



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 5, 2011

No. 60

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Reverend William Byrne, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Gracious and loving God, thank You for the blessings You have bestowed upon this Nation. Most especially, we thank You for the rights which You alone grant to all men and women, in particular, the gift of life and the right to pursue happiness.

Bless the men and women of this country who work to ensure that all men and women may enjoy these rights. Watch over those who protect our Nation, both military and civilian, at home and abroad.

Guard and protect those who have been devastated by storms and tornados this past week. Keep them safe and assist those who are working for relief. Comfort those who mourn, and welcome those who have died.

Bless these Representatives. May all they do begin with Your inspiration and find completion in Your love.

We ask this in Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

TEXAS WILDFIRES AND PAKISTAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, wildfires have raged in Texas because of a long drought this year. The town of Possum Kingdom, Texas, population 5,500, has burned up. This is one of the many photographs showing the raging fires throughout the State.

Statewide, two firefighters have been killed; 400 homes have been destroyed. The 9,000 fires have covered over 2,200,000 acres—this is the size of Rhode Island and Connecticut put together—and the costs of the devastating destruction are enormous.

The Governor has asked FEMA for a Federal disaster declaration because of the extensive fires, but the Governor has been turned down by the White House—no more additional help for Texas.

Too bad Texas isn't a foreign country like Pakistan. The Federal Government has shelled out over \$500 million for disaster aid to Pakistan citizens for the flooding in their country.

When Washington considers aid, if any, for disaster relief, it should at least consider Americans in Texas just as important as Pakistanis, but that doesn't appear to be the case. Meanwhile, the fires continue to burn in Texas.

And that's just the way it is.

REIN IN THE SPECULATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. American families and small businesses are being crushed by \$4 a gallon gas at the pump.

Now, the Republicans tell us, oh, it's plain old supply and demand; drill here now and fast in the future and that will solve the problem.

Well, actually supply is up—U.S. crude inventories are 12.6 million barrels over the 5-year average—and demand is down. So what's really going on?

Well, it's Big Oil and it's Wall Street. Goldman Sachs—no one less than Goldman Sachs—said that the culprit for inflating oil prices \$20 higher than what supply and demand dictate is excess speculation. Now, we wouldn't want to rein in the speculators because that's Wall Street and they're very generous to Republicans. And we wouldn't want to take on Big Oil, who's manipulating the market prices, because they contribute big-time to Republicans.

So let's just play pretend. Let's pretend we're doing something for consumers while hiding the culprits in plain sight. Speculation on Wall Street. They traded 189,000 contracts—that's 189 million barrels—by computer in 1 day last week, driving up the price for all Americans. Useless speculation.

Rein in the speculation. And take on Big Oil.

CONGRATULATIONS, CANADA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week's historic election in Canada brought to power a conservative majority for Parliament. By winning a full majority of the 167 conservative seats, Prime Minister Stephen

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H3065

Harper will now have 4 years of uninterrupted government. Plans to create jobs without increasing taxes and paying down the national deficit are top priorities of this new majority.

The relationship of Canada and South Carolina has been strong for many years. This year marks the 50th annual Canadian-American Days Festival at Myrtle Beach, which celebrates the partnership between our citizens. We welcome Canadian vacationers. We are grateful that former South Carolina Speaker of the House, David Wilkins of Greenville, served as the United States Ambassador to Canada from 2005 to 2009. Canada is our leading trade partner, which I know firsthand and appreciate, with the Michelin Tire Corporation of Lexington producing earth-mover tires for recovery of oil sands resources in Alberta.

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

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observation of Teacher Appreciation Week, which commenced on May 2 and will end tomorrow. It's not only appropriate to recognize our hardworking and dedicated educators, it is necessary.

In honor of Teacher Appreciation Week, I would like to recognize all the teachers in my district. I have visited every school back home, and I feel fortunate to have the classrooms filled with passionate teachers who are committed to every student by addressing their needs and guaranteeing their academic success.

I would specifically like to recognize the 2011 Teacher of the Year recipients from the school districts in Anaheim and Santa Ana, California. Mr. Erick Rossman, Ms. Anne "Mac" Devine, Ms. Sylvia Immanuel, Ms. Michelle Majewski, Mr. John Lombardi, and Ms. Valencia Davis, thank you. Thank you for your passion and your outstanding success and work with our students.

DRILLING EQUALS AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. PALAZZO. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in strong support of H.R. 1230.

As the Congressman from Mississippi's gulf coast, I have seen firsthand the damaging effect of the administration's decision to delay lease sales for offshore oil exploration. I also have worked offshore myself as a rigger, a roustabout, and a materials manager. I understand the positive economic impact offshore jobs have on the local and regional economies. By the administra-

tion's own admission, we have already seen 12,000 jobs lost with a direct salary impact of \$500 million. To prevent these jobs from permanently being sent to other countries, we need firm timelines for considering permits to provide certainty to investors and employers.

I not only support the passage of the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, but I urge the administration to undo their record of blocking and delaying energy production and to proceed with scheduled lease sales promptly. We must not continue to unnecessarily sideline a vibrant industry that is critical to our economic and national security.

BIG OIL

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

Ms. CHU. In my home county of Los Angeles, hardworking, middle class families are struggling every day to put gas in their cars so that they can get to work and take their children to school. But I did a double take recently when I saw that a gas station in my district had the highest price per gallon in the country—almost \$5 a gallon.

What is the Republican response? They just released their budget. It gives more tax breaks to Big Oil. They don't want to reward you for working hard. They want to reward ExxonMobil which made \$34 billion last year in pure profits, more money than any other company in the world.

You are stuck paying over \$4 a gallon for gas and the Republicans also want you to pay \$4 billion in tax breaks for Big Oil?

Stop the \$4 billion Republican giveaway. Let's make smart investments that will lower gas prices and put Americans back to work. It is time to say "no" to the GOP, the Grand Oil Party.

GAS PRICES

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. I rise today to express the frustration of the good people of Missouri's Fourth District with our Nation's gas prices. As I traveled around the Fourth District last week speaking at eight town hall meetings, the one comment I heard everywhere I went was that gas prices are crippling our families and our businesses.

One over-the-road trucker that I visited with from El Dorado Springs told me that just a couple of years ago he would bring \$1,000 in cash on the road with him for a week's worth of diesel, but now he has to come up with \$2,500 in cash before climbing in the cab. This is extremely hard for someone just trying to make ends meet, and carrying so much cash is dangerous, too.

Every extra dollar in gas prices means one less dollar for a family's

food, clothes, or spending time together at a ball game. For the average driver, the increased cost of gas since the President took office is nearly \$1,100 a year.

We must stop the government from standing between its citizens and reasonable gas prices. This country has been blessed with some of the most abundant resources on the face of the Earth, but this administration has stood in the way of exploring and utilizing them at every turn. It's time for the President to get out of the way and let us get to work developing our own sources of energy.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE RECOVERY EFFORTS IN NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express appreciation for the good work on the part of local emergency responders, FEMA, the Division of Emergency Management, the American Red Cross, and the many other agencies that have been helping survivors in my congressional district recover from the devastating tornadoes that hit North Carolina on April 16.

