soot pollution released in our air. It leaves the area surrounding the Grand Canyon, the Grand Canyon, an iconic national park, open to toxic uranium mining.

It cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund by 78 percent. It tears the heart out of the Clean Water Act, and it guts the Endangered Species Act. And it removes those pesky regulatory obstacles that keep pesticides out of our waterways.

The Republicans want to block EPA's efforts to protect communities from stormwater runoff and to issue new energy-efficiency standards for new vehicles after 2016. Everything we've put in place that makes sense is what they want to get rid of.

And on and on and on and on it goes, Mr. Chairman, one extreme policy rider after another. None of this will do anything to save taxpayers money. It is an absolute frontal assault on the water we drink, the air we breathe, the public lands we cherish.

This is a big special interest giveaway, and that is simple. It's a classic example of legislating to benefit friends and benefactors, Big Oil and other corporate polluters at the expense of national interests. The Nation's natural resources are not ours to exploit at our will. They are on loan to us. We must be the responsible stewards.

It will be a moral failure if we don't pass an improved environmental bill, and if we don't pass an environment on to the next generation, one that is in even better condition than the one we have today.

But that's what this disgraceful legislation would do. It breaks a covenant that the American people take very seriously, a covenant they actually take for granted. It's Republican extremism run amok on steroids, voraciously ramming out of control.

The base bill, H.R. 2584, must be stopped. This amendment cannot see the light of day. I urge all my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend Chairman SIMPSON for opposing this

amendment. This is an amendment that goes way too far. This bill is \$3.8 billion, almost \$4 billion below what the President requested. It's \$2 billion below the FY11 level, which we just passed a few months ago, and it would have a devastating effect on our environment.

When I hear people talk about growing the economy by cutting the budget, I wonder what school of economics they attended. In fact, there was an outstanding article just a few weeks ago in *The New York Times* that really laid out the basic problem we have in this economy, and that is that consumer spending has dropped by 7 percent. Normally, in previous recessions, it only went down 3 percent.

So then when you cut State and local government funding, when you cut Federal funding, you make a bad situation worse in terms of consumption. And that is why the economy has slowed down, and that's why it's not going to go up as a result of these kinds of reckless cuts being offered by the other side.

Let me give you one example. The former EPA administrator, Christine Todd Whitman, from New Jersey, did a study of what the backlog on wastewater treatment facilities was. And it was \$688 billion, and this was in 2002. It's definitely gone up.

And yet we're slashing, and would slash again, the amount of money for the Clean Water Revolving Fund and the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Fund and the State and Tribal Assistance Grants. Those are exactly the programs that we should be plussing up in order to get people back to work. It's infrastructure. That's one thing we used to be able to agree on, both Democrats and Republicans in this House, that we need infrastructure work. This will put people to work.

How are you going to get the deficit down? Not by slashing government spending. You're going to get it by putting people back to work. When you put them back to work, they start paying taxes, they start buying goods, and that will drive down the deficit. It will drive down unemployment.

This reckless amendment from the gentleman from Kansas, again, would make this bad situation even worse in terms of job creation. So I am pleased that the majority is resisting this ill-thought-out amendment, and I urge its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 65, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, in the committee report for this bill, the appropriations committee included some language expressing concerns in regard to the Environmental Protection Agency's Urban Waters Initiative and provides no funding in the bill for this program for fiscal year 2012.

I understand the committee's reluctance to extend funding for new broad, cross-cutting initiatives, given our economic situation. However, I feel this initiative has immense value to millions of people who live in urban centers and who rely on the government to ensure that they have clean water to drink and use in their daily lives. This amendment would restore partial funding for the Urban Waters Initiative for fiscal year 2012. This amendment does not increase the spending by one single penny.

Cities share one key characteristic: they're full of people, buildings, and businesses. Because everyone shares the same relative space, air and water environmental impacts are concentrated in smaller areas, including waterways. Urban waters take on large amounts of pollution from a variety of sources, including industrial discharges, mobile sources, such as cars and trucks, residential/commercial wastewater, trash and polluted stormwater runoff from urban landscapes. As urban populations often share centralized water sources, this pollution creates public and environmental health hazards like lowered drinking water quality and water bodies that aren't safe for human swimming.

The EPA launched the Urban Waters Program to address water quality challenges in the urban watersheds and build capacity of disadvantaged communities through projects that revitalize these watersheds. If maintained properly, urban waters can also yield positive impacts for populations in both urban and upstream communities. Revitalization of waterways can spur employment and the growth of local businesses and promote improvements in housing, safety, and quality of life in these areas.

□ 1540

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. REICHERT). The gentleman will suspend.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today,

the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. CLEAVER. Communities across the country are coming together, working with the EPA, State and local agencies, and taking steps to access, restore, and benefit from their urban waters and the surrounding lands. My Missouri 5 District, a large section of which is Kansas City, is one such community. The EPA regional staff are working with Kansas City and local citizen groups to monitor water supply and plan and conduct improvements to the Blue River watershed and Brush Creek.

Covering 270 square miles, the Blue River compromises the largest watershed in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area. Its drainage is divided between the States of Kansas and Missouri and flows through three counties, 12 cities, and 10 school districts. Brush Creek is the most visible tributary to the Blue River and runs completely through an area that we are trying to rebuild called the Green Impact Zone. The EPA is monitoring water quality along the watershed and assisting in local efforts to conduct large-scale watershed planning for Brush Creek and the Blue River.

Whether as a part of a cleanup leading to waterfront development or putting monitoring in place to ensure safe drinking water with the EPA's help, community groups across the country have taken the initiative, engaging volunteers, community organizations, and local and State government to make their waters safe for many uses.

This amendment provides \$3 million for urban waters within the EPA's Environmental Programs and Management account, though it is by no means the maximum amount of funds that this program could utilize. It will ensure that this vital, community-driven initiative can continue, and I ask for the approval of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The amendment would take \$3 million from the BLM Management of Lands and Resources and transfer it to the EPA's Urban Waters Initiative. The BLM Management of Lands and Resources account has already been cut by \$43.5 million below the FY11 and \$15.5 million below the President's budget request. This account funds the management of the BLM's more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres. Further cuts to this account would not be appropriate.

We eliminated funding for the EPA's new Urban Waters Initiative because it

was duplicative funding. Regardless of whether a water body is in an urban or a rural area, EPA and States should be addressing the most impaired waters first, and there are a number of well-established programs that handle that. There is no need for a separate, duplicative initiative in order to protect our urban waters; it only results in duplicative spending.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. Mr. CLEAVER’s amendment would add a modest \$3 million to the Environmental Protection Agency for the Urban Waters Initiative, which the subcommittee refused to fund.

EPA and the Department of the Interior announced the first pilot demonstrations of this program last month. They included Baltimore’s Patapsco watershed, the Anacostia watershed in the District of Columbia and Maryland, the Bronx and Harlem River watersheds in New York, the South Platte River in Denver, the Los Angeles River watershed, the Lake Pontchartrain area in New Orleans, and the northwest Indiana area, all areas in drastic need of attention.

The subcommittee report chides EPA for reprioritizing funds to begin the program in fiscal year 2011 without the express approval of the committee. But my friends on the other side should know that when you fund the government under a continuing resolution, the agency has more flexibility. If we don’t want EPA or any other agency to decide how to prioritize funding, then we should pass real bills. And, frankly, they did exactly the right thing in moving forward with this Urban Waters Initiative—that’s where the need is.

Furthermore, denying funds to urban watersheds—where a majority of our population lives—because of a dislike for all things EPA does is simply unfair to these urban communities.

On a bipartisan basis, we have worked together to provide needed funding for rural water programs. We agree that should be a priority, but we should also show the same level of commitment for the Urban Waters Initiative.

This program will also capitalize on work being done through EPA’s broader geographic programs, such as Chesapeake Bay and Lake Pontchartrain. These are two very critical water bodies that are endangered. I don’t think I need to get into the extent of the endangerment for Chesapeake Bay and certainly not Lake Pontchartrain. Imagine, just think back to what happened in New Orleans just a few years ago. This offset is from the management account of the Bureau of Land

Management, which is adequately funded in the bill.

So I really do support this amendment, and I would urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington State.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to associate myself with the gentleman’s remarks. I support this amendment.

I can think back to when I was going to the University of Washington, when Lake Washington, which is between Seattle and Bellevue, was completely polluted and you couldn’t swim in it. The people there bonded themselves and completely restored the lake. Today, that is some of the most valuable property in the entire Pacific Northwest.

So these urban water initiatives are critically important for the environment and for the health of the people of those areas.

I think this is a modest amendment, and I urge our colleagues to accept it.

Mr. MORAN. I very much thank the distinguished ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, it is true that no bill is perfect, but this bill is truly atrocious. I have come here as co-chair of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition to talk about how this bill represents a wholesale failure to really recognize our stewardship responsibilities of the greatness of this country. And it is a great country. I fly across it every Monday and Friday, and the words of the song that God’s grace was shed on thee in this country are really true. But this bill shows nothing but disdain for the precious assets of clean air, clean water, and good open ground that we have in this country.

I’m sad to say that when you look out across America today you will see Republicans and Democrats out recreating—they understand what a beautiful playground we have in our national lands and clean water—but right now all this bill is is a playground for the special interests. And it’s sad to say that a party that we have worked

with historically has now turned its back on its stewardship responsibility. Teddy Roosevelt, who started this effort, would be rolling over in his grave to see this wholesale abandonment of this stewardship responsibility of this great country.

Republicans and Democrats alike want more clean air; this bill gives them less. They want more clean water; this bill gives them less. They want more open good ground; this bill gives them less. And the reason is is that it’s based on a huge, mistaken belief that dirty air is good for our economy, that dirty water is good for our economy, and that despoiled land is good for our economy. These are falsehoods.

You want to talk about job creation, I’d like to talk about some jobs we would like to create and keep that are damaged by this bill. Right now in Puget Sound out in Washington State, we have historically grown some of the best oysters in the world in Hood Canal and other places. And now, because of water pollution, the oyster industry that employs thousands of people in my State is endangered by water pollution.

□ 1550

Now, one would think, when we’re trying to protect jobs in every industry, including the oyster industry, we might be interested in preventing pollution that destroys a whole industry. But no, that’s not what this bill does. This bill weakens our ability to protect against dirty water and storm water pollution that is endangering jobs in my State and other places in this Nation. Now, if you go to talk to people in this industry, they’ll say their jobs are important. But according to this bill, they are not. What’s important are the special interests and the ability to degrade our environmental protection.

Take a look at the alternative fuels industry that is now growing across this country and its ability to create millions of new jobs. A few weeks ago, I was at a company called Targeted Growth. Targeted Growth had an idea a few years ago of creating biofuels that we could fly airplanes with. Five years ago, people thought this was a pipe dream. But because of their intellectual prowess, just a few weeks ago, using Targeted Growth biofuels, we flew the first transoceanic flight using biofuels from camelina that can be grown in my State and refined in my State, the first time in American history. That’s something to be proud of.

Now, one would think in a bill like this, we would help new job-creating industries like that get started. But no. What this bill does is degrade the clean energy parts of our law that would give inspiration and additional innovation and investment in these clean energy industries.

This bill is an anti-job creation bill because it makes the assumption that dirty air and sick people are good for

economic growth, and that is not a recipe for economic growth in this country.

Now I'll just talk about one thing. There has been an 80 percent reduction in our Land and Conservation Water Fund, which is very disturbing, and it should be to Democrats and Republicans alike. This is one thing I hope we can fix in this bill, and it is not something that is so urban or rural. I think about this little city park in Mossy Rock, Washington. A police officer said, Why do I get all of these kids hanging around the bars? Let's get them in something. Let's get them off the streets. Using some of these funds, we now have a city park being built in Mossy Rock, Washington. Is that such a dangerous thing for our economy?

I hope the Bass amendment is successful later on so we can at least fix one thing in this bill. Otherwise, reject this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I take modest exception to the comments of my good friend from the State of Washington because, having read "Wilderness Warrior" about Teddy Roosevelt, there is no doubt that T.R. is spinning in his grave.

This Interior Environment appropriations bill represents an abdication of responsibility on the part of the Federal Government. Not only does the bill cut funding for clean air, clean water, and protection of public lands, it is polluted with anti-environmental riders. These riders have nothing to do with reducing the deficit and everything to do with undermining the role of the Federal Government in protecting our Nation's environment and public health.

This is a partisan attack on 40 years of progress to protect our health and environment. It places profit-seeking interests of large polluters over the health of the American public, privatizing the benefits while forcing the children and elderly to bear increased health care costs.

Most of all, this bill is a waste of time. In the midst of a looming debt crisis, we are engaged in a rhetorical debate about legislation that moves us backward and will never become law, either defeated in the Senate or vetoed by the President.

Republicans are risking the stability of our economy for the opportunity to demonstrate once again they are more concerned in protecting industry profits than the American people.

In the midst of a heat wave in Washington, D.C., and around the country, the bill pretends that climate change isn't happening, and even prevents the EPA from following the law and a Supreme Court decision to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It threatens 2 million jobs and over \$363 billion of the Nation's economy that depends on the

support of the programs of the Department of the Interior.

There are devastating cuts to clean water and the State revolving funds. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, as is referenced, an 80 percent cut, the most dramatic reduction in 45 years. It cuts EPA's operating budget, oversight budget for offshore drilling, and will leave communities around the country struggling to provide services to their citizens and even comply with Federal laws.

In Oregon, the cuts to public lands funding will mean missed opportunities to protect special places like the Columbia River Gorge.

It will also cripple local economies. Studies have shown that for every billion dollars invested in water infrastructure, between 20,000 and 26,000 jobs are created. It cuts almost a billion dollars from the State revolving fund that helps States finance federally mandated upgrades in repairs to water and sewer systems. It will put additional pressure on already tight local budgets, as well as potentially increasing water and sewer rates. And in communities like mine, we've seen them skyrocket in recent years.

The bill rolls back lifesaving and cost-saving measures under the Clean Air Act and other environmental laws which were enacted to protect the health and environment of the American people. It should be no surprise that it is cheaper and easier to prevent toxics like mercury and arsenic from going into our air and water in the first place than trying to remove them later. The EPA studies show that the benefits far outweigh the costs.

There is no doubt why a number of public health organizations, including the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Academy of Pediatrics have all written to Congress opposing these clean air policy riders.

The policy riders in the spending bill can only be described as fulfilling a special interest wish list. From blocking clean air regulations and oversight of mining to preventing Federal action to clarify the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act and to a new moratorium on listings in the Endangered Species Act, the bill countless times ignores the needs of our communities and instead implements what polluting industries have been asking for. Why are we talking about allowing new mining around the Grand Canyon?

Finally, most paradoxically, this bill restricts the funding for the EPA Office of Sustainable Communities. This is an office that provides technical assistance and guidance to local communities that wish to plan for increased economic growth and development, and account for the changes in their community and demographic impacts. This office has been in existence for over 15 years. It is an extraordinarily useful tool to help communities understand how to put the pieces together, how to coax out more value. The demand is so

high for their services, they can only help 9 percent of the applicants. Now would not be the time, it would seem, to make it harder for communities who wants to encourage economic development and growth in a thoughtful and sustainable fashion.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. We can and must do better for our communities.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, during our full committee markup on the Interior bill, Congressman LATOURETTE offered an amendment to prevent the Great Lakes States from receiving any EPA funding if they have implemented ballast water rules that have stronger timelines or standards than the Federal or international requirements that are currently in effect.

At the time, Mr. Chairman, I asked that we look more thoughtfully at the potential impact this amendment might have.

Since that markup, I have heard concerns from numerous groups and the State of New York. In addition, it is my understanding that both EPA and the Coast Guard are working towards finalizing national standards. Would you be willing as we move toward conference with the Senate to work with the New York Members, Congressman LATOURETTE, and other Great Lakes Members to help us find a workable solution to this problem of invasive species and ballast water discharges?

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his question.

The gentleman from New York has spoken to me about these concerns, and I am aware that this is a serious issue that will have an immediate impact on the State of New York and other Great Lakes States. Before conference, I will work with you, Congressman LATOURETTE, and other Great Lakes Members to try to resolve these concerns.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman for his assistance.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the reasoned and balanced approach he has taken to this. Rather than filing a knee-jerk reaction either in committee or now on the floor, he has recommitted to working together to solve this problem.

□ 1600

It's a problem that needs to be solved. And I just want the record to be clear: In 2008, the New York Department of Environmental Conservation—not the State legislature, not the State—enacted ballast water exchange

regulations that would have gone into effect, had they pushed the issue, that are 100 times more stringent than the international standard and would have gone to 1,000 times more stringent a year after that. Only two States, New York and Minnesota, had something in their regulations called “innocent passage,” and that is it applies to all ships that pass through New York’s water, whether they take on ballast water or discharge ballast water or whatever.

I take a backseat to no one in this Congress on the issue of invasive species in the Great Lakes. My first piece of legislation I wrote was with Senator John Glenn, the Invasive Species legislation, in 1996. But this particular provision by the New York Port Authority would cripple and perhaps eliminate commerce on the Great Lakes.

So this deserves thoughtful consideration. It deserves our study. And I would again commit to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) to work with you and the chairman to find a way that solves this horrible problem of invasive species in ballast water or anything else but doesn’t stop interstate commerce on the Great Lakes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. I hope the press and the American people are paying attention to what’s going on on the House floor. I know the news is all about raising the debt ceiling and all the cuts or revenues that might be involved before we can get legislation to do something that has been routinely done—almost automatically done—every year or two for decades.

What is happening on the House floor deserves the attention of the American people. This is the most antienvironmental House of Representatives in history. The new Republican majority seems intent on restoring the robber-baron era where there were no controls on pollution from power plants, oil refineries, and factories.

This year, we’ve witnessed weather disaster after weather disaster. There have been massive floods, record-breaking fires, record-breaking droughts, and now record-breaking heat waves. Yet earlier this year, the House passed a bill that repealed EPA’s scientific finding that climate change is occurring, is caused by man, and is a serious threat. We don’t hear about the connection between these weather events and climate change and carbon emissions. We’re not hearing about it when we watch the daily news shows and we’re not hearing about it from this administration.

I just sent, recently, a letter to Secretary Chu, the Secretary of Energy, a Nobel Prize winner, asking him to speak out. We need to educate the

American people so we can educate our colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

In this bill, the Republican majority wants to block EPA from issuing regulations to reduce carbon emissions from power plants and oil refineries that are causing this catastrophic climate change. The majority also wants to block regulations to cut carbon pollution from motor vehicles, even though these regulations help break our dangerous dependence on oil, save American families money, and clean the air we breathe.

This House can deny science, we can amend our Nation’s laws, but we cannot rewrite the laws of nature. The longer we ignore the scientific reality that our actions are destabilizing the environment, destabilizing our climate, the more costly and disruptive our response will need to be—and the more we endanger our children’s future.

When we were debating carbon regulations earlier this year, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claimed that they supported reductions in what they call “real” air pollution, whatever that means. But it turns out they’re gutting those protections as well. This legislation includes provisions that will block landmark rules to protect the health of our children by cutting air pollution and reducing toxic mercury pollution.

The bill blocks the Cross-State Air Pollution rule—an important rule that is designed to prevent dirty power plants in one State from contributing to air quality problems in other downwind States. EPA estimates that this rule will prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths and nearly 2 million sick days a year beginning in 2014.

The bill indefinitely delays mercury and air toxics standards from power plants. Mercury is a potent neurotoxin that damages brain development in infants and children, impairing their ability to think and learn. EPA’s mercury rule will clean up this pollution and prevent 17,000 premature deaths each year.

Republicans like to argue that environmental regulations must be justified by a rigorous cost-benefit analysis. Well, these regulations have been thoroughly analyzed and their benefits are 10 times greater than their cost, yet they want to stop those regulations from going into place.

These essential health protections are not being targeted because they are too costly. They are being targeted because they are opposed by powerful special interests like oil companies and electric utilities. We need to stop putting the special interests ahead of the public interest.

This bill poses a choice: Are we for protecting pregnant women, infants, and children from toxic pollution or are we for protecting the profits of special interests? A strong and vital EPA is in our national interest and the public interest. If we disarm EPA—as this

bill would do—there is no one to stand up to the polluters and protect American families.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. I rise today in strong opposition to the 2012 Interior appropriations bill, the most anti-environment bill I’ve seen on the House floor since I was elected to Congress.

If this bill passes, our air will be more polluted, our water will be dirtier, and we will know that much of what we love will disappear. This bill rolls back the clock to a time when big companies could poison our streams and rivers with impunity, when power plants could freely contaminate the air we breathe, and when our national treasures were destroyed by corporations, all for a bigger profit.

First, the bill slashes funding to the EPA by \$1.8 billion, stealing funding that keeps our drinking water and wastewater systems clean.

Then it guts the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This program has done more than any other to expand local parks, recreational green spaces, and public lands enjoyed by hundreds of millions of Americans. This bill cuts this program by 80 percent, to its lowest level in history, nearly eliminating efforts to ensure that our treasured places are protected for families to enjoy for generations to come.

Then it abolishes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Climate Service, which is crucial to understanding how the changes in our national climate affect our farms, coastal communities, and businesses.

Finally, it proposes crippling cuts to the development of renewable energy sources and energy efficiency, only making our Nation more dependent on importing oil and gas from foreign countries. But what’s worst of all is that these cuts severely jeopardize the 12.5 million jobs that could be created as a result of American clean energy innovation and undermine growth in our Nation’s clean tech industries.

Even though some are calling this a cost-cutting bill, it’s really a bill to pad the pockets of big corporations and the worst polluters. Unbelievably, it gives away \$55 million in subsidies to oil and gas companies and blocks the necessary increase in fees to inspect oil and gas stations from disasters like the BP gulf spill. That’s not all.

The bill includes 39 different environmental policy bans that open up our natural resources to greedy polluters and keep our environmental agencies from doing their jobs to protect us from contamination. It allows more soot pollution in our air by blocking critical public health standards that ensure our air is very healthy for Americans to breathe.

It blocks the EPA from implementing greenhouse gas pollution

standards for new cars in 5 years, jeopardizing 7,000 new jobs and the estimated 2.4 million barrels of oil a day saved in just two decades. It prohibits my home State of California from moving ahead with its own clean air standard. It exempts oil companies from complying with Clean Air Act standards for offshore drilling—again, protecting the special interests of Big Oil.

□ 1610

It puts the drinking water of 117 million Americans at risk by blocking EPA from keeping our water clean—half of America's streams and some 20 million acres of wetlands. It allows the unregulated discharge of pesticides directly into our rivers and lakes.

This bill is a direct attack, a declaration of war, on our air, water, wildlife, and wildlands. It is clear that this bill isn't about cutting spending. It is about cutting years off our children's lives by increasing their exposure to contaminants in the air and water. The Republicans are putting polluters ahead of the health and safety of the American people, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, when some of us go home and we speak to different groups about how Congress conducts its business, one of the parts of those conversations that may be hard to understand is that we have personal relationships and that we have people on both sides of the aisle who we respect and we like. So especially during these times it becomes difficult for some of us when, for instance, a person like myself looks at a Chairman ROGERS or a Chairman WOLF or a Chairman SIMPSON, and we know that these are good people who are totally confused as to what it is we're supposed to be doing.

You say to a Republican these days, Good morning; and he or she answers, Cut the budget.

The sky is blue.

Cut the budget.

We all understand the need to get certain amounts of spending under control, but the problem is that some folks—and this bill shows that—continue to totally misunderstand that, yes, we may have economic issues that we have to deal with—that's a given—but we are also still—and are perhaps forever—the greatest country on Earth.

How did we get there?

We didn't get there because we decided every couple of years to simply cut the budget. We got there because we invested money; because we created, yes, rules; because we created, yes, laws that protected our way of life

and the way that we wanted our future generations to be treated.

What you see across the board now is this belief that if you get the budget down to a certain number—and I say this profoundly sarcastically, perhaps, that some people would like to get it to zero, and I don't know what happens constitutionally after that if the budget is at zero—then the country will do better and everything will be well. Couple that with the fact that, while some folks on that side are, in fact, strong believers that you must cut spending, others have taken the opportunity to roll back language, to roll back regulations that have made the environment safer, that have made our lives better, that have made us safer as Americans.

The public is being told it's about cutting the budget. The public is being told it's about not having a national debt. The public is being told it's about the future of our country in terms of what we owe. Yes, that is a legitimate concern; but what the country is not being told is that, for instance, in this bill, through riders, we are going back, perhaps not even to the sixties, but to the fifties or even the forties on environmental issues and on other issues.

So what we need to do is to continue to be a voice on this side, as well as the folks on that side who believe as I do, that this is a wrong route to take and that we have to continue to stand up and say, We all understand the need to address the issues we have to, but we can't throw away everything that we've had; we can't throw away everything that we've built, and we can't simply not invest in the future.

I sit on other committees, committees that have traditionally given us an opportunity to invest. Somewhere right now in this country, there is a person, male or female, sitting with a white robe, in a laboratory, who is coming up with the next medicine, the next Velcro, if you will—the next invention that will make us a better Nation and a better society, that will help us and help the world.

If you look at those budgets—and they'll be coming to a floor near you pretty soon—those budgets are devastated when it comes to investing money in research. So, while it's good to tell the public to cut the budget, we need to be honest and say, In the process, we may set you back 30 or 40 years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. This bill, H.R. 2584, is a terrible bill. It is a terrible bill for our country, and it represents an assault on our environment.

Actually, I was looking through the various assessments about this bill, this Interior and Environment appropriations legislation for 2012, from different advocacy groups out there that are concerned about the environment, that are concerned about clean air and

clean water. That's the word they kept using, "assault." This is an assault on clean water. It's an assault on clean air. It's an assault on conservation. It continues the assault that was begun at the beginning of this year with H.R. 1—to completely dismantle our environmental protections.

I confess to you, I just don't understand the motivations of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Do we not breathe the same air? Do we not drink the same water? Do we not traverse the same beautiful terrain across this country? I can't imagine. I can't fathom what the motivation is to engage in this wholesale attack on our environment.

Let's look at that attack.

They are proposing to cut the EPA's budget. This is the agency that is charged with protecting our environment. They are proposing to cut that budget by 18 percent below 2011 levels and by 40 percent below 2010 levels.

I come from the Chesapeake Bay. I grew up fishing for crabs in the Nanticoke River on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. My grandmother lived in Salisbury. That's where we used to go during the summers. This would be devastating for the Chesapeake Bay. It cuts funding to the Chesapeake Bay Program, which is designed to put the Bay on a pollution diet so we can clean up the Chesapeake Bay. This would undermine that. It puts all these policy riders on it. It's loaded up with policy riders. It would prevent the regulation of coal ash as a hazardous waste. We have that issue in my district, regulating coal ash. I want the Environmental Protection Agency to be able to do that work, but this bill would undermine it. So it is an assault on clean water, and that affects the Chesapeake Bay.

Let's look at what else it does.

It's an assault on clean air. This bill, with all of these policy riders, would block standards to cut air pollution from cement kilns, delaying standards for power plants by 6 months, standards that would do—what?—reduce mercury, arsenic and lead in the air. Don't we want to do that? So why would we undermine that effort?

It would exempt oil companies. Now, this is no surprise. That has become a common practice. How many exemptions can we give to the oil and gas industry? Here is another one. It would exempt oil companies from complying with the Clean Air Act in offshore drilling operations. It's an assault on clear air. Do you know what? A study was done by the EPA that said the air quality improvements under the Clean Air Act, if maintained for the period from 1990 to 2020, will result in \$2 trillion in savings for this country and will prevent 230,000 deaths. So why would you want to undermine the protections with respect to our clean air?

□ 1620

It's an assault on environmental education, taking funding away from the

National Park Service in terms of needed construction that has to be done. It's an assault on our National Wildlife Refuges. The reduction in funding for our National Wildlife Refuges would result in 140 of them being closed. That's 25 percent of them across the country. It's an assault on conservation, reducing the Land and Water Conservation Fund to a 45-year low of \$66 million. That's an 80 percent cut from 2011 levels.

But here is the great shame of it.

The great shame of it is the American people are ready to step up and be stewards of the environment. They want to do that. They want to take ownership in their own backyards, but they can't do it if the Federal Government isn't there as a partner, so I urge the defeat of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. The American public was concerned mainly about two things in this last election:

A, jobs—trying to get opportunities for themselves and their children and young people to earn a living. They were also concerned, correctly, about the debt and deficit that confronts this country. Those were the two items that they were very focused on and concerned about, and I think almost everyone on this floor shares their concerns.

I got no message from any voter that I ought to come to Congress and undermine the air, water, land that they survive on, recreate on and rely on for the quality of their lives. Not one constituent, whether they voted for me or against me, said, "Undermine the protections of our land and water and air." Not one. However, that is what we're dealing with today—not jobs, not deficit—but undermining the integrity of our air, our water and our land.

I rise, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in strong opposition to this bill, which puts some of our Nation's most precious natural resources at severe risk. This bill slashes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by nearly 20 percent, after a year in which its funding already declined by 16 percent. The result of these cuts will be an agency unequipped.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't have to address you, but if I didn't under the rules have to address you, I would address all of America about their concerns about this undermining of the Environmental Protection Agency. Americans want the environment protected. They don't want that effort undermined.

It will mean higher risks of dirtier air, unsafe water and carbon pollution in our atmosphere. No American said that that's what they wanted when they talked to me.

This bill also includes a rider that would defund the listing of endangered

species and habitats—a true failure of environmental stewardship.

Perhaps worst of all, this bill comes with 39 separate anti-environment riders that cater to some of our Nation's most powerful special interests.

Now maybe I missed it. Maybe there's an American somewhere who said, "Look, protect the special interests and undermine our environment," but I just missed talking to them maybe. Maybe that was it.

These riders would endanger and exploit our public resources, including such treasures as the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River, the quality of our Nation's air and water for the private gain of just a few.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, which reinvests money we can gain from offshore oil and gas drilling into protecting our public lands—now, we have just seen a dramatic assault on our lands on the gulf coast—it's cut 78 percent from the current year's funding in this bill.

Communities waiting for funding for new sewer and drinking water systems will find a 40 percent cut from current levels. No American asked me for that.

In 1995, the very first vote the new Republican majority cast was on a bill like this one, one that attempted to slash the EPA and an active wish list of special interest priorities. The year is different but the policy is the same. But there was one major difference. That failed bill had just 17 environmental riders—less than half of this one. This one has 39. These provisions do nothing to control spending. They are end-runs simply around laws to protect our environment.

Now, as then, the wish list deserves to be voted down. Sherry Boehlert, who was a member of the Natural Resources Committee, stood on this floor when that 1995 bill was offered. A Republican leader in the House of Representatives said: Do not do this to our land, our air, and our water.

Let me close by quoting the wise words of the ranking member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, my colleague and friend Congressman JIM MORAN: "There are those who want to make this controversy between humans and the environment, but that is a false assertion."

I urge you to read the balance of Mr. MORAN's quote in opposing this bad bill.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. H.R. 2584 is, without question and without precedent, the most regressive, destructive, and shameless attack on our environmental protections, this country's public health, and conservation in over four decades.

This is accomplished through the backdoor changes, 40 ideologically driven policy riders in the legislation,

and it's easily the biggest payout to polluters and special interests who helped craft these riders and who are now adding those to our laws. And it's also accomplished on the riders, riders on an appropriations bill that legislates.

It's also accomplished through defunding agencies, such as the EPA, so that their oversight is weakened and their enforcement becomes non-existent.

Giveaway public lands. These mechanisms are used in this legislation to not only undermine but to dismantle protections that have been part of the legacy of this Nation for years upon years and decade upon decade. Matters of life and death to the American people, clean air and clean water, are left without funding to protect American families.

And the legislation before us does not create jobs. If the reason of the deficit—the reason that this is being done, as we hear from the other side, is for deficit reduction, that sounds hollow and contrived when one measures the cost of public health and cleanup that awaits the taxpayer in the very near future. It sounds hollow when the taxpayer sees the tax breaks, the public resource giveaways, and unregulated privileges to industry and big business. It seems hollow when the average American taxpayer suffers both the financial and human costs of this legislation.

Let me use one example of a rider introduced by my colleague from Arizona, a son of Arizona, to the Grand Canyon. This would effectively defund any opportunity to study, to analyze the consequences of uranium mining on 1 million acres around the Grand Canyon.

□ 1630

If anything else were to be an important point for this Congress, it is the icon of all our national parks, the Grand Canyon. And the uranium mining in that area has caused damage to people and the environment for years upon years. And now with this rider, we are perpetuating the same climate, the same strategy that has caused the problems in the area. We are jeopardizing the water, the Colorado River, and water users in Nevada, California, and Arizona. And they use an expert; they tout an expert, as of today and recently, a person who rationalized that there will be no real damage to the Grand Canyon. Isn't it ironic and somewhat interesting to note that this expert is sitting on 30 or more mining claims in the withdrawal area around the Grand Canyon and would stand to do very, very well financially upon the sale and resale of these claims? This is the expert.

This legislation, H.R. 2584, is a feeding frenzy for polluters, Big Oil, and speculators who make their huge profits by cutting corners, ignoring regulations, and skirting the responsibilities that we all have to follow the law. Now



their mission has an eager partner—the majority of the House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this legislation and to protect the health of the American people and the health of our legacy as a Nation.

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

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, as we sit and endure this mini-filibuster about how horrible Republicans are when it comes to this bill and the environment, I want to give a perspective about how some of these riders actually got in the bill.

I and a number of my colleagues have spent a lot of time talking with this EPA, this EPA administrator, and it's like talking to this lection. Nothing gets through. And I want to bring to your attention one particular matter that I put in this bill that's a rider, and it has to do with the U.S. EPA draft notice 2010-X, and that was a notice that went out to the manufacturers of lawn fertilizers.