I represent, Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest hit communities, Bertie County, where 12 people lost their lives, 50 were injured, and dozens are now homeless. I am grateful that President Barack Obama was very quick to announce that 19 counties were eligible for Federal disaster assistance, and the hard work toward recovery is now under way. More than 4,700 people in North Carolina have applied for State and Federal disaster assistance. We are a generous and resilient people, and I know we will recover.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in applauding the recovery efforts and in expressing deep sorrow for the victims and their families.

CONGRATULATING INDIANA ON ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THEIR LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the State of Indiana, Governor of Indiana Mitch Daniels, and Indiana State Legislature's accomplishments this past session that just ended.

I believe it is important to reflect momentarily on the achievements made in Indiana to give promise and hope that the same can be done here in Washington. Something I'm particularly proud of is the fact that Governor Daniels and the legislature have passed the fourth straight gimmick-free balanced budget for the State of Indiana which will give Indiana a budget in the black 8 years running. We can do the same here in Congress.

This legislative session in Indiana has also produced real education reform that was passed to usher in real choice for students and parents. Governor Daniels led the charge for full funding for kindergarten, the Nation's most expansive voucher program, more charter schools, and rewarding our teachers based on their effectiveness. We can do the same here in Congress.

As we discuss tax reform and how to do it here in Washington, Indiana's already done it. They have done it by lowering corporate tax rates, lowering property taxes to give a great place for businesses to do work. We can do the same here in Congress.

As a former State legislator in Indiana under the Daniels administration, I rise today because, in the midst of despair and partisan bickering, I know we can do the same here in Congress. We must do better.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1229, PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1230, RESTARTING AMERICAN OFFSHORE LEASING NOW ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 245 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 245

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are

waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. In the engrossment of H.R. 1229, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 1230, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1229;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 1229 to reflect the addition of H.R. 1230, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

□ 0920

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 245 provides for the consideration of two very important bills, H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, and H.R. 1230, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, both under a structured rule. With many amendments, all of which are Democrat amendments having been made in order, this is a very fair rule.

I commend the sponsor of the two bills, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, for his leadership in bringing both of these bills to the House.

H.R. 1229 is a bill that goes to the heart of the bureaucratic delays, which are preventing the approval of drilling permits within the Gulf of Mexico; and it modifies the standards and procedures governing Federal leases and permits in order to streamline the process, making the development of these domestic resources a reality instead of the status quo of paying lip service to drilling and then stifling drilling through bureaucratic inaction.

H.R. 1230 is a bill that would direct the sale of oil and gas leases within the Outer Continental Shelf, reversing a failed administration policy of canceling and delaying those processes.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 years, many Republicans have come to this floor and have sung the same refrain of "show us the jobs." It was, indeed, a nice song and a catchy tune—so catchy that the minority of today seems to have been picking up on that kind of song as well. I don't expect to hear that today, or at least we ought not to hear it today, because the two bills before us under this rule are real bills that create real jobs for people.

Unlike the bills we have seen over the past couple of years which have led us to a situation where today there are twice as many workers in the government as there are in all of manufacturing in this Nation, which is an exact reverse of the situation this Nation was in in 1960, these are not going to be government jobs which attack the taxpayers and suck the money out of their wallets to fund them. These are going to be real jobs that grow the private sector, that expand the economy, that provide wealth, and that will provide, actually, millions of new government revenues coming into this country.

The situation we find ourselves in today with regard to energy is one that is detrimental to everybody. Everyone who goes to the pump to fill their cars recognizes the cost is increasing and will continue to increase. They recognize that the situation we are in puts all our jobs in jeopardy, and it is because of the inaction of this particular administration. The President has continually said that he wants to do action, to move forward, to develop American energy, but the actions of his administration have, quite frankly, failed to meet the rhetoric of the administration.

The problem has always been a fundamental flaw in our Nation's energy plan. Last May, the Deepwater Horizon accident occurred, which was a tragedy; and we must thank all of those who helped to solve that particular problem; but, unfortunately, the administration's response to that tragedy has turned it into a catastrophe and one which destroys jobs.

Immediately, a moratorium on all sorts of development was put into place. Prior to that moratorium being put into place, there were 52 approved and pending permits, and that moratorium was lifted in October; but of those 52, only 10 permits have been issued since that time. Two of them are new in deepwater and are eight of the 52 that were originally done. That means there are over 40 still approved and still stalled in what has become a de facto moratorium, caused by a foot-dragging of this administration that, what one columnist said, is moving at a glacial pace. More rigs have left our shore—12—to go to other places in the world where they are welcomed and where they are developing energy sources, where they don't have to face the red tape and the foot-dragging than have actually been approved by this administration.

A perfect example is Seahawk Drilling, a company that had over 500 jobs and 20 rigs that went into chapter 11 bankruptcy. The president of that company stated only one reason for that bankruptcy and that loss of jobs, which was the de facto moratorium of inaction done by this administration in this area in 2008 in a response to an arbitrary drilling ban that was lifted by both the President and Congress. It created a 5-year plan. Virginia was supposed to start the exploration process in 2011, but the Secretary of the Interior delayed that until 2012 and then later delayed all exploration on the Atlantic coast until after 2017.

In the Gulf of Mexico, two other sales were canceled and moved out from this year, which was when they were supposed to begin, once again into next year. It became so bad that a judge in New Orleans gave the administration 30 days to start moving on these projects, saying that what was happening by this administration was increasingly inexcusable and that not acting at all is not a lawful action.

The result of this has simply been catastrophic for jobs in America. The Obama administration has admitted in its official memorandum that, for those days of its official moratorium, 12,000 jobs were lost; but what is more significant is the de facto moratorium there. An LSU study simply said, if this were sustained for 18 months in the gulf area, there would be 24,532 jobs lost and in the Nation 36,137 jobs lost simply because of what we are not doing in the Gulf of Mexico.

It is very simple to understand how this works. Each platform that is out there drilling has 90 to 150 employees. If you add the production team as well

as the exploration team, you can multiply that by a factor of four. So you have almost per every drilling up to 1,400 jobs that are tied to that particular project with \$1,800 a week as the average wage.

That means for every one of those drills that is not put back into production, it is \$5 million to \$10 million per month per platform that is lost to this economy; and the ripple effect within the economy for our energy uses as well as jobs is, once again, staggering as this administration is, indeed, going at a glacial pace. In Virginia alone, 2,000 jobs will be estimated to be lost if the de facto moratorium that pushes everything to 2017 is allowed to take place.

Now, this action, or inaction, by the administration costs every American. It costs us at the gas pump as we see the cost of running our cars increasing almost daily, and this hurts the poor worse than anyone else. It is estimated that every American will pay \$700 more this year for gasoline than last year. Obviously, those at the lower end of the economic scale are the ones who are hurt the most. For every cent that is increased in gas at the pump, that is \$1 billion that is taken out of household incomes in this country; and it makes sure that Americans are then put at the mercy of foreign oil development and foreign energy sources, which may not necessarily like us, and sometimes they're just flat out bad guys.

It also has other areas in which it has affected everyone—once again, those at the lower end of the income scale the most. For every dime that diesel goes up, that is \$400 million that is added to the agricultural industry, which is what we eat, which is tacked onto our food prices. You have to have oil for fertilizer. As that goes up, the cost of fertilizer goes up; the cost of running machinery goes up; the cost of food goes up; the cost of pharmaceuticals, plastics. If you go into the emergency room, everything that is not metal has some element of oil that developed it, and all of those are increasing.