Now, everybody in the Chamber would agree that the people who manufacture lawn fertilizer, what they put in the bag should be safe; it should not harm the environment; and it should actually what do it's supposed to do, and that's grow grass or do something else. However, the EPA, because they had precious little to do, decided that they weren't content with regulating what was in the bag. They want to regulate what's on the bag, and not the list of ingredients but what the product is called.

So draft regulation 2010-X says that these companies need to reevaluate the trademark names—some of them that have been in effect since the 1960s—and remove those that the EPA determines are misleading to the public. Now I sat down with Ms. Jackson, the administrator of the EPA, and went over this. She sort of smiled and said, You know what, this really doesn't make a lot of sense to me. I brought it up in subcommittee last year and withdrew it at the request of the then-majority who said they'd work on it. Well, it's still here.

And here is a list of the words that they determined you can't use if you are in a lawn fertilizer business: “Germ shield,” “100 percent protection,” “professional grade,” “pro,” “safe,” “safer,” “safest,” “natural,” “environmentally safe,” and “green.”

Now, hold on a minute. There's a company in Ohio. It's not in my district—full disclaimer—but it's called Scotts, and they make a product called Turf Builder. They also make a product called Turf Builder Pro. This draft notification tells them they can't call it “Pro” anymore because it's misleading to the public, even though the word “Pro” was installed to create a brand that small hardware stores could sell so you didn't have to go to the big-boxes, the Wal-Marts, the Kmart, and

those other companies. So it's a niche brand for smaller retailers. But you can't call it that anymore.

You can't claim that a bag of lawn fertilizer does anything green, unless that “green” applies to livability and sustainability. Now, Mr. Chairman, when I was growing up, green was a color. This folder was green. Not anymore. If I can't demonstrate this folder has something to do with livability and sustainability, I am misleading the people that are watching this program.

There's another company in Ohio that's over in Toledo—Ms. KAPTUR's district—they have a product called Anderson's Golf Pro. And the EPA has indicated that they are not allowed to call it “Golf Pro” anymore because you don't have to use the seed or the weed and seed on a golf course. You could use it, Mr. Chairman, on your front lawn. So they have to call it “Anderson's Pro.” Well, wait a minute—they can't call it “Pro” anymore either because that's misleading. So they can call it “Anderson's” and hope you can figure out what you are supposed to do with it.

I told my friends at Scotts, You have really barely scratched the surface on this thing because the product that Scotts manufactures that I like so much is Miracle-Gro. Now can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, how is the EPA going to be able to certify when I put that Miracle-Gro on my tomato plant that a miracle has occurred? You are going to put a tremendous burden on the Vatican. All these little old ladies are going to be at the airport, flying over to Rome to talk to the College of Cardinals and say, Did a miracle occur? That's why some of these riders are in here. You have to be able to talk to people. And if they won't talk to you, you have to take action, as is contemplated by the Constitution as a co-equal branch in the government. We have done that. And I'm sorry that it offends some of our colleagues.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, when Americans think of America, they think of our great resources. Now for Big Oil, that probably means the oil that's found on public lands and off our shores, where they can get it for a song and charge a fortune.

But for most Americans, it's the spacious skies and purple mountain majesties. This bill, this legislation that we're considering here now has no appreciation for America's priceless resources. According to the League of Conservation Voters, though, going farther than just beautiful vistas or purple mountain majesties, “This bill is the biggest assault on the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the wildlife and wild places we hold dear to ever come before Congress.” Continuing, the Clean Water Network or

the American Lung Association or the American Public Health Association or Physicians for Social Responsibility, they all go on to point out that the budget cuts or policy riders in this legislation undermine the laws that protect public health and reduce health care costs for all by preventing adverse health outcomes, including cancer, asthma attacks, strokes, and emergency department visits. It is not just for the beauty of this country, although that might be reason enough to try to preserve all of these things; it is for the health of America's people.

This legislation would put children's health at risk at the same time that it would be exempting oil companies from complying with clean air standards. We cannot tolerate this. Unregulated discharge of pesticides into our waterways, withholding funding for wild lands, allowing uranium mining all around the Grand Canyon. Mr. Chairman, this is an unprecedented attack, and not just on those things I've mentioned, not just on lifesaving public health protections and essential pollution control; it's an attack on science as well.

This bill includes reductions in funding for the U.S. Geological Survey, research in climate and land use, scientific research, monitoring, modeling, forecasting. Let me give an example: The LandSat 7 satellite just in the past month has been used to track the largest fire in Arizona's history. Yet because of the cuts that would come to pass through this legislation, the data coming from the LandSat system would go unrecorded, unanalyzed, unused. Talk about false economy.

And it's an unprecedented attack on our public lands. The largest cut in the Land and Water Conservation Fund that most of the Members of this House have seen in their service. And I must say, that's particularly important to a State like mine, New Jersey. My constituents reside in the most densely populated State in the Union, and yet they've demonstrated again and again with their votes their support for open space preservation, for fighting sprawl, for providing their kids, our kids, with safe places to experience the outdoors.

□ 1640

Mr. Chairman, there is a long list of reasons, and you'll be hearing still more about why this is terrible legislation.

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

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the underlying bill, H.R. 2584, and am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are using this appropriations process to put at risk the air that we breathe, the water that we drink, our public lands, and our public health.

For example, this bill would dismantle the Clean Water Act, which

would not only undermine our constituents' access to clean and healthy waterways but also would mean the loss of tens of thousands of jobs.

My district, the Fifth District of Massachusetts, is home to dozens of remarkable rivers and streams which are a key part of the history, culture, economy, and natural beauty of the Fifth District. Most of our rivers have excellent water quality; and it is common on warm days to see people swimming, fishing, and paddling. But our rivers were not always so hospitable. There was a time when the Merrimack River, one of the largest watersheds in New England and the river that flows through my hometown of Lowell, was a depository for waste and pollution. For 150 years, the Merrimack River was one of the 10 most polluted rivers in the country. It was the Clean Water Act enforcement of the early 1970s that changed the future of our rivers. Because of the act, and the enforcement authority it afforded the EPA, a clean-up plan was put in place and polluters and violators were held responsible. Slowly, the Merrimack and surrounding rivers were monitored and improved to meet the clean water standards we take for granted today. This is just one unfortunate example, but replicated all across our country, to our great good fortune and that of our children and grandchildren.

While some States may adequately protect their waters on their own, not all do. That is why Congress has given the EPA the authority to protect our waterways under the Clean Water Act. We must continue to strengthen safeguards for rivers and streams to ensure that all across the country Americans enjoy the benefit of clean, safe water.

I urge my colleagues to reject the shortsighted proposal to undercut the Clean Water Act and help protect America's clean water legacy.

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. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to a reckless and unconscionable Interior appropriations bill put forward by the House Republican majority. Once again, they have put a radical, out-of-touch agenda and the desires of Big Oil and big polluters before the interests of the American people, the need to create jobs, and the health of our environment. This appropriations bill is more than just a danger to the health and safety of American families. It represents the worst assault on clean air and clean water in our Nation's history.

This legislation slashes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by 18 percent. The majority has shown time and time again that it opposes any environmental regulation that might hurt the bottom line of polluters. But it doesn't stop there.

This legislation also slashes the Clean Water State Revolving Fund,

which helps States finance wastewater system improvements by providing 55 percent of the resources, meaning that America's waterways will be put at risk of sewage and urban runoff pollution, and good middle class jobs will be lost. And it cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which protects national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges from development, by 78 percent. In addition, this partisan legislation includes at least 38 policy riders that, for purely ideological reasons, would harm American families and the environment.

The bill would prohibit the EPA from implementing rules to protect communities from power plant pollution. It blocks the EPA from restoring Clean Water Act protections to more than half of our Nation's streams and 20 million acres of wetlands, meaning the drinking water of 117 million Americans is put at risk. It blocks the EPA from moving forward on fuel efficiency standards that will reduce foreign oil imports and cut pollution. It blocks the EPA from regulating carbon pollution at power plants, refineries, and industrial sites. It even stops indefinitely long overdue standards to control air pollution from toxic mercury, endangering pregnant women, infants and children.

This legislation would open up more of our coastline to offshore drilling and 1 million acres of land around the Grand Canyon, a national treasure, to toxic uranium mining.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the Republican Party was known as defenders of the environment. It was a Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, who inaugurated the National Forest Service and who worked to conserve 230 million acres of American land, including the Grand Canyon, which is now put at risk. He called the canyon, and I quote, a natural wonder, which is in kind absolutely unparalleled throughout the rest of the world. "Leave it as it is," he said. "You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it, and man can only mar it."

It was a Republican President, Richard Nixon, who signed significant expansions of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts and who brought life to the Environmental Protection Agency. Twenty years later, another Republican President, George Bush, Sr., expanded the Clean Air Act even further to protect Americans' health.

Yet today, a Republican majority brings us an Interior appropriations bill which undoes all of this good work, which endangers American families and threatens to do permanent and irrevocable damage to the environment.

I urge my colleagues in the majority, return to your roots to once again put the American people before the interests of polluters, and to oppose this disastrous legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill. Instead of working on a bipartisan solution to address the looming default crisis or to create American jobs, today House Republicans have brought to the floor H.R. 2584, unprecedented legislation that would gut pollution controls and public health protections in order to give bigger profits to Big Oil and other special interest polluters.

By attaching more than three dozen policy riders to this bill, the House GOP is attempting to use a spending bill to make backdoor changes to 40 years of Federal laws that protect clean air, water, lands, and wildlife. The legislation would also cripple the budgets of key Federal agencies charged with protecting American citizens and our natural resources.

This is a new low for the 112th Congress, which has already seen the new House GOP majority attempt to gut the Clean Air Act, overturn the Clean Water Act, repeal cost-saving energy efficiency standards, and pull the plug on American jobs in clean energy innovation and manufacturing. This legislation would overturn 40 years of bipartisan progress protecting the American people and the environment.

One area I choose to focus on is the continued attacks on the Clean Air Act, which has saved hundreds of thousands of lives and improved the health of Americans in every State. It protects the air we breathe and the water we drink. It protects our children from developing asthma and our seniors from developing emphysema. According to the American Lung Association, in 2010 alone, the Clean Air Act saved over 160,000 lives. Since 1990, the EPA estimates the Clean Air Act prevented an estimated 843,000 asthma attacks, 18 million cases of respiratory illness among children, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 21,000 cases of heart disease, and 200,000 premature deaths.

It is clear that the Republican majority is doing all it can to stop EPA from carrying out its mission of protecting public health and protecting the environment. Many will claim that the EPA is moving at a faster pace than any other administration in history. However, the EPA has proposed fewer Clean Air Act rules under President Obama over the past 24 months than in the first 2 years of either President Bush or President Clinton.

That is why in December of 2010, 280 groups, including the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association and others sent a letter urging the Congress to "reject any measure that would block or delay the United States Environmental Protection Agency from doing its job to protect all Americans from life-threatening air pollution."

□ 1650

This bill, an appropriation bill, is not the place to legislate these types of changes. These should be policy changes, not made during this process.

The Clean Air Act is promoting innovation and breaking Americans' oil dependence, but Republicans would give big polluters a loophole to roll back our clean energy progress and continue our addiction to foreign oil. The Clean Air Act is good for the economy. Many studies have shown that the Clean Air Act's economic benefits far exceed any costs associated with the law by as much as 40-1 ratio.

As President Obama so eloquently spoke of during his State of the Union address, we must out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build our global competitors and win the future. Rolling back a law that protects the air our children breathe to allow oil companies, companies that are already reaping record profits the ability to spew chemicals, smog, soot and pollution into the air just to please a lobbyist or a big oil corporation is irresponsible and, yes, extreme.

The Clean Air Act has been on the books for decades with positive results for our economy, our environment, and our businesses. Rolling back these protections will hurt our most vulnerable. We simply cannot afford to go backward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, the Interior and Environment appropriations bill before us today represents an all-out assault on clean air, clean water, and land conservation efforts in our country. To be clear, passage of this measure is an absolute abandonment of this body's responsibility to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

This bill seriously undermines the significant advances that we've made as a country as responsible stewards of our land and natural resources, our wildlife, our air, and our water. And perhaps most important, this legislation is a threat to the health and well-being of all Americans.

Some have argued that the riders attached to this bill are sensible and an attempt to rein in what they call the excesses of the Environmental Protection Agency and job-killing regulations. This is an absurd claim. This legislation is nothing more than a complete caving in to special interests and Big Oil and some of our Nation's worst polluters.

For the people I represent in the First Congressional District of Rhode Island, the stunning reductions to the EPA and the related policy riders that strike against the gains we've made to clean air and clean water are a threat to public health and the environment.

Let me give you one example, Mr. Chairman: According to reports from

Rhode Island Clean Water Action, Rhode Island has the third highest rate of childhood asthma in the Northeast and the fifth highest nationally. The State spends \$316 million providing health care for problems attributed to particulate matter every year.

What's more, 27,000 Rhode Island children currently suffer from asthma. The average length of a hospitalization stay for children with asthma in Rhode Island is 2 days, with an average cost of \$7,840.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to realize that the drastic reductions and the anti-environment riders in this bill threaten not only our air and water quality, but they will have real and economic consequences on real people, on real families, increasing health care costs, generating additional lost days of work and productivity, and inciting detrimental long-term health and developmental consequences for our children.

In addition, this bill slashes vital infrastructure funding that's not only essential to protecting our environment and public health, but also creates jobs and supports State and local economic development opportunities.

This bill sets the Clean Water State Revolving Fund at 55 percent, or \$833 million below the FY 2011 level. The bill sets the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund 14 percent below the fiscal year 2011 level, and that's a cut of \$134 million.

I'd like to read an excerpt from the 2010 annual report of the Rhode Island Clean Water Finance Agency, the entity charged with administering Federal and State programs relating to municipal wastewater and drinking water financial assistance: "A revolving fund allows the perpetual availability of funds to assist local governmental units in meeting water quality goals by providing loans and other forms of financial assistance. Our primary goals are to provide low-cost means to reduce pollution caused by wastewater, help provide safe drinking water, and to provide low interest loans to cities and towns to help citizens repair failed, failing or substandard septic systems."

Undeniably, at this moment we're working to rein in our public debt, we have to be smart about the investments we make. Just consider the mission of this State agency whose efforts are supported through the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds to provide low-cost means to reduce pollution caused by wastewater and to provide safe drinking water. These are fundamental objectives to safeguard the health and well-being of Rhode Islanders and of men, women and children all across this country.

And what's the response by our friends on the other side of the aisle in this Congress? To cut these vitally important infrastructure programs by more than \$1 billion. If this Congress wants to be serious about reigning in spending, we can no longer try to fool ourselves with the misguided belief

that critical infrastructure projects, especially those supported through State revolving funds that protect our health and environment, are going to miraculously become less expensive with time.

Reducing Federal funds that help support these kinds of projects to improve our water and wastewater systems will only incite deferred maintenance. Deferred maintenance only makes future projects more expensive and, in many instances, will increase the likelihood of infrastructure failures that threaten public health and the environment and impede economic growth. These will undoubtedly cost us more in the long run.

Some have called this bill the worst assault on clean air and clean water in history. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this assault on the health, welfare, and economic vitality of our States, our cities, and our towns. Let us not be known as the Congress who betrayed our solemn responsibility to be good stewards of the earth.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Having set sail in search of new shores for pirating and profiteering, it's quite apparent that the GOP is lost at sea under the helm of a confused, misguided leadership. Under the guise of austerity and deficit reduction, they have plotted our Nation on a fateful course that will only result in the surging of torrents of sewage, untreated chemicals and other hazardous materials into our rivers, streams and creeks, along with factories, plants and refineries belching smoke, smog and mercury into our blue skies. Sick children and the aged who suffer from asthma, respiratory illnesses, they'll get sicker and sicker, while oil and gas companies and mining companies get fatter and fatter.

Mr. Chair, as I see it, this bill is nothing more than an attempt to remove 40 years of Federal laws that protect our air, water, land, and wildlife. Only in a Republican-controlled House would we increase access to oil and gas leases, while reducing our ability to ensure drilling operations are environmentally safe.

Only in a Republican-controlled House would we reduce the ability of States to safely manage their sewage and wastewater run off.

And, Mr. Chair, only in a Republican-controlled Congress would we allow more uranium mining near the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Chair, these efforts are opposed by the majority of Americans who believe in oversight of drilling operations, protection from tainted drinking water, and those who believe that the Grand Canyon, with all of its majestic beauty, should be a natural national treasure for the enjoyment of

families and tourists, not a wasteland laid bare by mining companies whose insatiable appetite for profit is equaled only by the magnitude of the damage they would inflict upon our environment.

□ 1700

These aren't the rants and raves of liberal environmentalists hell-bent on protecting nature at all costs. These are the sentiments of red-blooded Americans who believe that our natural resources, like the Grand Canyon, improve our quality of life.