Now, there are only two ways that we can handle this situation. First, you can go with the old concept of supply and demand and simply increase production, which is what these two bills are trying to do; or you can go to the approach that this administration seems to be asking us to do, which is to cut our standard of living, accept gasoline prices at the European level, and beg Saudi Arabia to be nice to us—to put our futures in the hands of OPEC and then amazingly say we can also solve these problems simply by taxing oil companies at a higher rate.

Since 2010, the domestic production of energy in this country has decreased 16 percent. In this year, next year and the year after that, we estimate, unless we make changes, that a quarter of a million barrels of oil will be decreased in our production rate in each of those years. The only area in which any energy production has been increasing is

on private property. Unfortunately for this country, almost all of the energy that we have, most of the energy that we can develop, is on public lands, which is controlled by the government, which is doing nothing now to help develop that.

This is a time where pragmatism is much better than a failed ideology of restrictions. Now, what these two bills do is to simply reverse the job-killing delays that have been taking place. In H.R. 1229, it reforms the law to require leaseholders to receive permits to drill before they start drilling; and it will do it for the first time by law, not simply by a regulation. It demands that the Secretary of the Interior conduct and approve safety revenues, once again, for the first time in history.

More importantly, it ends the de facto moratorium by demanding prompt guidelines and action. It says that the Secretary of the Interior will have 30 days in which to deal with these issues and then can have up to two 15-day extensions—a total of 60 days to do the review.

Now, while that may seem to some as a quick path, it's not when you look at the history of what has been done. Before the moratorium went into effect, it was taking 5 to 15 days to do the drilling leases and permits.

□ 0930

One company was done in nine days just recently. What the problem is is that most of these are simply not being done simply because of inaction. It also says for those that were approved prior to the May 27 moratorium, you've got 30 days to get them going again. This is plenty of time to do the work.

It also does something else for the first time. It provides an expedited hearing process so that legal rights are not lost—they are protected—but you will not go back into a concept of a never-ending lawsuit moratorium.

In 1230, the bill recognizes that this year will be the first time since 1958 that we have a possibility of no offshore lease sales. And it wants to reverse that action to proceed promptly with the 5-year plan so that things, for example, in Virginia will be in effect within 1 year, and those that were scheduled in the gulf can be done within 1 year of the passage of this bill.

This bill simply will create billions in Federal Reserve revenues coming in, and it will create billions in our economy, and it will create jobs.

I hate to say this, but under President Obama, the cost of energy has skyrocketed. The administration has actively blocked and delayed energy production. It's cost jobs. It's raised energy prices. It's made the United States more reliant on unstable foreign countries for our energy. Through the American Energy Initiative, this House is actively working to increase American energy production to lower gas prices, to create American jobs, to generate revenue to help reduce the deficit, and to decrease our dependence on foreign energy.

The United States Government has had a long history of sporadic attempts to respond to oil and gas prices. Usually, we have missed the mark. But, unfortunately, oil is still the lifeblood of the world and will be for most of our lives. That is why 70 countries and 31 States in the United States are involved in the process. Prices are influenced by the signals that are given by worldwide circumstances and also by government policy.

These two bills are the first of several signals that this House wants to send to the world and to the economy that says our goal should be to come as close to economic and energy self-sufficiency and independence as possible. We are not an energy-poor Nation; and we need to be developing the resources in every way possible, including in the gulf, including in the Outer Continental Shelf, and including on our land sources. That is our future if we want to do anything to create jobs and help the American people. That is specifically what these two bills are aimed to do.

With such, Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule and a fair rule; and the underlying piece of legislation is entirely worthy of our support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today the House considers the BP respill bills. That might not be what they are officially called, but it's a much more accurate title for this legislation. It's clear that the authors of these BP respill bills did not learn any lessons from the Deepwater Horizon disasters. These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for offshore workers, 11 of whom died on the Deepwater Horizon. These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for the environment, which was coated with 4.1 million barrels of oil along the Gulf Coast and is killing fish and wildlife in the area to this day as a result of BP's recklessness.

These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for our national security because they reinforce the complete myth that America can somehow drill our way out of dependence on oil. And these bills are more dangerous for the economy, risking destroying fishing and tourism jobs in affected areas.

But one thing these bills do not do is make filling up at the pump any more affordable at all for American families. According to the American Petroleum Institute itself, the main advocacy group for oil interests, even if we opened all Federal land to oil drilling, including offshore areas, including Alaska's wildlife refuge and all Federal land that is in the national parks, they can't even say that it would reduce gas prices or oil prices. In fact, the cheap oil analyst at the Oil Price Information Service, which calculates gas prices for AAA, the motorist organization, said: "This drill, drill, drill thing is tired. It's a simplistic way of looking for a solution that doesn't exist."

So if this legislation isn't about reducing the price at the pump, what is it about? It's about exploiting our legitimate concerns about high gas prices to deliver another huge giveaway to Big Oil, an industry that made over \$35 billion in profits in the last quarter alone. Meanwhile, the majority refuses to end Big Oil's nearly \$50 billion of special interest tax breaks.

Yesterday in the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN brought forth a bill that would have ended the giveaway of tax revenue to Big Oil. Unfortunately, the Republican majority chose not to allow that amendment in this rule.

Had that been allowed under the open rule that Mr. MCGOVERN proposed, I would have brought forth an amendment on the floor to use those \$50 billion of revenue to reduce the corporate tax rate to help create jobs in America. Instead, the Republican majority is continuing to seek to keep American taxes high, to keep corporate taxes high, and this is another example of a job-destroying bill that keeps taxes high while picking winners and losers in the economy and using government subsidies to aid an industry that is one of our most profitable industries.

We should allow American businesses of all sizes to compete. The America corporate tax rate of 35 percent is higher than most of the rest of the world, which is why many companies continue to engage in operations overseas. If we can reduce it from 35 percent to 30 or 28 or 26 percent—and we could have done had Mr. MCGOVERN's amendment passed in the Rules Committee yesterday, and that is one of the reasons I oppose this rule today—that would create an enormous engine of economic growth.

While frequently the Republicans give lip service to lower taxes, they continue to use special interest tax breaks to keep taxes high on small- and middle-sized American companies that don't have the same lobbyists here in Washington to lobby us for special interest tax breaks.

We know that Big Oil would rather do without the fuss of showing that they can drill safely; but that's what this bill, in fact, delivers. This legislation states that the Interior Secretary must act on any drilling permit within 60 days, or it's automatically approved. What should be a very serious process to ensure safe drilling, to ensure that there aren't further disasters, and to ensure that jobs are not destroyed turns into little more than a rubber stamp, a rubber stamp for the further degradation of our economy and of our environment.

The second bill this rule makes in order claims to restart the process, or issuing, of oil and gas leases. Now, what the majority is doing in this is essentially validating what the administration has already done. The administration has already restarted offshore drilling in February. In fact, the administration has announced plans to offer all three Gulf of Mexico lease

sales that are mandated in this bill this year or early next year. Again, this particular policy is one that I don't agree with fully with the administration, but I am glad to see that the Republican majority is validating President Obama's leadership on this energy issue.

Together, these bills will not relieve pain at the pump, but they will increase the chances of another Deepwater Horizon disaster, costing lives, livelihoods, and hurting some of our precious natural resources. Why? Because that's what Big Oil wants. If Big Oil wants to keep taxes high for American companies, if Big Oil wants to destroy jobs, then the Republican majority is giving them that. In fact, even the problem the majority purports to be addressing with these bills, the speed of permitting in the gulf and restarting offshore oil drilling, doesn't even exist.

Here are the facts: Following the temporary pause on deepwater drilling last year, what Secretary Salazar listed in October, the oil industry wasn't able to demonstrate that it possessed the capacity to contain a deepwater blowout until February 2011. Once oil companies demonstrated that they had the capability to contain a blowout, the first permit was issued 11 days later, February 28, 2011. There have now been a total of 10 deepwater drilling permits issued since that time. In addition, there have been 39 shallow water permits approved since last October, matching the number from before the spill. Let me repeat that: matching the number of permits from before the spill. If anything, the majority, by acting through this bill, is effectively congratulating the administration on its leadership for speedily approving permits.

In addition, in the gulf region, the number of jobs that depend on tourism and fishing is five times the number of jobs related to the oil and gas industry. Gulf jobs related to oil and gas and other resource extraction total about 154,000. The total number of jobs for tourism and fishing are 777,000 jobs. So with this bill, the majority is putting at risk those 777,000 jobs for the benefit of 154,000. We should not put them at risk just to make the permitting process easier for Big Oil to exploit.

□ 0940

Passage of these bills is not good for the gulf coast's economy or its ecology, although it is best for Big Oil.

Again, while I appreciate the Republican majority's efforts to validate the leadership of President Obama on energy issues, this rule could be a lot better. Rather than keeping corporate taxes high, we could help make America more competitive by reducing corporate taxes and helping make American businesses more competitive, including the critical tourism and fishing industries in the gulf coast.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of very quick points, if I could.

Once again, the purpose of these two bills is to start our process going towards Americans having adequate energy supplies to live their lives. And it's one of the things that you either increase production or you try to cut back. Our goal is to increase the production.

The idea that what we are doing is in some way making safety less significant is silly. There are new safety rules that have been in place. They are ready. They are prepared. They are ready to go forward.

The myth of subsidies to Big Oil is one of the things also that we need to talk about because even my fellow Democrats have admitted that the President's plan to push a tax hike on energy taxes does result in the loss of American jobs and higher taxes on independent oil and gas companies.

I love the fact that we always spin things by talking about Big Oil. But the nonpartisan Politifact.com noted that a majority of the U.S. oil production comes not from the biggest multinational oil companies but from independent firms. American production activities are dominated by these independent producers who drill 95 percent of the Nation's natural gas and oil wells, accounting for as much as 67 percent of the total U.S. natural gas and oil production.

Often we try to find some kind of straw man which to attack, and the idea of Big Oil is one of those easiest ones to do. But in reality, if those tax hikes were to go into place on production, you would not be hitting the Big Oil companies; you're going to be hitting small companies which have 100 or fewer employees, not only offshore, but on the shore as well. That is the attack.

I'm sorry. I am not validating President Obama's leadership on this issue. To me, leadership means you do something. Inaction is not leadership.

It's not the government picking winners and losers. What this administration is doing by the de facto moratorium, the inability to move forward on this issue is simply picking losers, losers in the field, losers for America, losers in jobs, and that is wrong.

This tries to get us going ahead in an area and in a way in which we can do it, we should do it, we have the capability of doing it. All we simply need to do is do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule because my constituents in the State of Rhode Island can no longer wait for action to reduce the price of gas at the pump, and this bill does nothing at all to address this issue today.

Just last week the price of gasoline shot up to more than \$4 and, as we all know, this is an increasingly familiar story for States all across this Nation, hurting families and small businesses.

And it really underscores what I heard from my own constituents, hundreds of men, women, and families all throughout Rhode Island in recent weeks. We have got to find immediate solutions to lower the price of gas.

But the legislation before us this morning calling for domestic drilling will not provide the short-term relief that's needed right now. At the same time, it will make drilling more dangerous for our environment, for our economy, and for our national security.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have refused to take up the recommendations of the independent commission convened after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill and instead, continue to fight to protect Big Oil and continue to fight to protect subsidies while the American people are struggling with higher gasoline prices.

We've got to find solutions to lower the cost of fuel now. We've got to find solutions and ways to end the \$4 billion in tax breaks that pad the profits of Big Oil.

And the way to do that, Mr. Speaker, is to bring legislation already drafted, already introduced to the House floor for a vote immediately that would address the issue of the rising cost of gas. Legislation to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and legislation aimed at preventing Big Oil from engaging in price-gouging schemes which drive up the price of oil at the pump would go much further than anything that's in this bill and would help to ease the pain at the pump that American families are experiencing.

We need to do those two things. End the subsidies, and begin to address this urgent problem now. And stop taking measures that continue to advance the interests of Big Oil rather than the American people.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. For the moment I will reserve the balance of my time and enjoy the spin.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. We all understand the desire to do something about high gas prices, and we all sympathize with families in this economy who are struggling with \$4 a gallon gasoline.

But these bills will do nothing to provide American families with relief. They could threaten coastal ecosystems and the millions of Americans who rely on them.

It's been a year since we watched the horror in the gulf coast. We found that the agencies who oversee offshore drilling and the oil companies that engage in it were not prepared for the disaster. And Americans will be paying for that failure for years.

The administration has taken a number of steps to prevent future spills. Unfortunately, these bills undermine that process, making drilling less safe.

Instead of pretending as if one of these terrible environmental disasters never happened, Congress should implement the recommendations of the oil spill commission. We should be pursuing legislation that will reduce our dependence on oil by investing in things that give American commuters choices, in terms of more efficient vehicles, transportation alternatives, alternative fuels.

This bill, fortunately, will never be enacted into law. But I'm disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make in order any of the amendments to repeal unnecessary tax subsidies to the oil industry. At a time of record profits, it's adding insult to injury that billions of dollars are going to flow to the largest oil companies and make no difference to the consumer, no difference in the production of oil. It just adds to the bottom line of these international corporations.

I hope that at some point the House will be able to deal with these subsidies, which, even our Republican Speaker recently said, should be examined. And I've had legislation ready and ready to go for months now, and I hope it gets a chance to be voted on on this floor.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the subsidy issue, the simple fact of the matter is that the Republicans are not for free markets. But what they are for is Big Oil co-opting free markets. In fact, 70 percent of all energy-related subsidies go to fossil fuels like oil and coal. Less than 5 percent of subsidies go to renewable energies like wind and solar.

The gentleman from Utah pointed out that many of these subsidies help small drillers, and, in fact, that can be true. But it is easy to apply changes only to the Big Oil companies and not even affect independent producers.

There's simply no excuse not to end this corporate welfare which keeps taxes for all Americans who pay their taxes artificially high. In fact, at the same time that BP was reaping sizable tax benefits from leasing the Deepwater Horizon rig, it turned out that the company was using the tax break for the oil industry to write off 70 percent of the rent for Deepwater Horizon. That tax subsidy cost American taxpayers \$225,000 a day since the lease for Deepwater Horizon began. And that's just one example of many.