The American people don't want progress if progress means that our skies get darker, our water gets murkier, and they don't want our wildlife to go extinct, but clearly that will be the effect of this bill should this ill-gotten measure pass.

Mr. Chairman, day after day, week after week, and month after month House Republicans hand out life preservers to special interests while kicking the American people overboard like the bundled tea kicked overboard by the real tea partiers at the start of the American Revolution. Sure our children have asthma, but big business gets to pump more pollution into our air. Sure our water is tainted, but special interests get to dump runoff in our streams. Yes, our endangered species are slowly fading away, but now we can drill in their habitats. What happens, Mr. Chairman, when our air becomes too dirty to breathe, when our water becomes too dirty to drink, and when our wildlife all go extinct?

I urge a "no" vote on this bill. But before I close, I would like to remind my colleagues across the aisle that the captain always goes down with the ship. And that's the real deal.

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

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Colleagues, Mr. Chairman, if I might, I just wanted to start by acknowledging the loss of our valiant Capitol Police, Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, who were honored today. I just wanted to acknowledge the men and women of the United States Capitol Police for their service, and my sympathy again to the families of Officer Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

I also wanted to make note of my worshipping with the Norwegian Seamen's Church yesterday in Houston and let the Norwegian people and the people of Norway, of course, know that America stands with them during this very difficult time.

I thought it was appropriate to acknowledge those tragedies because it is a time when we have had to come together. And I also believe that as we look at where we are today, this should be an opportunity for us to be able to

come together. So I'm disappointed in this legislation because it really does not seem to call us to do that.

I want to remind America and my colleagues that we are 50 States, but there are times when we act on behalf of our States and districts and there are times when it is important to exist as a single nation.

One single State did not defend the Nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor; we came together. One State on its own or one region did not end segregation and establish civil rights; we did it together.

There are times when the stakes are so high that we simply must unite. And so I raise the question of: Where are we with this bill that seems to attack both clean air and clean water by repealing requirements that prevent pesticides sprayed from chemical companies from entering rivers and streams?

I come from the energy sector, and I believe that the energy sector creates jobs. I also believe that we can be a good neighbor, strong in our domestic development and production, but also concerned about clean air, clean water and the environment.

When you listen to those who have worked in this area for so long, you hear opposition from the Wilderness Society that says this Interior bill is an extreme assault on America's bedrock—environmental protection; the Clean Water Network that says these severe spending and budgetary cuts in this bill include not only cuts but a series of policy riders, really having no place in the appropriations process; and the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, these budget cuts and/or policy riders would impact EPA's ability to do their job.

I don't know if our Members realize that in 2011 we cut 16 percent from the EPA; now we want to cut 18 percent, over \$1.5 billion. That cripples the very agency that protects our water and our air, protects our children and our elderly.

What is the response to our responsibility to be the custodians of this wonderful Nation? What a beautiful country we have. And then to hear that another one-third is being cut from the National Landscape and Conservation System that does monuments and trails and our wild rivers. How many families pack up in times that are hard and take those family members on a road trip to travel the beauty of this Nation—the tall mountains, the deep valleys, and the wonderful rivers?

Well, let me tell you what this legislation will do. It will be a bill with a litany of additional cuts, important for programs that cut climate change prevention programs, the Fish and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is a program that, in essence, assaults what we're trying to do here in America.

How many friends know that we have been able to prevent 230,000 deaths each

year by regulating toxins in the air? We've already heard my colleagues come to the floor of the House and talk about the rising increase in many cities of asthma.

So let me make it very clear: We want to create jobs. I have joined together where we can deregulate and disentangle the regulations that would keep us from creating jobs. But I also believe that when it comes to protecting the Nation's assets, we join together as Republicans and Democrats.

I remind you that none of this creates jobs. I remind you that we have already engaged in these cuts. Isn't it interesting that in regular order we are now doing, even though there is disagreement, what our friends on the other side of the aisle said they can't do? That's why they're not raising the debt ceiling. But I will tell you that these draconian cuts, along with the draconian debate on the debt ceiling, is what is going to undermine America.

Let's stand as Americans unified to fix this crisis.

First, I would like to thank my friends in the Congressional Progressive Caucus who are here today to stand up for the environment, and the health of our constituents. I am saddened that so many of my Republican friends are willing to sacrifice the quality of the very air we breathe, and water that we drink.

This harmful legislation cuts the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by 18 percent, in addition to a 16 percent cut in funding for FY 2011. This is unacceptable; in order to protect the environment without harming industry, we must reach a compromise instead of haphazardly slashing the EPA budget.

The cuts to the EPA budget included in the bill reduce funding for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, grants for state implementation of environmental programs, and restorative funding for the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay and Puget Sound.

The Administration estimates that cuts to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund will cut off funding for nearly 400 wastewater and drinking water infrastructure projects, resulting in thousands of lost jobs.

These cuts purposefully limit the EPA's ability to ensure that all Americans have access to drinking water that does not contain harmful pathogens and toxins that expose Americans to serious risks, such as typhoid, hepatitis, cancer, and organ damage.

This legislation has attached several riders to further undermine the Clean Water Act, by repealing requirements that prevent pesticides sprayed by chemical companies from entering rivers and streams, and stopping the EPA from treating coal ash as hazardous waste.

The assault on public health does not stop with the quality of our drinking water; this bill also takes drastic steps to weaken the Clean Air Act. A rider is attached that will prevent the EPA from implementing the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, a regulation that was implemented to protect the public from dangerous air pollution and prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths, 15,000 heart attacks, and 400,000 cases of aggravated asthmas.

As a Representative of the 18th District of Houston, I am firmly committed to protecting the air we breathe, the water we drink, and

the land we need for our survival. Since 1999, Houston has exchanged titles with Los Angeles for the poorest air quality in the nation. The poor air quality is attributed to the amount of aerosols, particles of carbon and sulfates in the air. The carcinogens found in the air have been known to cause cancer, particularly in children. The EPA is the very agency charged with issuing regulations that would address this serious problem. Those regulations should be of course fair while doing the job they are intended to do.

But, my friends, the disregard this bill shows for the health of the American people does not stop there. Another rider prohibits the EPA from finalizing regulations to reduce mercury emissions from factories. There is no reason why Energy, jobs creation and the environment cannot work harmoniously.

Not only does this legislation irresponsibly eradicate life saving provisions of the Clean Air and Water Acts, it also cuts the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) budget by 78 percent. The LWCF funds many park and outdoor recreation areas that contribute over \$700 billion to the economy and facilitate 6.5 million jobs.

This bill makes a litany of additional cuts to important programs that cut climate change prevention programs, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is full of perks for special interest, and reduces our ability to facilitate the upkeep of National Parks, protect the Grand Canyon, and add species to the endangered species list.

I am outraged that my friends on the other side of the aisle would consider passing this legislation that compromises our access to healthy air and clean water; that reverses EPA regulations that were implemented to save lives. Public lands, national parks, the air, the water, the wildlife in this nation belongs to everyone, and I cannot support a bill that trades the quality of these precious resources for benefits to big business and special interest groups.

There are times in which we are 50 states, and times when we exist as a single, united, nation. One single state did not defend the nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor. One state, on its own, did not end segregation and establish Civil Rights. There are times when the stakes are too high, when we must unite as states and act as one.

Our Nation's parks are maintained by the National Park Service. The Park Service is responsible for preserving, restoring, and maintaining our Nation's monuments for the enjoyment of all Americans.

Recently, the Martin Luther King, Jr., National Memorial has joined other historic sites on our Nation's Mall. Martin Luther King, Jr., gave his life in the pursuit of a dream. His "I Have a Dream" speech has been read and heard by millions of men, women, and children around the world.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial is one of many cherished sites honoring men and women who have advanced the society we know today; historic sites that include Freedman town and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. When the Republicans cut the National Park Service, they cut our ability to maintain and preserve our Nation's monuments.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic site is operated by the National Park Service (under U.S. Department of the Interior). This

legislation contains \$2.5 billion for the NPS, which is \$132 million below last year's level. Operation of the National Park System is funded at \$2.2 billion, which is \$10 million below FY 2011 enacted levels. This funding will allow all National Parks to remain open and NPS activities to continue through next year without furloughs or reductions in full time or seasonal employees. These cuts result in the loss of jobs and the loss of our Nation's cherished and prized history.

The EPA has a broad responsibility, for research, standard-setting, monitoring and enforcement with regard to five environmental hazards: air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, radiation, and pesticides. The EPA represents a coordinated approach to each of these problems. There has been a systematic effort to tie the hands of the EPA's ability to protect our environment and thereby protect the long term health of our Nation. Cuts to the EPA are just another means to bring down the agency. The EPA can keep our environment safe without hindering job creations. There are many critics out there who despise the EPA because they say that it is a burden to economic growth. I say that this is nonsense, for healthy populations are the foundation for prosperity.

Let us not forget what happened in Woburn, Massachusetts in the 1980s, where numerous families were afflicted with cancer as a result of toxins being placed in the water. It was the work of brilliant lawyers in conjunction with the EPA who proved that the chemical entities involved deliberately placed toxins in the water.

Let us also not forget The Love Canal of the 1970s near Niagara Falls either. In this region, scores of women had miscarriages and many more were contaminated from chemical wastes in the water. Are supporters of this bill encouraging our country to go back to a time when these problems were common?

Because the issues associated with Woburn and the Love Canal are well in the past, supporters of cuts to the EPA must feel that the water people drink is perfectly safe to drink and does not need to be regulated. Just last year in the small town of Crestwood, outside of Chicago, it was discovered that town officials were secretly introducing tainted well water into the town water supply for years. The people were told that the water came from Lake Michigan. When the story broke, the Department of Public Health conducted a survey of disease rates and found that men in the town had high rates of kidney and gastrointestinal cancer. I, for one, will not tolerate this and I know the American people will not tolerate this as well. The American people will not tolerate the fear of turning on their faucets and wondering whether or not the water coming out has lead, plutonium, or wastes from chemical entities.

Protecting the quality of our air and water, protecting the health of each and every one of our constituents, is an example of a time when Congress must consider the implications beyond our districts and our states.

Surely preventing 230,000 deaths each year by regulating toxins in the air, and ensuring that millions will not lose their access to healthy drinking water is not controversial. I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents they represent, and take essential steps to protect the environment. Until that time, I cannot, and will not, support this damaging legislation.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in strong opposition to this reckless bill and the abundance of extraneous and irresponsible provisions that it contains.

Right now we are down to the wire on defaulting on our debt. But instead of focusing on a way forward, the majority is offering up this ill-conceived piece of legislation, a bill that is polluted—and I emphasize "polluted"—with unrelated and inappropriate riders that do not belong in a spending bill. The reality is that these riders will have very little impact on our national deficit, but they will have a huge and lasting effect on our health, our environment, and our natural resources.

So why are these programs being targeted? Well, we've seen this before with H.R. 1 earlier this year, and we're seeing it again now. The majority is choosing to reward Big Oil and polluters at the expense of the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the wildlife and wild places we hold dear.

Mr. Chairman, it's not an exaggeration to say that this bill drastically undermines our government's ability to protect our environment. This bill jeopardizes the conservation and protection of places like the Channel Islands National Park in my congressional district and the wildlife this special place harbors; closing a quarter of national wildlife refuges across the country, affecting places like the Gueloupe Dunes near Santa Maria; slashing support for Federal programs that support our outstanding natural areas, like the Piedras Blancas Light Station or the Carrizo Plain National Monument in California; opening up protected and sensitive areas in California's national forest to off-road vehicle use, putting places like Los Padres National Forest at risk; and blocking the protection of wilderness-quality lands.

And as the bill stands, Mr. Chairman, it would bar new listings of threatened and endangered species as well as critical habitat designations. And it would gut the successful Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is our Nation's principal source of Federal funding to preserve irreplaceable lands and waters.

Under this disaster of a bill, the LWCF would be reduced to the lowest level in its 45-year history, an 80 percent cut compared to last year's funding.

□ 1710

And who will benefit from this cut? Not the American taxpayer because this fund is paid for from offshore drilling revenues. Instead, communities will lose important conservation and recreation projects that create jobs and improve the quality of life for working and middle class Americans.

But this assault isn't limited to our lands and wildlife. This dirty legislation is also littered with riders that seek to gut the protections of the Clean Water and Clean Air Acts, such as preventing the EPA from strengthening limitations on polluted storm water runoff, blocking the EPA's oversight on water used by power plants, and impeding the clarification of which streams and wetlands are protected under the act.

Under the House spending plan, the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds will also see significant cuts. These are the funds established for States to complete water infrastructure projects, projects which create jobs and provide clean, safe drinking water. The riders in this bill, Mr. Chairman, are also an assault on the very air we breathe. They would prevent the EPA from limiting carbon pollution from power plants and other stationary sources, from updating limits on smog and mercury emissions.

One rider would block the EPA from setting new mileage standards for cars, and won't even allow the State of California to set its own standards. Surely we can think of better solutions to solve our fiscal problems rather than attacking our air, our water, and our lands. Sadly, this Interior appropriations bill deeply undermines our important role of passing on an America whose land, water, and air are clean, healthy, productive, beautiful, and accessible for all to enjoy.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible, terrible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, as one of the former cochairs and leaders of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the largest, bipartisan, bicameral caucus in this Congress, I reluctantly rise in strong opposition to this Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill falls short on so many different levels—especially our responsibility to future generations to be good stewards of the public lands, the vital natural resources, and the wildlife that we have within our borders.

But don't take my word for it, Mr. Chairman. We have had a tradition in this place for many years of having strong, bipartisan support for reasonable, sensible, land and water conservation programs. That's why earlier this month, a coalition of over 640 outdoor recreation entities sent a letter to each of our offices, including the Congressional leadership, expressing their deep concern and dismay over the funding cuts proposed in this appropriation bill.

This letter was signed by entities such as the Boone and Crockett Club, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, National Fish

and Wildlife Foundation, National Wild Turkey Foundation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and Trout Unlimited, and it was also signed by the president of The Wilderness Society, Bill Meadows, and a board member of the Civil War Trust, John Nau. I would like to read that letter at this time.

"We are a broad coalition of organizations representing millions of members with very diverse political backgrounds and areas of interest united behind a shared belief that natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, and investments in them, are vital to the future of our great Nation.

"Like you, we are concerned about our Nation's fiscal health. The Nation faces unsustainable future fiscal deficits, which must be addressed. As part of the overall solution to our deficit challenges, we know that conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs will not and should not be exempted from scrutiny. We are willing to engage in a process to find further savings in spending and review the economic and budgetary benefits of critical conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

"The Federal budget cannot and should not be balanced disproportionately on the backs of conservation, outdoor recreation, and preservation. Doing so will impose on the future generations whose well-being depends on the conservation and preservation of our common natural and historic resources.

"As a diverse community of taxpayers and voters who care about natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, we stand ready to work with you on serious efforts to address our Nation's economic and fiscal challenges, as they relate to investments in, and tough choices about, the programs we care about. We urge this Congress to address the Federal deficit while still investing in critical conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs in 2012."

Mr. Chairman, these groups realize, as many of us realize too, this is more than just being good stewards of the land and doing right by future generations. Investment in these vital programs is crucial for economic development and job creation in this country. The Outdoor Industry Foundation has issued a survey from year to year showing the economic impact of many of these conservation programs on outdoor recreation activities. They found that outdoor recreation contributes \$730 billion annually to the U.S. economy, supports 6½ million private sector jobs, one out of every 20 jobs, and stimulates 8 percent of consumer spending.

In Wisconsin, my home State, hunting and fishing alone supports 57,000 jobs, and \$400 million in State revenue. Sportsmen spend \$3.1 billion annually, which helps stimulate the Wisconsin economy and other States.

Mr. Chairman, the irony in all this is that these organizations and these programs have been giving at the idol of deficit reduction for some time. In fact, over the last 30 years, American investment in parks, wildlife, clean water, and clean air has fallen from 1.7 percent of overall Federal budget to less than 0.6 percent. So throughout the years, there has been a continual reduction in funding for these programs. The irony is that for many of these programs, for every public dollar used, it is leveraged to draw in more private sector dollars. This too will be in great jeopardy with the dismantling of these programs. These aren't programs you can just turn on and off with a spigot. You need a continuity of care to keep them going. With funding reductions of this magnitude, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to maintain that continuity of care. Whether it is to clean water, clean air, to wildlife preservation and enhancement, all of these programs are under a direct assault with this Interior appropriations bill.

With the Land and Water Conservation Fund, an 80 percent proposed cut, the irony with this program is that it is funded by oil royalties. It has been a grand bargain that has been used in the past to allow development of oil on public lands.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this appropriations bill. We can do better than this. We have to do better.

JULY 6, 2011.

Hon. HARRY M. REID,  
*U.S. Senate,*

*Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*House of Representatives,*

*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND SPEAKER BOEHNER: We are a broad coalition of organizations representing millions of members with very diverse political backgrounds and areas of interest united behind a shared belief that natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, and investments in them, are vital to the future of our great nation.