I also want to address some misperceptions regarding President Obama's policies regarding oil resources. The Obama administration is allowing, on average, more drilling than the Bush administration did. In fact, the Obama administration approved more leases in 2010 than the Bush administration did in any year except one of his presidency.

Again, in moving forward and reissuing permits, which the administration has already begun to do, this bill helps validate President Obama's leadership on this issue.

The real issues at hand are the subsidies that the industry continues to receive. As long as we continue a policy of using taxpayer dollars to artificially pick winners and losers in the economy, the winner here being Big Oil, the loser being American taxpayers, we will continue to hurt energy security, destroy jobs, and continue to put our environment at risk.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0950

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, Mr. BISHOP.

I am from Louisiana, and of course these leasing issues, the issues of drilling and oil production are very important to my State. And certainly any issue with regard to oil spills affects my State the most in the last year or so because of the Deepwater Horizon.

But here is the point I want to make: The President has said that oil production in the United States and offshore in the gulf is the highest it has ever been. When I asked Secretary Salazar in the Natural Resources Committee, he said the same thing. Then I asked Mr. Bromwich and he gave the same answer.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the oil production off the Gulf of Mexico peaked at 1.7 million barrels a day. It is now down to 1.5 million barrels a day, and in the next year it will decrease by another 225,000 barrels a day. And even if we restore drilling permits at the level they have been previously, it will continue to decline over the next several years.

So I think we can ill afford, Mr. Speaker, at a time when our gas prices continue to go up, to continue this activity that we have, this ruse, where we have a slowatorium off the Gulf of Mexico.

I think we are up to about 12 permits in the deep water at this point. And I was speaking with the gentleman, an expert on this, yesterday. He said that we normally pace about 40 or 50 permits a year. So that means that we are at a fraction of what the actual permitting process would normally be in the best of times.

Now, some would say, well, we haven't proven that it is safe. Well, if that is true, why is the administration releasing permits? Obviously that is proof that the administration is comfortable that we can again drill in the deep water off the Gulf of Mexico.

So I say today that with America being at gas prices that will soon approach \$5 a gallon and the USGS now saying that we now have more coal, natural gas, and oil than we have ever thought we would have, really more than any other country in the world, including Russia, and many more times than what Saudi Arabia has, 1.3 trillion barrels of oil equivalent if you add coal, natural gas, and oil, why in the world are we pulling back on the explo-

ration and production of these vital resources that we have?

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

I will say in summary, I am from the Fourth District of Louisiana where we have a veritable Saudi Arabia of natural gas in my district, the most natural gas in North America and the fourth largest deposit in the world, and we didn't even know about it 4 years ago. That just goes to show you how new technologies in the area of exploration and development are creating many more resources than we ever thought we had, and it will help stabilize our prices.

So I ask that we pass this bill today and that we finally get this country back onto stable footing.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that, immediately after the House adopts this rule, we will bring up H.R. 1689, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act of 2011.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation, in its analysis of the administration's budget, stated that the repeal of oil and gas preferences are "likely to have no effect on the world price of fossil fuels, and any increase in prices for domestically consumed fossil fuels are likely to be attenuated."

Again, when we talk about ending the giveaway to Big Oil and Gas, it will have no effect with regard to actual energy prices.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this very important issue, important in having an immediate impact on America's families.

They are feeling the pain at the pump. Our families, our workers, our small businesses, every day it gets worse for them, the price at the pump. So what can we do about it? Well, we can do a number of things, and we will, that we have been advocating for.

Of course we must increase domestic production, and there is a way to do that. But that is not all that we have to do. The American people understand that their tax dollars are going to subsidies for Big Oil. If we ended those subsidies, we could save over \$30 billion for the American people.

To put it into context, my colleagues, for the first quarter of this

year, the Big Five oil companies made profits of over \$30 billion. Why are we, the taxpayers, subsidizing their drilling of oil when they are making huge profits, doing it in the free market?

President Obama has written to leaders in Congress asking to bring a bill to the floor to end these subsidies. I have written to Speaker BOEHNER asking him to do so. He has said the oil companies should pay their fair share. Mr. RYAN, the chair of the Budget Committee, has acknowledged that in his own district. And yet, in the budget that is proposed by the Republicans, Big Oil still gets a big subsidy from the taxpayer. It would mean a great deal to us, in a situation where we are saying to seniors, We are going to cut Medicare; you are going to have to pay \$6,000 a year more, at a minimum, for fewer benefits because we want to cut Medicare at the same time we are giving tax cuts, big tax breaks to Big Oil.

So here we are today. Just last week, ExxonMobil reported \$10.7 billion in profits during the first quarter of 2011. Over \$10 billion in profits, a 69 percent jump from last year. In fact, this quarter marked some of the largest oil profits since 2008.

Democrats are introducing comprehensive legislation. Mr. TIM BISHOP is going to be leading us on the previous question, which we urge our colleagues to vote "no" on so that we can bring up Mr. BISHOP's legislation.

Much of what that does is to eliminate tax breaks for the five largest oil companies, saving over \$31 billion over 10 years. Think of it. We are trying to just save \$31 billion over 10 years, when the oil companies made \$31 billion in profits in the first quarter of this year. That is so unfair to the taxpayer.

Legislation to ensure that oil companies are paying the royalties that are due the American taxpayer. Hold Big Oil and the industry accountable for price gouging at the pump. Use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to increase the oil supply and combat price hikes. In addition to that, we must end the harmful speculation which Wall Street tells us accounts for a large percentage of the increase in the price at the pump.

We also will have measures that increase American energy production. It is very important. We don't disagree that we have to have production, but we do agree that we have to do other things that have a more immediate effect on the price at the pump. And we can do that. And we must invest in our clean energy future, which will reduce our dependence on foreign oil, which is a national security issue, which will enable us to create new green jobs in our country, a jobs issue which is a moral obligation we have to the American people to create jobs.

But what the Republicans are proposing today has blinders on it. It does not recognize that what it is doing does nothing to reduce the price at the pump in the short term; that there are

many other avenues that we can proceed down in addition to increasing domestic production; and that the American people need something fresher and newer on this than being sabotaged every few years about the price at the pump while we, the taxpayers, are giving subsidies to Big Oil to drill while they are making profits in the first quarter of 1 year that are almost more than what we would save for the taxpayer.

□ 1000

They don't need a subsidy to drill. They don't need an incentive. They have the profit motive, and it has served them well.

We in this Congress have to be thinking about the future. How do we prevent this from happening again, but also how do we have the most immediate effect on the price at the pump? Congressman TIM BISHOP gives us that opportunity today, recognizing that we want to have the full diversity of energy possibilities available to us so that the American taxpayer and the American consumer are well-served.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, to allow Mr. TIM BISHOP to bring up an initiative that he will talk about that addresses concerns of the American people that they know about, that they want to end subsidies on Big Oil, especially when we are talking about it in the context of we must cut investments in Medicare, seniors must pay more, but don't ask us to cut subsidies to Big Oil. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who lives in this area and understands the situation firsthand.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't disagree more with the comments that were made by the minority leader from California. What we are talking about here are high gas prices that people are paying at the pump today and why we are in this situation. We are in this situation because of this administration's policies that have shut off the American energy supply.