Like you, we are concerned about our nation's fiscal health. The nation faces unsustainable future fiscal deficits, which must be addressed. As part of the overall solution to our deficit challenges, we know that conservation, recreation, and historic preservation programs will not and should not be exempt from scrutiny. We are willing to engage in a process to find further savings in spending, and review the economic and budgetary benefits of critical conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

The Federal budget cannot and should not be balanced disproportionately on the backs of conservation, outdoor recreation and preservation. Doing so will impose on the future generations whose well-being depends on the conservation and preservation of our common natural and historic resources.

As a diverse community of taxpayers and voters who care about natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation, we stand ready to work with you on serious efforts to address our nation's economic and fiscal challenges, as they relate to investments in, and tough choices about, the programs we care about. We urge

this Congress to address the federal deficit while still investing in critical conservation, recreation and historic preservation programs in 2012.

Please see attached for list of signers as of 7/6/11.

Thank you.

BILL MEADOWS,  
*President, The Wilderness Society.*

JOHN NAU,  
*Board Member, Civil War Trust.*

We are a broad partnership of nonprofits, organizations and businesses that represent tens of millions of American citizens who believe we must elevate the importance of natural resource conservation, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation programs.

#### LIST OF SIGNATORIES

##### NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Access Fund, Alliance of National Heritage Areas, American Alpine Club, American Association for State and Local History, American Bird Conservancy, American Canoe Association, American Cultural Resources Association, American Farmland Trust, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), American Fisheries Society, American Fly Fishing Trade Association, American Forest Foundation, American Hiking Society, American Land Conservancy, American Mountain Guides Association, American Recreation Coalition, American Rivers, American Trails, American Whitewater, Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies, Bird Conservation Network, Blue Goose Alliance, Boone and Crockett Club, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Choose Outdoors, City Parks Alliance, Civil War Trust, Congressional Sportsmens Foundation, Conservation Force, Dallas Safari Club, Defenders of Wildlife, Delta Waterfowl Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Endangered Species Coalition.

Great Old Broads for Wilderness, HistoriCorps, International Mountain Bicycling Association, Izaak Walton League of America, Land Trust Alliance, Marine Fish Conservation Network, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association of Forest Service Retirees, National Association of State Park Directors, National Audubon Society, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, National Marine Sanctuary Foundation, National Park Trust, National Parks Conservation Association, National Preservation Institute, National Shooting Sports Foundation, National Wild Turkey Federation, National Wildlife Federation, National Wildlife Refuge Association, Northern Forest Canoe Trail, Openlands, Organic Farming Research Foundation, Orion—The Hunters' Institute, Outdoor Alliance, Outdoor Industry Association, Outdoors America, Outward Bound U.S.A., Partnership for the National Trails System, Pheasants Forever, Portland Trails, Preservation Action, Public Lands Foundation, Quality Deer Management Association, Restore America's Estuaries, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.

Saving Birds Thru Habitat, Sierra Club, Society for American Archaeology, The Center for Desert Archaeology, The Center for Large Landscape Conservation, The Coastal States Organization, The Colorado Mountain Club, The Conservation Fund, The Forest Land Group, The Hawk Migration Association of North America, The Land Connection, The Lands Council, The National Trust for Historic Preservation, The Nature Conservancy, The Trumpeter Swan Society, The Trust for Public Land, The Wilderness Society, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Part-

nership, Tread Lightly!, Trout Unlimited, Western Rivers Conservancy, WildEarth Guardians, Wildlands CPR, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Management Institute, Winter Wildlands Alliance.

##### STATE, LOCAL, AND REGIONAL NONPROFITS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Agricultural Stewardship Association, Alabama Historical Commission, Alabama Trust for Historic Preservation, Alaska Association for Historic Preservation, Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, Alliance for Historic Wyoming, Alliance for New York State Parks, Alton Marketplace/Illinois Main Street, American Society of Landscape Architects, Amigos de la Sevilleta, Amigos de los Rios, Ammonoosuc Chapter of Trout Unlimited (New Hampshire), Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation, Appalachian Highlands Conservancy, Appalachian Mountain Club, Arabia Mountain National Heritage Area, Arkansas Historic Preservation Program, Arlington Heritage Alliance, Ascutey Mountain Audubon Society, Ashland Mainstreet, Inc., Audubon Outdoor Club, Audubon Society of Northern Virginia, Baltimore Department of Recreation and Parks, Baltimore National Heritage Area, Bear-Paw Regional Greenways, Bedminster Regional Land Conservancy, Berkley Conservation Institute, Bernheim Arboretum and Research Forest, Bird City Wisconsin, Blue Mountain Land Trust, Bosco-Milligan Foundation, Boston Harbor Island Alliance, Branford Land Trust, Breckenridge Outdoor Education Center, Bull Moose Sportsmen's Alliance, CA Japanese American Community Leadership Council, Cahaba Riverkeeper, California Capitol Historic Preservation Society, California Council of Land Trusts, California Heritage Council, California Preservation Foundation, California State Historic Preservation Office, Californians for Western Wilderness, Carolina Mountain Land Conservancy, Cascade Land Conservancy, Cashiers Historical Society, Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation, Inc., Center for Desert Archeology, Central Coast Land Conservancy, Central Virginia Battlefields Trust, Charles River Watershed Association, Chassahowitzka National Wildlife Refuge.

Complex, Inc., Cherokee County Historical Society, Cherokee Forest Voices, Chesapeake Conservancy, Chesapeake Wildlife Heritage, Chicago Wilderness, Chisago Lakes Main Street Initiative, Chisholm Trail Heritage Museum, Cienega Watershed Partnership, City of Madisonville, City of Minneapolis, Department of Community Planning and Economic Development, City of Shelby, Clinton Brown Company Architecture ReBuild, Coastal Conservation League, Colorado Mountain Club, Colorado Preservation, Inc., Columbus Landmarks Foundation, Community Open Land Trust, Connecticut Audubon Society, Connecticut Preservation Action, Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office, Conservation Council for Hawai'i, Conservation Federation of Missouri, Conservation Trust for North Carolina, Cooks Creek Watershed Association, Crossroads of the American Revolution, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, D&R Canal Watch, DC Preservation League, Deer Creek Museum, Glenrock Historical Commission, Delaware and Raritan Canal Coalition, Delaware Highlands Conservancy, Delmarva Ornithological Society, Eau Claire Historic Preservation Foundation, Endangered Habitats League, Environmental League of Massachusetts, Finger Lakes Land Trust, Fire Island Land Trust, Florida Trail Association, Inc.

Florida Trust for Historic Preservation, Foothills Conservancy of North Carolina, Forest Trust, Foundation for Historical Louisiana, Four Corners School of Outdoor Edu-

cation, Frederick Historic Sites Consortium, Friends of Acadia, Friends of Back Bay, Friends of Blackwater, Friends of Camas National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Congaree Swamp, Friends of Dyke Marsh, Friends of Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge, Texas, Friends of Hakalau Forest, Friends of Heinz Refuge at Tinicum, Friends of Ironwood Forest, Friends of Las Vegas National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Louisiana Wildlife Refuges, Inc., Friends of Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Necedah National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Nevada Wilderness, Friends of Noxubee Refuge, Friends of Princeton Nursery Lands, Friends of Princeton Open Space, Friends of Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Red Rock Canyon, Friends of Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Shiawassee National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Sunhaze Meadows National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of the Arapaho Wildlife Refuge Complex, Friends of the Chassahowitzka National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Inc., Friends of the Florida Panther Refuge, Friends of the National Wildlife Refuges of Rhode Island, Friends of the Neches River, Friends of the Prairie Learning Center.

Friends of the Refuge Headwaters, Friends of the Sonoran Desert National Monument, Friends of the Southwest Louisiana Wildlife Refuges and Wetlands, Friends of the Tampa Bay National Wildlife Refuges, Friends of Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge, Friends of Walkkill River, Friends of Wertheim National Wildlife Refuge, Georgetown Trust for Conservation & Preservation, Georgia Forest Watch, Georgia Land Conservation Center, Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, Glendale Heritage Preservation, Gold Coast & Hamburg Historic District Association, Grand Canyon Trust, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy, Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association, Greater Houston Preservation Alliance, Greater Lovell Land Trust, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Greenbelt Land Trust, Guam Historic Resources Division, Harris Center for Conservation Education, Harrodsburg First, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area, Heart of the Lakes for Land Conservation Policy, Heritage Alliance of Northeast Tennessee & Southwest Virginia, Heritage Nebraska, Heritage Ohio, Historic Annapolis, Historic Boulder, Inc., Historic Charleston Foundation, Historic Chicago Bungalov Association, Historic Denver, Historic FL Keys Foundation.

Historic Fort Worth, Inc., Historic Hawaii Foundation, Historic Kansas City Foundation, Historic Madison, Inc., Historic Preservation Alliance of Arkansas, Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend & Joseph County, Historic Preservation League of Oregon, Historic Seattle, Historic Valley Junction Foundation, History Colorado, Hoosier Environmental Council, Housatonic Valley Association, Hudson Highlands Land Trust, Huyck Preserve and Biological Research Station, Ice Age Trail Alliance, Idaho Conservation League, Idaho Rivers United, Idaho State Historic Preservation Office, Idaho State Historical Society, Illinois Audubon Society, Illinois Environmental Council, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, Indian River Lakes Conservancy, Iowa Wildlife Federation, Jackson County Tourism, Jay Heritage Center, Jefferson Land Trust, John G. Riley House Museum, Kentucky Woodland Owners, Keweenaw Land Trust, Kingston Greenways Association, Kingston Historical Society, Land Conservancy of Adams County, Land Trust for Santa Barbara County,

Land Trust for the Little Tennessee, Landmarks Illinois, Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, Life of the Land, Little Beaver Creek Land Foundation, Los Alamos Historical Society, Main Street Corning.

Main Street Perryville, Maine Preservation, Malheur Wildlife Associates, Marine Conservation Institute, Maryland Commission on African American History and Culture, Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Ornithological Society, Mendocino Land Trust, Messa Land Trust, Michigan Historic Preservation Network, Milford Preservation Trust, Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission, Minnesota Forestry Association, Mississippi Heritage Trust, Mississippi Land Trust, Mississippi River Trust, Mississippi SHPO, Missoula Parks and Recreation, Monadnock Conservancy, Montana Association of Land Trusts, Montana Audubon, Montana Preservation Alliance, Montana Wildlife Federation, Montpelier Mansion, Mount Grace Land Conservation Trust, MS Dept. of Marine Resources, Nantucket Historic District Commission, Napa County Landmarks, National Committee for the New River, National Outdoor Leadership School, Natural Resources Council of Maine, Natural Resources Initiative of Mississippi, Naturaland Trust, Nevada Conservation League & Education Fund, New Jersey Conservation Foundation, New Jersey Recreation and Park Association, New London Landmarks, New Mexico Archeological Council, New Mexico Heritage Preservation Alliance, New Mexico Wildlife Federation.

New River Land Trust, New York City Audubon, New York-New Jersey Trail Conference, NH Association of Conservation Commissions, North Carolina Coastal Land Trust, North Carolina Historic Preservation Office, North Country Trail Association, North County Conservancy, North Dakota Historical Society and State Historic Preservation Office, North Preston Properties, North Shore Land Alliance, Northeast Wilderness Trust, Northern Forest Canoe Trail, Northern Sierra Partnership, Northern Virginia Conservation Trust, Northwest Watershed Institute, Norwalk Preservation Trust, Oakland Heritage Alliance, Oblong Land Conservancy, Ohio Archeological Council, Ohio Forestry Association, Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Ohio Historical Society, Oklahoma Historical Society, Old Escondido Historic District, Open Space Institute, Oregon Natural Desert Association, Oregon Wild, Oregon-California Trails Association, Outside Las Vegas Foundation, Pacific Crest Trail Association, Pacific Rivers Council, Parker River Clean Water Association, Pasadena Heritage, Passaic River Coalition, Peconic Land Trust, Pleasant River Wildlife Foundation, Prairielands Preservation Foundation Board, Preservation Alliance of Philadelphia, Preservation Alliance of Minnesota, Preservation Alliance of West Virginia, Preservation America.

Preservation Buffalo Niagara, Preservation Commission, Rock Island, Illinois, Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, Preservation Kentucky, Preservation Louisville, Preservation Pennsylvania, Preservation Resource Center, Preservation Texas, Inc., Preservation Trust of Vermont, Preservation Wayne, Preserve Calavera, Preserve Rhode Island, Providence Preservation Society, Public Land and Water Access Association, Putnam County Coalition to Preserve Open Space, Quindaro Ruins/Underground Railroad-Exercise 2011, Redlands Conservancy, Richland County Conservation Commission, Ridges to Rivers Open Space Network, Rio Grande Return, Riveredge Bird Club, Rock Island Arsenal Historical Society, Rock Island Preservation Society, Rowayton Arts Center, Sacred Sites International, Saginaw Basin Land Conservancy, Salem Audubon

Society, Saline Historic Downtown Alliance, San Juan Citizens Alliance, San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council, Santa Fe Conservation Trust, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, Sayre Main Street, Inc., SC Coastal Conservation League, Scenic Hudson, Scenic Virginia, Scott County Historic Preservation Society, Sequoia Riverlands Trust, Serpentine Art & Nature Commons, Inc., SEWEE Association, Sheepscot Valley Conservation Association.

Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Soda Mountain Wilderness Council, Solano Land Trust, Somers Land Trust, Sourland Planning Council, Southern Appalachian Highlands Conservancy, Spokane Preservation Advocates, St. Marks Refuge Association, Inc., Stanford White Casino Theatre corp., State Historic Preservation Office, Wisconsin Historical Society, State Historical Society of South Dakota, Swan Ecosystem Center, Tampa Bay National Wildlife Refuges, Taos Land Trust, Tapteal Greenway Association, Tennessee Clean Water Network, Tennessee Ornithological Society, Tennessee Parks and Greenways Foundation, Tennessee Riverkeeper, Texas Land Conservancy, The Arkansas Audubon Society, The Audubon Society of Greater Denver, The Cazenovia Preservation Foundation, The Clinch Coalition, The Connecticut Ornithological Association, The Conservancy of Montgomery County, The Cragmoor Conservancy, Inc., The Delaware River Greenway Partnership, The Foundation for Historical Louisiana, The Georgia Conservancy, The Grand Staircase Escalante Partners, The Great Swamp Conservancy, The Harris Center for Conservation Education, The Historical Society of Harford County, Inc., The Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership, The Lake County Forest Preserve District, The Land Conservancy for Southern Chester County, The Land Conservancy of New Jersey, The Maryland Historical Trust.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History, The Oblong Land Conservancy, Inc., The Prairie State Conservation Coalition, The Preservation League of New York State, The Trustees of Reservations, The Villagers Inc., The Warwick Conservancy Inc., TN Environmental Council, Torne Valley Preservation Association, Tug Hill Tomorrow Land Trust, Tulsa Foundation for Architecture, Upper Midwest Archaeology, Utah Heritage Foundation, Valley Conservation Council, Vanceburg Renaissance on Main, Vermont Land Trust, Virgin Islands Historic Preservation Office, Virginia Forest Watch, Voyageurs National Park Association, Wallowa Land Trust, Inc., Washington Water Trails Association, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, Washington Wildlife Federation, Weeks Bay Foundation, Western North Carolina Alliance, Western Reserve Land Conservancy, Western Resource Advocates, WHALE—New Bedford, Wheeler Wildlife Refuge Association, Whidbey Camano Land Trust, Wildlife Mississippi, Williamsburg Main Street Program, Willistown Conservation Trust, Winyah Rivers Foundation, Woodstock Land Conservancy, WV Land Trust, Young Preservation Associates of Pittsburgh.

#### INDUSTRIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

1% for the Planet, Acorn Products, Advanced Flexible Materials, Inc. American Alpine Institute, American Outdoor Products, Inc., American Sportfishing Association, Angling Trade Magazine, B.A.S.S. LLC, Backpacker Magazine, Big Agnes, Bison Belts, Black Diamond, Blue Ridge Outdoors Magazine, BlueWater Ropes, Boa Technology Inc., Brandwise, Inc., Breathe Magazine, C4 Waterman, CamelBak, CarbonVerde, LLC, Cascade Designs, Inc., Casual Adventure, Chaco, Colorado Kayak Supply, Confluence Films,

Conservation Easement Consultants, Dale of Norway, Inc., Dansko, Inc., Deckers Outdoor Corporation, Deneki Outdoors, Deuter USA, Inc., DNF Media, Inc.—Outdoor USA Magazine, Eastern Mountain Sports, Ecosystem Management Consultants, Elevation Outdoors Magazine, Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance, Far Bank Enterprises, Fly Fish 10k, Forest Capital Partners, G.Loomis, Inc., Gerber Legendary Blades, GoMotion Inc., Gramicci, Great Outdoor Store, Harboe Architects, PC, HCFR Outdoors, LLC.