This is supply and demand. Why do prices go up? Well, gee-whiz, if the President of the United States says by policy we are going to close off billions of barrels of known reserves in America, what do you think that does to prices? Do you think that actually lowers prices? Of course, as you are seeing prices skyrocket at the pump, it is because of these policies. That is why we have seen the price of gasoline more than double since Barack Obama has been in office.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are bringing today and what this rule addresses is the ability to start opening up some of those known areas here in America, because, again, our demand continues to increase for oil here in this country,

and while the President is out tilting at windmills, the prices at the pump continue to skyrocket because the President is saying run those jobs off to foreign countries, like Brazil.

He is bragging that he wants to create more energy jobs in Brazil. We are saying, Mr. President, we have thousands of jobs here in America that we can create today. We have got billions of dollars that are being sent to foreign countries, many of whom don't like us, by the way. We can bring those dollars back. And, by the way, that can also help us pay down the national debt that is out of control right now. And that is what this bill addresses.

And what's their answer on the other side? The President is talking about raising taxes on American energy, and the minority leader from California just emphasized it. She talked about a \$30 billion tax increase on American energy production. You want to talk about a warped policy? Look at what their plan is.

We're saying let's open up supply. Let's create jobs in America. I have seen it in south Louisiana. We have lost over 13,000 jobs in the energy industry just because of the President's policies in the last year, where he shut down production and said you can't go back to work drilling safely for known oil in America. But he wants to run those jobs off to foreign countries. So that is what is happening.

We saw one of the deepwater rigs go to Egypt just in the last few months. So an employer is saying, I want to take a thousand jobs and it's better to do business in Egypt because of these radical American policies on energy right now. So we are trying to turn that around and say let's actually explore for energy here in America, creating thousands more jobs in America and bringing in billions more dollars that pay down our deficit.

Their answer is raise \$30 billion in taxes and, you know, go talk about Big Oil. Big Oil is not going to pay that. Big Oil is leaving. They are going to foreign countries. It is our local energy producers here in America who will pay that tax. And you know what that ends up equating to? That means higher prices at the pump, \$30 billion in higher prices at the pump, because of their policy.

And they're bragging about it. They're saying, let's raise taxes on American energy. By the way, their bill doesn't apply to energy that is produced in Saudi Arabia. So what do you think is going to happen?

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Now more oil is going to be coming in from Saudi Arabia because of their policies.

We have got to reverse this radical approach and actually create jobs in America, create energy in America and bring down the skyrocketing price of gasoline at the pump, and it can all be

accomplished with this legislation here today that I strongly support.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

The oil companies are making windfall profits right now. Look at what just happened in the last 3 months: ExxonMobil made \$10 billion; Shell, \$8 billion; BP, \$7 billion; \$6 billion for Chevron; \$3 billion for Conoco. Yet the Republicans oppose allowing the Democrats to bring out here a motion that will take away tax breaks that are meant for companies that make toasters or aluminum foil, but not the oil industry.

The oil industry does not need a subsidy from the American taxpayer as they are tipping consumers upside down at the pump every single day. We need to take back those tax breaks and use them; use them to reduce the deficit, use them to help grandma with Medicare, use them for things that are important, but not for oil companies at this time.

So, what have the Republicans decided to do? The Republicans instead have decided to squeeze—to squeeze Medicare, to squeeze the program for grandma, so that they can find the revenues to give tax breaks for oil companies. I will tell you, the GOP has set up a legislative drill rig on top of the Medicare program to poke holes in our seniors' safety net. That is right, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are building a pipeline into the pocketbooks of our seniors so that they can pump them dry. No money for Medicare, but plenty of breaks for the oil companies. And they are going to deny the Democrats the ability to have a vote here on the House floor on those tax breaks for oil companies here today.

There is one thing that we can do in order to ensure that the speculators in the marketplace are told there is a cop on the beat, and that is to deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve right now. In 1991, Bush the First used it. The price went down 33 percent. In 2000, the President used the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, President Clinton. It went down 18 percent. Bush the Second used it in 2005 after Katrina. The price went down 9 percent. That is the weapon we can use right now, and send a message to Big Oil, to OPEC, and to the speculators that we mean business.

What the Republicans are saying here today is we are going to cut Medicare in order to have tax breaks for the wealthiest oil companies in the history of the world. That is not what the American people want to hear at this time of high energy prices in our country, with a dagger pointed right at the heart of the American economy, and that is what OPEC and the speculators and Big Oil are doing to our country.

Vote "yes" today on the previous question to give the American taxpayers the relief they need from these

gifts which we give to Big Oil. Vote “no” on the rule and “yes” on the previous question.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I rise to ask in particular that we have a reasoned debate on this question.

I come from the gulf region and was appalled at the horror of the BP oil spill. My constituents are still suffering from that spill. I recognize that we have a dual responsibility, and that is to ensure that those individuals are made whole—and I might add that a better compensation system needs to be in place—but also that we restore jobs.

A civil discussion is what is needed. As an oil and gas lawyer and also a member of the Homeland Security Committee which addresses the question of our own safety and security, we have to find a way to restore offshore deepwater drilling in a safe and secure manner.

□ 1010

I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not take an amendment that I offered that would have modified the processing procedures of H.R. 1229, to restart that leasing process to extend the time for the Department of the Interior to review safely and securely and to eliminate the deemed provision, though I am supporting the Holt amendment and, of course, the Moran amendment.

But, frankly, I think the issue is, energy at this time is multitasking, from nuclear energy to solar, to wind, to biofuels and fossil fuels (oil and gas). If we are in agreement with Brazil to do offshore deepwater drilling off the coast of Brazil, we need to restart that deepwater drilling here in the United States, safely and securely. As relates to the expanded lease sales, the question has to be whether States are prepared for that offshore drilling and whether or not we have secured the kind of technology that will allow us to do it safely and securely. I believe new containment processes are being put in place to help deepwater drilling to lower costs for the America people.

Energy companies have organized something called a containment group to develop that new technology. What I would say is that this discussion should not be captured by special interests where we try the “get you” politics for the Department of the Interior or “get you” politics for President Obama. This is the time to get the best politics for the American people, to bring down gasoline prices, invest in energy which includes deepwater drilling and oil and gas, and let’s get going on helping the American people to boost energy resource and to create jobs.

I ask for a reasoned discussion on this important issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we heard from our friend from Massachusetts the allegation that we over here on this side of the aisle were squeezing Medicare. Good grief. Even now has the gentleman from Massachusetts not read the ObamaCare bill? It cuts \$500 billion out of Medicare.

We heard from Minority Leader PELOSI that we have a moral obligation to create jobs. Then what this administration has done under her definition is immoral, because this administration has been killing jobs. We hear so much from the other side about the working poor. Coming from an area in Texas where we have lots of hardworking poor folks, that’s who is being hurt by this administration’s policies. When you shut off the jobs in the Gulf of Mexico, when you come out and say we’re going to tax these American companies even more, we’re going to take away their subsidies, they’re called business deductions, the cost of drilling, the cost of doing business.

And who will be taxed? American companies. We will be putting further tariffs on, not foreign products but American companies. We drive ourselves more and more to foreign oil, and that’s a mistake. Price controls is what President Carter did. He was going to show the energy companies, and as a result we had no gas, we ran out of gas, it was a disaster. Salazar has shut down leases that were let after a 7-year process that could have produced as many as a trillion barrels of oil.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOHMERT. You could have an immediate effect if you would encourage your party’s President to change course and start creating jobs. The energy industry would create a million jobs across the country if we opened up the OCS. We’ve heard the testimony a million jobs if ANWR is opened. A million jobs if the North Slope is opened.

What is more, we’ve also heard from people that know that a dollar out of four is most likely attributable to speculation. The speculators look at what we do. And we make it harder and harder to produce our own energy, the speculation keeps going up. You could turn around a dollar out of four overnight if we showed the world, we’re going to use our own energy.

This country has been blessed with more natural resources when you put them all together, and this administration and the former majority has done more to put them off-limits. It’s time to get back to what the former Speaker said was our moral obligation. You lower energy prices by using more of our own energy, you create jobs, and you bring down the price that is killing the working poor. And that’s a moral obligation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, a former member of the Rules Committee, Ms. CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. In the State of Florida, we are still recovering from last year’s BP oil blowout disaster. We’re recovering economically and environmentally from the policies of the past that elevated oil company profits over safety.

To add insult to injury, every summer the price of gas goes up, and we see it in Florida because our economy is largely tied to tourism, and we see it and it pains us and consumers know that they are messing around with the American consumer. They understand that the Wall Street speculators are making a profit, maybe 20 percent in the price of gas, and that is not fair.

Why don’t we start with a meaningful energy policy that addresses those speculators? Instead of continuing oil company giveaways, why don’t we start with ending the taxpayer subsidies to the big oil companies? Just in the first quarter of this year, BP has made over \$5 billion in profit. Exxon has made over \$10 billion in profit. With the skyrocketing debt and deficit, why is it fair for the American taxpayer to be subsidizing the most profitable companies in the world? That is where we should begin this debate today, ending those oil company subsidies to bring down the price of gas and tackling the outrageous profits that go to the oil companies while the consumer is paying through the nose at the pump.

My Republican friends are on the wrong track when it comes to energy policy. We’ve got to prohibit Wall Street speculators from artificially inflating prices. We’ve got to adopt the oil spill commission’s recommendations to make drilling safe before we charge ahead and open up new areas to drill. There are millions of acres to drill. Millions of acres. All we’re asking is fairness and safety as they proceed in doing so so the American taxpayer will not have to pay any more.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY). He is a member of the Resources Committee that provides a great deal of insight from his personal background.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, what amazes me is that the gentlelady from Florida must have missed the AP report a couple of weeks ago when it said that Florida was getting ready to experience another oil crisis and it was in the fact that the price at the pump is going to impact tourism.

Tourism. That’s what I hear here all the time. Our tourism jobs. Jobs that normally pay minimum wage. When in my State, oil and gas jobs pay much better than that.

If we want to get this economy rolling, we have to provide that economy

with affordable energy, not make-believe energy, not energy that comes in possibly 40 or 50 years from now. We need to apply affordable energy to this economy now. It will not get any better in this country until we give middle class Americans affordable energy, so that they can get to and from their job.

Repealing section 199 will endanger 600,000 barrels per day, 10 percent of our domestic production by 2017. Boy, that's really going to lower the price at the pump.

They're concerned about Medicare and Medicaid. Well, where do you think those profits to shareholders go? Do you know who those shareholders are? They're the American people. Do you know how many pension plans hold those shares of Exxon and Chevron in their portfolio?

Why are we picking those winners and losers? As a freshman, it's hard for me to understand how we continue in this town to reward failure and punish winners. It just amazes me.

□ 1020

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, one thing we do know is that our constituents are paying about \$4 a gallon for gas. What they have to ask is: Where's all this money that they're paying going? Well, as you have seen, it's going in profits to the biggest oil companies. In fact, almost \$30 billion went just in the last 3 months to the top three oil companies—about \$11 billion to Exxon, about \$9 billion to Shell, and over \$7 billion to BP. Remember BP? And that's after they've taken \$5 billion in subsidies from the taxpayer and as in the case of ExxonMobil paid zero corporate taxes.

Well, what are they doing with that profit? What they're doing is spending 90 percent of it on stock buy-backs so that, of course, the remaining stock outstanding becomes even more valuable, thus enabling their executives to become even wealthier, and to stock dividends for their shareholders. And the remaining 10 percent goes to oil and gas exploration and to TV advertising so they can convince the American public otherwise.

What this bill will do is to enable those who own oil company stock and run oil companies to grab up our last remaining oil reserves at a cost of \$30 to \$40 a barrel so that they can then sell it at \$100 a barrel to make more profit. The motivation for this bill is more about scoring political points and currying favor with the oil and gas industry than the current House majority can't seem to coddle enough. And they're betting that the next oil spill disaster that this legislation could enable through a return to weaker regulation—weaker regulation than we had before the gulf oil spill disaster, will not occur on their watch. That oil spill disaster that spilled 200 million gallons into the Gulf Coast waters occurred at a time of even tougher regulation than this bill will create.

They are counting on the oil companies remembering and the consumers and taxpayers forgetting.

This bill should be defeated.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this rule brings forward two bills that are the first of the majority party's "amnesia acts," which ignore the safety and environmental concerns that were laid bare last spring and summer by the largest oil spill in United States waters. For the sponsors of this bill, it's as if the worst and most costly oil spill in history never happened. Last week, the Big Five oil companies reported \$32 billion in profits. That's just for the first 3 months of this year. Yet the majority's solution is to protect the billions of dollars of tax breaks each year for these companies.

Just to give you an idea, Exxon pays an effective tax rate of 0.4 percent. I imagine every person in America would like to have a tax rate of essentially zero. Yet the majority's solution is to protect these tax breaks. Furthermore, they deem the environmental and safety regulations that existed before this accident in the gulf as satisfactory. And let's be clear: How much will these bills reduce gas prices for the American people? Zero dollars and zero cents.

Scientists, engineers, and our best energy analysts say we cannot drill our way to lower gas prices. This won't do it. Let's address the financial speculation that we've heard about—the real cause of high gasoline prices. Exxon, with those huge prices, what do they do? They buy back their stock.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HOLT. These actions needlessly endanger the lives of offshore workers, imperil the resources and livelihoods of fishermen. This legislation is designed to give Big Oil more handouts. These companies are not being responsible citizens.

Vote "no" on the rule, vote "yes" on my amendment, vote "no" on the bills.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. I rise to oppose this rule.

Americans are feeling pain at the pump. Rising gasoline prices—and they're rising, folks—it's going to cost the average person another \$800 per year at the rate of these increases. That wipes out the tax breaks that most Americans have just received, and it's going to hurt our economy, and it's hurting our national security. These oil companies are making in-

creased profits as the money in our wallets flies right into the gas tanks.

Now is the time to consider a sensible energy policy and to strip subsidies from oil companies. It shocks every American taxpayer to know that they're required to fork over an additional \$40 billion-plus over the next decade to give tax subsidies and giveaways to these enormously profitable companies. What are they doing with that money? They're taking up to 90 percent of that and buying their stocks back, increasing their own personal wealth.