Honey Stinger, Hornady Manufacturing, Horny Toad, Hurricane Kayaks, Immersion Research, Injinji, Karhu, KINeSYS Inc., Kokatat, Lafuma America Inc., Lawson Hammock, LEKI USA Inc., Leupold & Stevens, Liberty Mountain, Light and Motion, Loksak Inc., LOWA Boots LLC, Marmot Mountain, LLC, Merrell, Metolius Mountain Products Inc., Momentum Media PR, Morsel Munk, LLC, Mountain Gazette, Mountain Gear, Mountain Mama, Mountain Shades, Mountain Tools, Nantahala Outdoor Center, National Marine Manufacturers Association, Nau, Inc., NEMO Equipment, Inc., Nester Hosiery, New England Wood Pellet LLC, New Forests Inc., Noelani Hawaii SUP LLC, North Preston Properties, Oboz Footwear, One Source Apparel, Orvis, Osprey Packs, Outdoor Divas, Outdoor Industries and Associations Association.

Outside Adventure Film School, Pack Rat Outdoor Center, Paddlers Supply, Pennsylvania Fly Fishing Company, Petzl, Piragis Northwoods Company, Prana, Product Architects Inc., Pure Fishing, Red Wing Shoe Company, Reflex Sourcing Inc., REI, Remington Arms Company, Rock Creek Outfitters, Rose Creek Anglers, Inc., Sanitas Sales Group, Sasquatch, Saucony, Serac Adventure Films, Sierra Business Council, Skinny Skis, Small Planet, Smith Optics, SnowSports Industries America, Sport Chalet, Inc., Sporting Culture Advisors, Sportworks Northwest, Inc., Sullivan-Bishop Agency LLC, Suspenz Storage Racks, Terra Public Relations, Terra Strenua Outfitters, Terramar Sports Inc., The Fly Shop, Inc., The Forest Group, The Lyme Timber Company, The Mountaineers, The Painted Trout, The Seeley Lake Nordic Ski Club, The South Carolina Aquarium, The Trailhead, The Walton Works, LLC, Thompson Manufacturing, Inc., Tierra Environmental, Timbuk2, Twenty Two Designs, LLC, W & W associates, Inc., Waterwisp Flies, West Coast Corp., Wild River Outfitters, Inc., Yellow Dog Flyfishing Adventures.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, there is an unfortunate time-honored tradition in the House of people coming to the floor and objecting to reductions in spending with heartfelt arguments as to why the spending is necessary and never offering any suggestions about where the money might be made up instead. That, frankly, is one of the reasons we have the huge deficits and debts that we do. So I want to break with that tradition and talk to you about a spending reduction I have a great concern about and then talk about how we might make it up instead.



There is not a person in this House who has not been touched in some way by cancer in their family, in someone they love, some friend. I don't think there is anybody here who hasn't had the heartbreak of dealing with malignancy in their family. Let me say from the outset, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is a Member of this House that doesn't want to do everything he or she could to deal with solving that problem. There is not a Member in this place, Republican or Democrat, who is indifferent to the problem of fighting cancer.

Now, cancer comes from a lot of things. It's genetic. It's hereditary. It comes from foods. But a lot of it comes from the environment. It comes from water. If the water we drink or we cook with or we bathe in is not clean, it can sometimes be the trigger that triggers the dreaded disease of cancer for someone we care about.

So a long time ago when this was discovered in the 1960s, there was a bipartisan agreement to try to do something to try to clean the water of this country and keep it clean. It was upheld by Presidents like Ronald Reagan and George Bush, Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter, Barack Obama, many others, Democrats and Republicans in control of Congress.

That's why I have to look at the bill before us today and just be astonished by the fact that the Clean Water Fund is cut by 55 percent. Let me say that again. The fund that has been set up to protect the clean water of our country that is consumed by Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, cut by 55 percent. The amount of that cut is about \$833 million below the amount of money that we spent last year; about \$833 million.

□ 1720

Usually, people stop there. But I want to talk about where we should get the money instead.

Now, \$833 million is less than 3 days' worth of spending in Iraq and Afghanistan. How about that? We will spend more than \$833 million in the next 3 days in Kabul and Baghdad, in part to help build clean water systems there, in part to help create jobs there. I just think that's inexcusable that we find ourselves in a position where we're spending in 2 or 3 days in Iraq and Afghanistan what we could spend to eliminate this cut and provide clean drinking water for the people of our country.

The amount of subsidies we're going to give oil companies—the oil companies made record profits in 2010. They made about \$60 billion in profits, if I'm not mistaken—\$77 billion, actually, in profits last year. We'll spend six times as much of this cut in the Clean Water Fund to give money away to those oil companies this year. These are people who made \$77 billion in profits last year, whose stocks are off the charts, who are paying their CEOs hundreds of millions of dollars in compensation,

and we're going to give them about \$7 billion from the wallets of the people of this country this year. That's six times the amount of this cut in the Clean Water Fund.

So I understand if you come to the floor you've got the responsibility of saying, Well, if you don't want to cut this, you've got the responsibility to say, Where else should we get it from? I think that's a reasonable rule under which to live.

So, ladies and gentlemen of the House, my proposal would be this: Let's not reduce the Clean Water Fund by 55 percent. Let's not say to cities and villages and towns and States and Indian tribes around our country that the money that we lend to them—we don't give it to them; most of the time it's a loan—to help build clean water systems that bring clean water to our kitchens and our homes and our places of worship and work, hospitals, let's not reduce that. Instead, let's take 2½ days of what we're going to spend in Iraq and Afghanistan and put it there. Let's take one-sixth of the money we're going to hand to the oil companies and put it there.

This is something we shouldn't do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LEE. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior appropriations bill.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I want to thank Ranking Member MORAN and our full committee ranking member, Congressman DICKS, for leading the fight every step of the way against this Republican assault on the environment.

Sadly, Mr. Chair, this bill is nothing more than a vehicle for bigger profits for Big Oil and other special interest polluters.

This bill and all it contains destroys critical environmental standards established to protect the public's health. By attaching more than 40 extremely dangerous policy riders, the Republicans take direct aim on the water we drink, the air we breathe, and the environment in which we live. This terrible legislation guts the budgets of key Federal agencies charged with protecting our citizens and our national resources. It terminates air quality standards as well as land and water conservation funding that will impact all communities in our country. But these cuts will hit my home State of California especially hard.

Mr. Chair, I'm proud to serve as a Representative of California's Ninth Congressional District, which has long been at the forefront of the environmental movement, including working on critical issues of climate change as well as fighting for renewable energy, green jobs, and environmental justice.

This bill undermines the Clean Air Act's ability to crack down on air pol-

lution, threatening the quality of life for our children, our families, our communities, including my constituents in the East Bay, many of whom suffer unfairly from poor air quality.

Now, let me just tell you this personal story. Many of my childhood friends who grew up with me in my neighborhood, a polluted neighborhood in El Paso, Texas, many of them were dead before they turned 55 years of age, or many of them who are still alive have chronic or debilitating diseases. These tragedies can be directly related to environmental degradation of the neighborhoods in which I lived and grew up in in El Paso, Texas.

Also, let me just say, this bill is unjust because it really does refuse to fund EPA at a level where there can be some justice in terms of the overall programs of environmental administration, where it can implement its core mission of protecting human health and the environment. This means that more women and more children and more people facing or living in poverty and more communities of color are bearing the brunt once again of pollution, environmental degradation, and climate change. Sadly, this is in line with the Republican plan to balance the budget on the backs of the poor.

Rather than Republicans taking actions to create jobs, this bill guts funding to create jobs—especially green jobs. Rather than the Republicans taking action to protect our Nation's clean water supply and open spaces, this bill takes us back to dirty water and closed parks. Rather than taking action to ensure that people across this country can trust our government—and they want to trust us—to protect the water that they drink and the air that they breathe, this bill rolls back the standards and protections aimed at protecting public health.

Mr. Chairman, as a person of faith, I believe that there is a moral and ethical responsibility to protect the natural resources provided by our Creator. This measure before us prohibits us from acting on that very, very serious and important responsibility.

How can we here make decisions that knowingly harm people? How can we make decisions that pollute our environment? How can we make these crass decisions, as Members of Congress, that will increase health hazards leading to diseases such as cancer?

People elect us because they trust us to make decisions that protect and enhance their quality of life. They want us to preserve our beautiful planet. Future generations are counting on us. This bill really does let them down.

We need to defeat this horribly destructive bill and move quickly to matters that the American people expect us to address, like to create jobs, raise our debt ceiling, and to protect the public health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. While our Nation stumbles toward a potential default, the Republican Party is wasting our time with consideration of a bill that will not move through the Senate and which the President has already threatened to veto. But even though this legislation is a futile effort, it does clearly articulate the philosophy of the Republicans in this House of Representatives. This is a bill that really makes one shake one's head. It is an astonishing effort to destroy hard-won, longstanding, and successful and popular laws. It cuts valuable health and environmental programs. It caps the responsibility of corporate polluters and balances minimal cost savings on the back of our most precious natural resources.

H.R. 2584, the funding bill for the Department of the Interior and Environmental Agencies, completely guts funding for public lands and public health programs that the American people care about and desperately need.

A 64 percent cut to the State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program and a 95 percent cut to the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Funds means we can expect a rapid increase in endangered and extinct species on Federal and non-Federal lands alike.

An 80 percent reduction in the Land and Water Conservation Fund means we should not expect adequate maintenance of landmarks, including Harpers Ferry, West Virginia; Yellowstone National Park; or California's Big Sur coast.

□ 1730

A 40 percent cut to the National Landscape Conservation System means 27 million acres of national monuments, wilderness areas, scenic rivers, and other treasures will be inadequately protected.

A 60 percent cut to the North American Wetlands Conservation Act means our birds, fish and wildlife resources will lose protections that keep these populations viable.

A 55 percent reduction to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund means less protection for water quality improvement projects in the United States.

And a prohibition of funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative means my home State of Illinois and the great Lake Michigan will lose millions of dollars in Federal assistance to promote good jobs and clean drinking water for millions of our citizens.

While this bill severely cuts these and other priorities, it provides hand-outs to corporate polluters in the form of policy riders. These riders would threaten the enforcement of the public health and environmental laws which have protected our country for decades.

One rider reverses a moratorium on uranium mining on the rim of the Grand Canyon, and would turn one of

our Nation's most iconic landmarks into an eyesore. Another extends loopholes in the Clean Water Act, jeopardizing drinking water for 117 million Americans; and many others weaken the Clean Air Act and limit regulations against toxic air pollution, which saved an estimated 160,000 lives just last year.

The Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act have protected American health and welfare for 40 years, and have been the catalyst for green energy investment and job creation. More than 80 percent of the American people believe the EPA should not be prevented from performing its duties, and the Gallup Poll reports that four out of five Americans are personally concerned about the water they drink, as well they should.

Although this legislation is dead on arrival at the White House, it poses a fundamental debate about the type of country we want to hand over to our children and grandchildren. Do we want to be a Nation that oversees the disappearance of animal populations, wetlands and national parks because we aren't willing to ask for one penny more from millionaires and billionaires? Do we want to be a Nation that turns away from water treatment and infrastructure in the hopes that no one will notice? Do we want to be a Nation that values the profits of corporate polluters over the health of children?

The Republican majority has clearly stated its position. I oppose this bill. The funding cuts and destructive policy riders that riddle this bill turn back the clock on vital environmental and health policies. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to uphold our commitment to clean air, clean water and preserved natural resources.

This weekend, my granddaughter, who celebrated her 10th birthday, had her party on Lake Michigan and enjoyed the precious clean water. I urge my colleagues to vote against this attack on our American resources and our values.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I've been listening from afar to this discussion on the floor, which is so, so fascinating. The former majority, wanting so desperately to become the majority again, is suggesting that by way of this bill we're taking the heart out of America's infrastructure program.

The fact is, in just recent years, the former majority increased spending in all of these categories at levels that would almost startle the people if they'd ever see the detailed facts. The fact that we are not increasing spending to their wish lists ahead, in some way, becomes a cut in their mind's eye when we're faced with the reality that the covered wagon that took us to California from the East is about to go

over the cliff of bankruptcy if we don't do something about spending. This same voice, or series of voices, is currently doing battle over the debt limitation, and they're suggesting that we're holding this up because of some loopholes in taxes for the so-called "rich."

Conversations taking place by many of the rich of the House indeed reflect the reality that what they really want is more spending and more funding for these programs. While we're attempting to make an effort to cut back spending and to cut the impact of government on the private sector, these same voices will not give up until they have an opportunity to impose more taxes.

One of the two parties having this discussion wants more spending on government programs and wants more taxes. The other side of this discussion would suggest we ought to cut back spending, make sense out of our budget and, indeed, recognize that the private sector, in keeping some money in their jeans in order to invest in the private sector, is really the way to create jobs.

With that, it's fascinating to watch this discussion. I'll be glad to come back three or four more times and have this discussion, Mr. Chairman. In the meantime, I certainly would hope more people would talk about what they really know about the environment or really know about the Interior bill rather than the rhetoric that is part of next year's campaign.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. What a fortuitous moment to have the opportunity to follow my colleague from California.

Indeed, I do know something about the Interior budget. I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior, and I know full good and well what the Department of the Interior means to America.

Early this morning, I left Sacramento. My mind was very much on the debate you just suggested: What are we going to do about the deficit?

But it didn't take long to realize, as I sat by the window, as I moved over the Sierra Nevada mountains into Nevada, then across to the Rockies, and across this entire Nation—for most of the way, it was rather clear—that we have an awesome, unbelievably beautiful country. We're the strongest Nation in the world, and we have great economic strength.

This bill, however, would take this great Nation, the great beauty and the incredible people of America, and put them at risk. It would put this Nation's extraordinary beauty and resources at risk. That's what this is about. This isn't going to solve the budget deficit one way or the other. This is a miniscule part of the overall Federal budget. It is important—important because

it is about this Nation's physical and human health. We're talking about the Environmental Protection Agency.

This bill as written would bring to the people of America poison. It is the poisoning of our rivers and our air. Use whatever word you want about clean-up—use the nice words—but we're talking about poisoning the rivers and the air of America. That's what this bill does. When you take the Environmental Protection Agency and you take away its ability to protect us, then you are allowing poisons to be in our water and in our air and in our land.

You look at this bill, and you're talking about the extraordinary physical nature of America. Do you want the great mountains of the Appalachians to be flattened so you can have more coal to burn and then foul the atmosphere? That's what this bill does.

Do you want to take away the ability of this Nation to protect your precious Mojave Desert? That's what this bill does.

Do you want to allow those who would destroy by grabbing the resources of this Nation without even bothering to pay a decent royalty? That's what this bill does whether it's the oil in the gulf or the copper in a new mine in Arizona.

I've listened to the Republican bills day after day on this floor and in committee, and they would strip away the protections that Americans want for their health and for their land. That's not what we should be doing.

Do you want to know where the money is? My colleague from New Jersey said it very well:

It's in Afghanistan and it's in Baghdad. We're building the bridges. We're cleaning the rivers. We're providing the water and the electrical systems there to the tune of \$150 billion a year.

Bring our troops home. Bring our money back to America. Build America. Rebuild America. There is the answer. Not in this way will you ever solve the deficit.

By the way, this bill lays off people—15,000 people at the EPA alone. This bill will not build infrastructure. This bill will take away the infrastructure for our sanitation systems, for our water systems. That's what this bill does.

□ 1740

My colleague from California knows full good and well what's intended here. It's to give our resources to the polluters. It's to foul our air. It's to remove the ability of the people of America, not some government in Washington but the people of America, who have for the last 40 years demanded clean water, that their resources be protected, that the commons be protected. It is the people of America that want a future that's good for their children, that want a future that's viable, that want a future that does not have poisoned water and air. That's what the people of America want. This bill goes exactly the wrong direction.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal 2012 Interior and Environmental appropriations bill.

I do want to start on a positive note. The bill would restore the President's proposed cuts to mitigation fish hatcheries. That's a good thing. It would increase funding for the Indian Health Service, and it would largely maintain funding for the National Park Service operations and the Smithsonian. So I commend the subcommittee for those decisions.

But I'm afraid the list of positive things is pretty short. So I want to, in the time I have, list some of the devastating cuts that this bill includes. And while our friend from California has suggested that these really aren't deep cuts, I believe the content of this bill belies that notion.

The bill before us picks up where H.R. 1 left off last spring making numerous and deep cuts to the programs that protect our air, water, public lands, and wildlife. Here are just a couple of the most egregious cuts in this bill:

First to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This funds the acquisition of public lands so they're protected from development and can be enjoyed by future generations. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has a dedicated revenue stream from offshore drilling royalties. It takes nothing from the General Fund. And yet this bill would cut Land and Water Conservation funding by 80 percent—the lowest level for the program in 45 years.

It threatens completion of the acquisition of the Rocky Fork tract in Tennessee and several treasures in North Carolina that need protection. Every Member of this body should ask: How many acquisition projects would this halt in my State? There is no reassuring answer.

Secondly, the Environmental Protection Agency, the bill continues the Republican majority's assault on the EPA. After imposing a 16 percent cut in the current fiscal year, the majority is now proposing a further 18 percent reduction in the agency's budget. That would push agency staffing to 1991 levels. The goal of a cut so massive is plain and simple: to ensure that the EPA doesn't have the resources it needs to fulfill its core mission, and that mission includes lifesaving and life-enhancing research, largely based in my district, that Research Triangle part.

Third, the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. The SRFs provide funding directly to the States to fund water infrastructure projects that enable communities to better manage wastewater and polluted runoff and to protect clean and safe drinking

water. This provides one of the most basic services taxpayers expect—clean water. And yet this bill would cut funding for these two programs by nearly a billion dollars combined.

Given how essential water supply is to economic growth, this is ironic at this particular time as our communities struggle to retain and regain jobs. I suggest to colleagues, ask your State and local governments how they're going to make up this difference.

Mr. Chairman, as if these cuts weren't bad enough, the majority has loaded this bill with legislative policy riders and funding limitations that will roll back 40 years of progress towards clean air and clean water.

These anti-environmental riders have no place in an appropriations bill. They will not save the country a penny, and they will cost tens of thousands of lives. They will expose our children, families, and communities to unnecessary illnesses, and they will degrade our irreplaceable natural resources.

The majority claims that these cuts are needed to demonstrate fiscal discipline. Mr. Chairman, this book is a textbook case in false economies. In gutting critical environmental protection programs, it piles up frightful economic and human costs for the future.

Our constituents and our environment today and in future generations deserve better than what this bill is offering. I urge my colleagues to oppose this shortsighted appropriations bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Well, congratulations. This is probably the most radical anti-environment bill that the House of Representatives has ever considered. It cuts open space funding to the lowest level in a half a century. It opens the Grand Canyon to uranium mining. It denies the existence of climate change and eliminates funding for Federal agencies to monitor and adapt to it. It contains more than three dozen anti-environment policy riders that eviscerate the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and other landmark environmental statutes.

The bill desecrates the legacy of Teddy Roosevelt and a long line of bipartisan conservation leaders while it also endangers public health.

The Republican majority claims to be concerned about spending, but this reckless bill will impose billions of dollars, Mr. Chairman, of health care costs on Americans by increasing the incidence of asthma, emphysema, heart attacks, and even premature death. This anti-environmental bill will increase health care costs by up to \$539 billion according to the Congressional Research Service. Since Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP are responsible for 33.9 percent of total health care costs,

this Republican bill will cost taxpayers some \$179 billion more.

In addition, it will cause more than 60,000 premature deaths, 20 million lost days of work, and 36,800 additional heart attacks in America.

This bill eliminates funding for critical and conservation priorities, completely defunding the Forest Legacy program. It defunds the Chesapeake Bay Restoration program. It blocks Environmental Protection Agency implementation of public health standards for particulate, lead, greenhouse gas and other pollutants. It allows the unregulated destruction of one of America's two most biodiverse regions, southern Appalachia, by repealing Clean Water Act standards to protect streams from mountaintop removal.

It imperils the cleanliness of public drinking water by allowing unregulated disposal of coal, waste, and pesticides, and casts into regulatory purgatory developers and others seeking clarity of Clean Water Act regulations.

The Republican majority seems to be living in an alternative reality. As Americans face unprecedented drought in the Southwest, record floods in the Mississippi basin, record heat here in eastern and midwestern cities, accelerating sea level rises, and other symptoms of global warming, this bill blocks funding even to monitor global warming. Not only do the Republicans deny the existence of global warming, apparently, they have even blocked funding to monitor its impacts.

This reckless policy rider doesn't just endanger polar bears, coral reefs, and countless other species and ecosystems; it endangers American infrastructure from the Norfolk Naval Base to the Jefferson Memorial.

It endangers public health by increasing smog pollution and heat-related deaths, as we've seen from the recent heat wave that swept across the east and midwest United States, setting record temperatures here in Washington, D.C., Newark, and other cities across this eastern seaboard.

I urge my colleagues to reject this reckless legislation that defunds critical public lands programs, eviscerates 40 years of bipartisan environmental standards, and desecrates the memory of Teddy Roosevelt.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1750

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, our country is facing an incredibly important moment as critical decisions need to be made regarding the national debt and our long-term deficit and how to constrain spending. Members on both sides of this aisle recognize the reality that we need to restore fiscal responsibility in our budget.

However, Mr. Chairman, in times of national importance, we need to stay

focused on what our country needs and what's best for the American people and avoid the temptation to play politics, as this bill does.

Far too much has been carried out by the majority party under the guise of cutting the deficit and fiscal responsibility when it's actually policy-making to implement a hard right, radical, anti-environmental agenda which can actually cost more money in the short, medium, and long term.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts proposed by the majority in this bill have nothing to do with fiscal responsibility. They have everything to do with implementing radical anti-environmental ideology. The bill makes sweeping cuts to critical programs that protect the public's health, reduce our expenditures for health care, protect our environment, and keep industry from running over the public and consumer rights.

Yet at the same time it does that, Mr. Chairman, this bill actually increases spending on programs that are little more than handouts and subsidies to oil and gas companies and mining companies, in particular, one that the government waste watchdog group Taxpayers for Common Sense has called "the granddaddy of Federal subsidies." This isn't about saving taxpayer money in this bill; it's about slashing environmental protections while giving handouts and subsidizing the dirtiest, most influential industries.

There's more pork in this bill than in an Iowa hog lot. This is supposed to be a spending bill that attempts to balance various budget priorities against one another. It's not supposed to be a grab bag of provisions demanded by the Nation's worst polluters, energy companies, and other special interests who receive handouts under this bill.

Yes, this bill would do away with the Clean Water Act, putting the rest of us in danger because mountaintop coal mining companies and factory farms want it. This bill does away with key provisions of the Clean Air Act, undermines protections of our public lands, and repeals the Endangered Species Act to satisfy a few at the expense of the many.

The bill will put more toxic mercury, arsenic, and lead into our air and put our children's health at risk by blocking standards to cut toxic air pollution from cement kilns, allow more soot pollution in our air, block EPA from moving forward with carbon pollution standards for new vehicles after 2016, jeopardizing a process projected to create up to 700,000 new jobs and save 2.4 million barrels of oil every day by 2030.

States would also be blocked from moving ahead with their own clean car standards, threatening the health of America's children, elderly citizens, and other vulnerable populations by blocking EPA's ability to limit dangerous carbon pollution from power plants and other large stationary sources.

This bill also expedites uranium mining in the Grand Canyon, gives special legal exemption to grazing on public lands, eliminates endangered species protections for animals from big horned sheep to grey wolves, and more. Yet it increases spending for the 1879 mining law and other elements that actually threaten to endanger our environment and are an additional handout to Big Oil.

Mr. Chairman, this bill isn't a serious funding proposal. It's a polluter's wish list of subsidies, handouts, and pork. The majority can call it what they will, but don't say that this bill serves the cause of cut-cutting while it lards up programs that are little more than a subsidy to wealthy mining and drilling interests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 19, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is increase the funding for our Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement by \$5 million. And what it would do is it would allow BOEMRE to quicken the pace of permit approval and, in turn, promote the rate of oil and gas investment in the gulf region. To accomplish this, we will reduce the Rangeland Management Fund by \$6 million, which still leaves that fund above its fiscal year 2011 funding level.

Let me point out to you why this is the wise thing to do. In response to the Deepwater Horizon explosion and the resulting oil spill last year, in May, the administration issued a temporary moratorium, halting permits of oil and gas production on the Outer Continental Shelf. The moratorium was lifted in October of last year; but since then, the issuance of permits has been slow. President Obama directed BOEMRE to reorganize itself into two independent groups: one that handles revenue from oil and gas leasing, and the other that regulates the oil and gas industry. This is all a change that most of us believe is necessary and wise.

However, the speed of permitting activity has not returned to pre-Deepwater Horizon levels. There is a significant and growing backlog of drilling plans pending approval. The number of pending deepwater exploration and development plans has increased by more than 250 percent. This is up from a historical average of 18 plans pending to now nearly 65 pending approval.

Also there's a drastic decline in drilling permit approvals. Deepwater exploration and development drilling permit

approvals have also declined by approximately 80 percent, down from an average of nearly 160 per year to a pace of only 30 per year. Shallow water exploration and development drilling permits approvals have also dropped by nearly 50 percent from an average of 390 per year to a pace of fewer than 180 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you that there was a recent study that showed that increasing the pace of permitting and, subsequently, the pace and scale of investment in the gulf would create 230,000 domestic jobs in 2012 as well as more than \$44 billion in U.S. gross domestic product.

I just want to focus on that number for a second, Mr. Chairman, because as we have been here for the 112th Congress, the American people have been demanding that we use the money we have efficiently so that we can invest in the American people and get a return on our investment. So here we are asking the American people for \$5 million and are asking our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who earlier this year proposed legislation that was purported to increase drilling and to lower gas prices. Well, now they have the opportunity to take \$5 million, invest it in BOEMRE, and have the opportunity to create 230,000 jobs.

There are 14.1 million people in this country who are actively seeking employment and cannot find it. Here we have a chance to help 230,000 of them in fiscal year 2012 alone, and we have the ability to increase our gross domestic product by \$44 million.

Mr. Chairman, I think that's what the American people are demanding. They want us to use our money wisely. That's what this amendment does. And I will just ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this. It's a job creation amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The amendment would take \$6 million from BLM's Lands and Resources and transfer it to BOEMRE. The BLM's management account has already been cut \$43.5 million below fiscal year 11, \$15.5 million below the President's request. This fund allows the BLM to take care of more than 245 million surface acres and 700 million subsurface acres; further cuts to this account would not be warranted.

I want to commend the gentleman for the location where he wants to send the money. I have no big opposition to the increase in the BOEMRE spending. But we did the best we could to balance this particular piece of legislation. BOEMRE has already been increased by \$37 million above fiscal year 2011. It's also been increased significantly in several continuing resolutions. Therefore, because of the location of the off-

set, I urge our colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,617,000)".

Page 10, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$10,617,000)".

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

□ 1800

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, again I rise to talk about what I consider to be wise investments into the future and the stability of this great country.

For the last 21 years, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act has created jobs and served as an important investment tool in our Nation's economy and for wetlands in every single State. NAWCA has been responsible for restoring over 26 million acres of wetlands, equivalent to the size of the State of Ohio. Not only did it restore over 26 million acres, it also creates nearly 7,500 jobs annually and hundreds of millions in worker earnings every year.

If we look at the fiscal year 2011 appropriations with \$37.5 million, it is down from \$47.6 million for fiscal year 2010. This bill allocates only \$20 million for fiscal year '12, a cut of 47 percent from fiscal year '11 levels and 58 percent from fiscal year '10 levels.

Here is the important point, Mr. Chairman: The law requires that each Federal dollar put into the program be matched by \$1 in non-Federal funds. Because the competition for these dollars is so great, on average, each Federal dollar is matched 3 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, over and over again I keep saying that the American people are looking for us to spend money in this great country, where we get a return on our investment. Now we have another program where, for every dollar we spend on this program, the American people get \$3. That's what we should be doing in this time of great economic hardship.

I am asking my colleagues on the other side to look at where we're spending money in this bill and put money where we're going to get a good

return on our investment, we're going to create jobs, and at the same time we're going to preserve and restore our wetlands.

That, Mr. Chairman, I think, is the responsible thing to do, the wise thing to do, and I would encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

I would now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

I rise in support of the Richmond amendment and in opposition to H.R. 2584, the Interior and Environment appropriations, and I do so because we cannot afford to make such drastic cuts to programs that benefit our Nation's drinking water, deplete our air pollution standards, and reduce the beautiful landscape.

For example, in Illinois, where I live, the drinking water systems face a required investment of \$13.5 billion over the next 20 years to replace aging facilities and comply with safe drinking regulations. In 2009, total Federal funding for drinking water was less than \$3 billion, which included a one-time \$2 billion infusion of funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Within Cook County, a large portion of my district, we can take only half an inch of rainwater before flooding takes place. This means sewer water and other contaminants flood both the streets and homes. We cannot afford to reduce the health and safety of our citizens, and we cannot disrupt our environment.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding, urge support of his amendment, and urge that we defeat the overall appropriation bill.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just say that this is another one of my small attempts to make an awful bill just a little bit better, and I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the Chair.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his amendment, but he again targets the account that we talked about in the last amendment, and that is the Bureau of Land Management's land and resources account which, as I indicated during the last amendment, is already cut by \$43½ million below the fiscal year '11 level and \$15½ million below the President's request.

In addition, this time the gentleman attempts to reach the Secretary's account and wants to reduce it by \$6.8 million. Nobody likes to stand up for bureaucrats or the Secretaries around here, but that account has already

been cut by \$33½ million. Any further reductions could impede the new Office of Natural Resource Revenue, which collects royalties for on- and offshore oil and gas production, which I know is so important to our friends in the minority.

For those reasons, again not because of the place where the gentleman wants to put the additional funds but because of where they come from, I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOCHUL

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$4,452,000)”.

Page 3, line 17, after the first dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$4,452,000)”.

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I believe my amendment is going to have appeal for both sides of the aisle. I have sat here and listened for some time, particularly on the Republican side, about the need to be cutting our expenses. Well, my amendment does just that.

My amendment actually removes \$4.4 million in spending increases and returns those very funds to deficit reduction. Those of us who also believe that the taxpayers should not hand over an additional \$4.4 million just to help out the oil and gas industry would also support this amendment.

What my amendment does is remove a \$4.4 million increase in funding for oil and gas management. I just cannot stand here and support an additional increase in taxpayer spending at a time when the other parts of this budget are being slashed.

Forgive me today if I don't have a lot of sympathy for Big Oil. Last quarter, Exxon posted \$11.4 billion in profits, in one quarter alone, Mr. Chairman. Royal Dutch Shell posted over \$6 billion profit in one quarter alone. The additional \$4.4 million added to help out the oil and gas companies to cover their permit application processing is literally pocket change for these big companies.

We live in tough economic times, and we all came to Congress to make tough decisions. We need to cut spending. That's why I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment and cut this spending increase.

My amendment, I assure you, does not address the merits of drilling whatsoever. This is simply an issue of fairness for the taxpayers. In times of government austerity and record profits for oil companies, this amendment is a

simple statement that these companies should pay for the administrative expenses associated with processing their applications.

Some people don't have a problem asking our seniors, our families, and our small businesses to pay more during these tough times. Well, I do. I think it is fundamentally unfair to increase spending in their areas while at the same time we are hurting our seniors. Almost every other area of this bill is being slashed, but the one that greases the skids for oil companies to get their approval is being increased over last year's budget. Something is just not right with our national priorities, and I believe that reasonable Democrats and Republicans will agree.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern for the budget deficit and reducing the budget deficit, but I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment would limit the BLM from spending \$4.5 million of offsetting collections for the processing of application of permits to drill. The BLM still collects the fees, they just wouldn't be able to spend the funds.

Mr. Chairman, this makes little sense as those fees offset the cost to administer the oil and gas permitting program. In other words, these programs are paid for by the industry, not by taxpayers. In other words, the BLM will have the cost of these programs but won't be allowed to spend the fees it has collected.

So I have a problem with this amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL).

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

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

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

□ 1810

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. MORAN of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas.

An amendment by Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri.

An amendment by Mr. RICHMOND of Louisiana.

An amendment by Ms. HOCHUL of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) 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 175, noes 237, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

AYES—175

Ackerman	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Andrews	Gutierrez	Payne
Baca	Hahn	Pelosi
Baldwin	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Bass (CA)	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Becerra	Higgins	Polis
Berkley	Himes	Posey
Berman	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Hochul	Rahall
Blumenauer	Holden	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Holt	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Honda	Richmond
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Inslee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Israel	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Jenkins	T.
Chandler	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Jones	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Schrader
Clay	Kildee	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kucinich	Scott, David
Cole	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sires
Courtney	Levin	Slaughter
Critz	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lipinski	Speier
Cummings	Loeb sack	Stark
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Luján	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Maloney	Tierney
Deutch	Markey	Tipton
Dicks	Matsui	Tonko
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Donnelly (IN)	McCollum	Tsongas
Doyle	McGovern	Van Hollen
Edwards	McIntyre	Velázquez
Ellison	McNerney	Visclosky
Engel	Meeke	Walz (MN)
Eshoo	Michaud	Wasserman
Farr	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Fattah	Miller, George	Watt
Filner	Moore	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moran	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nadler	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Wu
Gosar	Neal	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Pallone	
Green, Gene	Pascrell	

NOES—237

Adams	Gingrey (GA)	Olson
Aderholt	Gohmert	Owens
Akin	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Alexander	Gowdy	Paul
Altmire	Granger	Paulsen
Amash	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Austria	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Peterson
Barletta	Grimm	Petri
Bartlett	Guinta	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Platts
Bass (NH)	Hall	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Hanna	Pompeo
Biggert	Harper	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Harris	Quayle
Billirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Black	Hayworth	Reichert
Blackburn	Heck	Renacci
Bonner	Hensarling	Ribble
Bono Mack	Herger	Rigell
Boswell	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Boustany	Huelskamp	Roby
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Brooks	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Buerkle	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Jordan	Roskam
Campbell	Kelly	Ross (AR)
Canseco	King (NY)	Ross (FL)
Cantor	Kingston	Royce
Capito	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan
Cardoza	Kissell	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kline	Scalise
Cassidy	Labrador	Schilling
Chabot	Lamborn	Schmidt
Chaffetz	Lance	Schock
Coble	Landry	Schweikert
Coffman (CO)	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Conaway	Latham	Scott, Austin
Costa	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Cravaack	Latta	Sessions
Crawford	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Shuster
Cuellar	Long	Simpson
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Dent	Lungren, Daniel E.	Southerland
DesJarlais		Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Stivers
Dold	Marchant	Stutzman
Dreier	Marino	Sullivan
Duffy	Matheson	Terry
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Thornberry
Ellmers	McClintock	Tiberi
Emerson	McCotter	Turner
Farenthold	McHenry	Upton
Fincher	McKeon	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Walden
Flake	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Webster
Fleming	Meehan	West
Flores	Mica	Westmoreland
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gallely	Myrick	Woodall
Gardner	Neugebauer	Yoder
Garrett	Noem	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Noem	Young (FL)
Gibbs	Nugent	Young (IN)
Gibson	Nunes	
	Nunnelee	

NOT VOTING—20

Bachmann	DeFazio	Mack
Berg	Dingell	McDermott
Boren	Giffords	Oliver
Braley (IA)	Graves (MO)	Richardson
Buchanan	Hinche	Shuler
Cohen	King (IA)	Waters
Costello	Lynch	

□ 1837

Messrs. CASSIDY, BOSWELL, and SOUTHERLAND changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. COLE, Ms. JENKINS, Messrs. PERLMUTTER, HOLDEN, SCHRA-

DER, DONNELLY of Indiana, and PAYNE 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. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 284, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

AYES—126

Adams	Graves (GA)	Olson
Akin	Griffith (VA)	Palazzo
Amash	Guinta	Paul
Bachus	Hall	Pearce
Bartlett	Harper	Pence
Benishek	Harris	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Black	Hensarling	Pompeo
Blackburn	Herger	Posey
Boustany	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Quayle
Brooks	Hultgren	Renacci
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Ribble
Buerkle	Hurt	Rigell
Burgess	Issa	Roe (TN)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Canseco	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Cassidy	Jordan	Rooney
Chabot	Kingston	Roskam
Chaffetz	Kline	Ross (FL)
Coffman (CO)	Labrador	Royce
Conaway	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	Landry	Scalise
DesJarlais	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN)	Long	Sensenbrenner
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Fincher	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Flake	Marchant	Southerland
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns
Fleming	McCaul	Stutzman
Flores	McHenry	Sullivan
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Fox	Miller, Gary	Walsh (IL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Webster
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gallely	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Neugebauer	Woodall
Garrett	Nugent	Yoder
Gerlach	Nunes	Young (IN)
Gibbs	Nunnelee	
Gibson		

NOES—284

Ackerman	Bilbray	Capuano
Aderholt	Billirakis	Cardoza
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Carnahan
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Carney
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carson (IN)
Austria	Bonner	Carter
Baca	Bono Mack	Castor (FL)
Baldwin	Boswell	Chandler
Barletta	Brady (PA)	Chu
Barrow	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Barton (TX)	Bucshon	Clarke (MI)
Bass (CA)	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)
Bass (NH)	Calvert	Clay
Becerra	Camp	Cleaver
Berkley	Cantor	Clyburn
Berman	Capito	Coble
Biggert	Capps	Cole

Connolly (VA)	Johnson (GA)	Reed
Conyers	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Reichert
Costa	Jones	Reyes
Courtney	Kaptur	Richmond
Cravaack	Keating	Rivera
Crawford	Kelly	Roby
Crenshaw	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Critz	Kind	Rogers (MI)
Crowley	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cuellar	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (AR)
Cummings	Kissell	Rothman (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Davis (IL)	Lance	Runyan
Davis (KY)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Denham	Latham	Sánchez, Linda T.
Dent	Lee (CA)	
Deutch	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Sarbanes
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lipinski	Schiff
Dold	LoBiondo	Schilling
Donnelly (IN)	Loeb sack	Schmidt
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Schock
Dreier	Lowey	Schrader
Duffy	Lucas	Schwartz
Edwards	Lujan	Schweikert
Ellison	Lummis	Scott (VA)
Ellmers	Lungren, Daniel E.	Scott, David
Emerson		Serrano
Engel	Lynch	Sewell
Eshoo	Maloney	Sherman
Farr	Marino	Shimkus
Fattah	Markey	Simpson
Filner	Matheson	Sires
Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Slaughter
Fortenberry	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Frank (MA)	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Frelinghuysen	McColum	Smith (WA)
Fudge	McCotter	Speier
Gallely	McGovern	Stark
Garamendi	McIntyre	Stivers
Gardner	McKeon	Sutton
Gerlach	McKinley	Terry
Gibson	McMorris	Thompson (CA)
Gonzalez	Rodgers	Thompson (MS)
Gosar	McNerney	Thompson (PA)
Granger	Meehan	Tiberi
Green, Al	Meeks	Mica
Green, Gene		Michaud
Griffin (AR)		Miller (NC)
Grijalva		Miller, George
Grimm		Moran
Guthrie		Murphy (CT)
Gutierrez		Murphy (PA)
Hahn		Nadler
Hanabusa		Napolitano
Hanna		Neal
Hastings (FL)		Noem
Hastings (WA)		Owens
Hayworth		Pallone
Heck		Pascarell
Heinrich		Pastor (AZ)
Herrera Beutler		Paulsen
Higgins		Payne
Himes		Pelosi
Hinojosa		Perlmutter
Hirono		Peters
Hochul		Peterson
Hochul		Petri
Holden		Pingree (ME)
Holt		Platts
Honda		Polis
Hoyer		Price (NC)
Inslee		Quigley
Israel		Rahall
Jackson (IL)		Rangel
Jackson Lee		
(TX)		

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann	Dingell	Moore
Berg	Giffords	Oliver
Boren	Graves (MO)	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Hinche	Shuler
Buchanan	King (IA)	Shuster
Cohen	LaTourette	Waters
Costello	Mack	
DeFazio	McDermott	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1844

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 248, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

AYES—165

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Andrews	Hahn	Payne
Baca	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bass (CA)	Heinrich	Peters
Becerra	Higgins	Petri
Berkley	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Hinojosa	Polis
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hochul	Quigley
Blumenauer	Holt	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Honda	Reichert
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Richmond
Butterfield	Insee	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Rush
Carney	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Johnson (IL)	T.
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schwartz
Clay	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Langevin	Scott, David
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Cooper	Levin	Sherman
Courtney	Lewis (CA)	Sires
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
DeGette	Lowey	Sutton
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Dent	Maloney	Tierney
Deutch	Markey	Tonko
Dicks	Matsui	Towns
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Dold	McCollum	Upton
Doyle	McGovern	Van Hollen
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeks	Visclosky
Engel	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Farr	Miller, George	Schultz
Fattah	Moore	Watt
Filner	Moran	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Napolitano	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Neal	Wu
Green, Al	Pallone	Yarmuth

NOES—248

Adams	Akin	Altmire
Aderholt	Alexander	Amash

Austria	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Bachus	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Barletta	Griffin (AR)	Paul
Barrow	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Bartlett	Grijalva	Pearce
Barton (TX)	Grimm	Pence
Bass (NH)	Guinta	Peterson
Benishek	Guthrie	Pitts
Biggert	Hall	Platts
Bilbray	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Harper	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Posey
Black	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Quayle
Bonner	Hayworth	Rahall
Bono Mack	Heck	Reed
Boswell	Hensarling	Rehberg
Boustany	Herger	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Reyes
Brooks	Holden	Ribble
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Rigell
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Rivera
Buerkle	Hultgren	Roby
Burgess	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Burton (IN)	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Camp	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Canseco	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Cantor	Jones	Rooney
Capito	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Cardoza	Kelly	Roskam
Carter	King (NY)	Ross (AR)
Cassidy	Kingston	Ross (FL)
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Royce
Chaffetz	Kissell	Runyan
Coble	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Coffman (CO)	Labrador	Scalise
Cole	Lamborn	Schilling
Conaway	Lance	Schmidt
Costa	Landry	Schock
Cravaack	Lankford	Schrader
Crawford	LaHama	Schweikert
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Scott (SC)
Critz	Latta	Scott, Austin
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Sessions
Culberson	Long	Shimkus
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Shuster
Deming	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
DesJarlais	Lujan	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Donnelly (IN)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Dreier	E.	Southerland
Duffy	Manzullo	Stearns
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Stutzman
Ellmers	Matheson	Sullivan
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Farenthold	McCaul	Thompson (CA)
Fincher	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	McCotter	Thornberry
Flake	McHenry	Tiberi
Fleischmann	McIntyre	Tipton
Fleming	McKeon	Turner
Flores	McKinley	Walberg
Forbes	McMorris	Walden
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Walsh (IL)
Foxx	Meehan	Webster
Franks (AZ)	Mica	West
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Gallely	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Mulvaney	Wittman
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Wolf
Gibbs	Myrick	Womack
Gibson	Neugebauer	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Yoder
Gohmert	Nugent	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Nunes	Young (FL)
Gosar	Nunnelee	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Olson	
Granger	Owens	

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	DeFazio	McDermott
Berg	Dingell	Olver
Boren	Giffords	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Graves (MO)	Shuler
Buchanan	Hinchey	Waters
Cohen	King (IA)	
Costello	Mack	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1850

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 192, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

AYES—221

Ackerman	Filner	Matsui
Alexander	Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (NY)
Altmire	Fleming	McCaul
Andrews	Flores	McCollum
Baca	Frank (MA)	McGovern
Bachus	Fudge	McHenry
Baldwin	Garamendi	McIntyre
Barrow	Gerlach	McNerney
Bartlett	Gibbs	Meehan
Barton (TX)	Gibson	Meeks
Bass (CA)	Gohmert	Mica
Becerra	Gonzalez	Michaud
Berkley	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Berman	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Bishop (GA)	Grimm	Moore
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Moran
Blumenauer	Hahn	Mulvaney
Boswell	Hall	Murphy (CT)
Boustany	Hanabusa	Murphy (PA)
Brady (PA)	Hanna	Nadler
Brady (TX)	Harper	Napolitano
Brooks	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Nugent
Butterfield	Himes	Nunnelee
Capps	Hinojosa	Owens
Capuano	Hirono	Palazzo
Carnahan	Hochul	Pallone
Carney	Holden	Pascrell
Carson (IN)	Holt	Paul
Castor (FL)	Honda	Payne
Chandler	Hoyer	Pelosi
Cicilline	Insee	Peters
Clarke (MI)	Israel	Peterson
Clarke (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Petri
Clay	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	(TX)	Pitts
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Poe (TX)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Posey
Conyers	Jones	Price (NC)
Cooper	Jordan	Rangel
Courtney	Kaptur	Renacci
Crowley	Keating	Richmond
Cummings	Kildee	Rooney
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ross (AR)
Davis (IL)	King (NY)	Ross (FL)
DeLauro	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Dent	Lance	Roybal-Allard
Deutch	Landry	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Langevin	Rush
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Dold	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Lee (CA)	T.
Edwards	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Engel	Lipinski	Scalise
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Farr	Loeb sack	Schiff
Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	Schilling
Filner	Lynch	Lowey
Frank (MA)	Maloney	Scott (VA)
Fudge	Markey	Scott, David
Garamendi	Matheson	Sensenbrenner
Gonzalez		Serrano
Green, Al		



Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Southernland  
Speier  
Stark  
Sullivan

Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NOES—192

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Amash  
Austria  
Barletta  
Bass (NH)  
Benishkek  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Broun (GA)  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Costa  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
DeGette  
Denham  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gingrey (GA)  
Goodlatte

Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Henger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kelly  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy (CA)  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olson

Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Platts  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reichart  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Webster  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann  
Berg  
Boren  
Braley (IA)  
Buchanan  
Cohen  
Costello

DeFazio  
Dingell  
Giffords  
Graves (MO)  
Hinchev  
King (IA)  
Mack

McDermott  
Olver  
Richardson  
Shuler  
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1856

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOCHUL  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 141, noes 271, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]

AYES—141

Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baldwin  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuan  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Courtney  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gutierrez  
Hahn

Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Higgins  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Insee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildeer  
Kind  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowe  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeke  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi

Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth

Davis (KY)  
DeGette  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holden  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)

Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)

Quayle  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wu  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Bachmann  
Berg  
Boren  
Braley (IA)  
Buchanan  
Cohen  
Costello

Crowley  
DeFazio  
Dingell  
Giffords  
Graves (MO)  
Hinchev  
King (IA)

Mack  
McDermott  
Oliver  
Richardson  
Shuler  
Waters

□ 1903

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

Mr. SIMPSON. 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. NUGENT) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, 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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1938, NORTH AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY SECURITY ACT

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-181) on the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

FBI DIRECTOR EXTENSION ACT, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1103) to extend the term of the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1103

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

**SECTION 1. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) on May 12, 2011, the President requested that Congress extend the term of Robert S. Mueller III as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by 2 years, citing the critical need for continuity and stability at the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the face of ongoing threats to national security, and leadership transitions at the Federal agencies charged with protecting national security;

(2) in light of the May 1, 2011, successful operation against Osama bin Laden, the continuing threat to national security, and the approaching 10th anniversary of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the President's request for a limited, 1-time exception to the term limit of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in these exceptional circumstances, is appropriate; and

(3) this Act is intended to provide a 1-time exception to the 10-year statutory limit on the term of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in light of the President's request and existing exceptional cir-

cumstances, and is not intended to create a precedent.

**SEC. 2. CREATION OF NEW TERM OF SERVICE FOR THE OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.**

Section 1101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (28 U.S.C. 532 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) Effective on the date of enactment of this subsection, a new term of service for the office of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be created, which shall begin on or after August 3, 2011, and continue until September 4, 2013. Notwithstanding the second sentence of subsection (b) of this section, the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection shall be eligible to be appointed to the new term of service provided for by this subsection, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and only for that new term of service. Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, from appointing an individual, other than the incumbent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to a 10-year term of service subject to the provisions of subsection (b) after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(2) The individual who is the incumbent in the office of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection may not serve as Director after September 4, 2013.

“(3) With regard to the individual who is the incumbent in the office of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the date of enactment of this subsection, the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1103, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this September 11 marks the 10-year anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in U.S. history. America is fortunate not to have suffered another attack of such magnitude and devastation in the past decade. America has remained safe but not because those who are determined to deny us our freedoms and destroy our way of life have given up. We are safe because of the men and women who serve our country with devotion and distinction—those who serve in our Armed Forces, our intelligence community, and our law enforcement agencies.

These public servants and their families make tremendous sacrifices to

keep us safe and to keep terrorists on the run. Their work is often unrecognized and underappreciated. In addition to ensuring that terrorists are denied victory, some of our public servants also protect us from crime and ensure that justice is served.

The agency that is charged with this unique duty is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI director is limited to a 10-year nonrenewable term. Congress imposed this restriction to ensure political independence and to act as a restraint on unbridled power and the potential for misuse of that power.

In just a few weeks, the current FBI director, Robert S. Mueller, III, will conclude his 10-year term. The President has asked for a one-time 2-year extension for Mr. Mueller to ensure continuity in America's national security team. The killing of Osama bin Laden and personnel changes in key national security posts make these unusual times that justify a short-term extension.

Director Mueller has shown himself a dedicated public servant who has kept terrorists at bay and reduced crime.

Mr. Mueller assumed leadership of the FBI on September 4, 2001, just 1 week prior to the attacks of September 11, 2001. During his tenure, he has reformed the FBI to ensure that it is able to address not only terrorist threats, but also threats posed by traditional criminals. This request for an extension was made not by Mr. Mueller but by the President of the United States.

Mr. Mueller has agreed to accept this extension if it is approved by Congress. It's not every day that the House, the Senate, and the White House can agree, but this is something we all can agree is essential.

This bill creates a new, one time only 2-year term of service for the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Mueller will be eligible to be appointed to this new term of service with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate will hold a confirmation vote after the President signs this bill.

This new term would expire on September 4, 2013, after which, Mr. Mueller would no longer serve as director. This bill does not prevent the President from appointing a different individual to a new tenured term by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

If the President wants to continue the services of the incumbent, this bill allows that to happen for a limited time and in a constitutional manner. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to continue the service of FBI Director Robert S. Mueller, III, for an additional 2 years.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1910

I am pleased to join with the chairman of the committee in support of the