So let's be clear. Oil companies don't need it. If you don't believe me, ask them. The former CEO of Shell oil says, "With higher oil prices, the subsidies aren't necessary."

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say they're for the all-of-the-above strategy when it comes to oil. Let's be clear. They support oil above all—above Medicare, above putting police on the streets, above increasing reading teachers, and above protecting our coastal communities.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), another great new member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. This isn't about oil company profits. This is about supply and demand. We don't have the supply necessary to meet the energy needs in this country. But the American people know that we've got the resources here in this country, whether it's offshore, on the Outer Continental Shelf, or on Federal lands that have currently under this administration been taken off the table for energy production. Supply and demand drives the price. We are reliant on foreign sources of oil, and a foreign group known as OPEC determines the price of that oil they sell to us. We've got the resource in this country. This legislation will put the gulf back to work, meeting the energy needs for the American people.

I'm a small business owner. I doubt many people that serve in this body have ever run a business, met a payroll, and tried to meet their overhead. I can tell you what \$4.85 a gallon in August of 2008 meant to my small business only running two trucks on the road. I can only imagine what the loggers, what the truckers, what the farmers, and the other industries in the Third Congressional District of South Carolina are feeling today with the experience of rising oil prices.

The gentlelady from Florida said that in the summer, prices go up. We're not in summer yet. Prices are going up because of supply and demand. We have the opportunity to meet our demand right here by harvesting American resources for our American energy needs.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

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

With regard to the last comment, it is the oil cartels that drive prices, not the normal functions of the market and supply and demand.

With regard to the oil subsidies, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity here today to see where the Republicans and the Democrats in the House stand on deficit reduction. Mr. Speaker, by defeating the previous question, we can and we will reduce the deficit by over \$12.8 billion. We have the chance to have the discussion around the continuing resolution, around the budget, around deficit reduction. And here we have an opportunity, without impacting the price of oil, without impacting what consumers pay at the pump, to reduce the deficit by \$12.8 billion by defeating the previous question. I think that's what the American people want to see.

The American people spoke out in the last election. Let's reduce the deficit. Let's work across the aisle to see what we can do to cut unnecessary government expenditures, to make those decisions to help make sure that we can leave something other than a legacy of debt to the next generation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is an easy one. Let's defeat the previous question and reduce the deficit by \$12.8 billion.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a document from the Treasury Department which states that the manufacturing deduction for oil and gas effectively provides a lower rate of tax with respect to a favored source of income. In fact, it distorts the market by encouraging more investment in the oil and gas industry than would occur under a neutral system.

Again, by returning to the free market, we are able to reduce the deficit by over \$12.8 billion instead of having Big Government trying to pick winners and losers in the economy with regard to tax policy.

GENERAL EXPLANATIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL YEAR 2012 REVENUE PROPOSALS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, FEBRUARY 2011

REPEAL DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING DEDUCTION FOR OIL AND NATURAL GAS COMPANIES
CURRENT LAW

A deduction is allowed with respect to income attributable to domestic production activities (the manufacturing deduction). For taxable years beginning after 2009, the manufacturing deduction is generally equal to 9 percent of the lesser of qualified production activities income for the taxable year or taxable income for the taxable year, limited to 50 percent of the W-2 wages of the taxpayer for the taxable year. The deduction for income from oil and gas production activities is computed at a 6 percent rate.

Qualified production activities income is generally calculated as a taxpayer's domes-

tic production gross receipts (i.e., the gross receipts derived from any lease, rental, license, sale, exchange, or other disposition of qualifying production property manufactured, produced, grown, or extracted by the taxpayer in whole or significant part within the United States; any qualified film produced by the taxpayer; or electricity, natural gas, or potable water produced by the taxpayer in the United States) minus the cost of goods sold and other expenses, losses, or deductions attributable to such receipts.

The manufacturing deduction generally is available to all taxpayers that generate qualified production activities income, which under current law includes income from the sale, exchange or disposition of oil, natural gas or primary products thereof produced in the United States.

REASONS FOR CHANGE

The President agreed at the G-20 Summit in Pittsburgh to phase out subsidies for fossil fuels so that the United States can transition to a 21st-century energy economy. The manufacturing deduction for oil and gas effectively provides a lower rate of tax with respect to a favored source of income. The lower rate of tax, like other oil and gas preferences the Administration proposes to repeal, distorts markets by encouraging more investment in the oil and gas industry than would occur under a neutral system. This market distortion is detrimental to long-term energy security and is also inconsistent with the Administration's policy of supporting a clean energy economy, reducing our reliance on oil, and cutting carbon pollution. Moreover, the tax subsidy for oil and gas must ultimately be financed with taxes that result in underinvestment in other, potentially more productive, areas of the economy.

PROPOSAL

The proposal would retain the overall manufacturing deduction, but exclude from the definition of domestic production gross receipts all gross receipts derived from the sale, exchange or other disposition of oil, natural gas or a primary product thereof for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011. There is a parallel proposal to repeal the domestic manufacturing deduction for coal and other hard mineral fossil fuels.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to submit for the RECORD a July 3, 2010, New York Times article regarding oil subsidies.

Again, this talks of the oil subsidies that continue to benefit this industry to the detriment of the American taxpayer and to the detriment of future generations of Americans who will continue to suffer under an increasing mountain of debt unless we defeat the previous question here today.

[From NY Times, July 3, 2010]

ON SUBSIDIES

But an examination of the American tax code indicates that oil production is among the most heavily subsidized businesses, with tax breaks available at virtually every stage of the exploration and extraction process.

According to the most recent study by the Congressional Budget Office, capital investments like oil field leases and drilling equipment are taxed at an effective rate of 9 percent, significantly lower than the overall rate of 25 percent for businesses in general and lower than virtually any other industry.

And for many small and midsize oil companies, the tax on capital investments is so low that it is more than eliminated by various credits. These companies' returns on those investments are often higher after taxes than before.

Efforts to curtail the tax breaks are likely to face fierce opposition in Congress; the oil and natural gas industry has spent \$340 million on lobbyists since 2008, according to the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics, which monitors political spending.

Some of the tax breaks date back nearly a century, when they were intended to encourage exploration in an era of rudimentary technology, when costly investments frequently produced only dry holes. Because of one lingering provision from the Tariff Act of 1913, many small and midsize oil companies based in the United States can claim deductions for the lost value of tapped oil fields far beyond the amount the companies actually paid for the oil rights.

Other tax breaks were born of international politics. In an attempt to deter Soviet influence in the Middle East in the 1950s, the State Department backed a Saudi Arabian accounting maneuver that reclassified the royalties charged by foreign governments to American oil drillers. Saudi Arabia and others began to treat some of the royalties as taxes, which entitled the companies to subtract those payments from their American tax bills. Despite repeated attempts to forbid this accounting practice, companies continue to deduct the payments. The Treasury Department estimates that it will cost \$8.2 billion over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year after the national tragedy of Deepwater Horizon, the majority party has decided not to address a single problem that led to this economic and environmental tragedy. Instead, the majority is pushing through these bills, simply rubber-stamping offshore drilling and maintaining taxpayer subsidies and giveaways to Big Oil, which increase the deficit.

During a Special Order speech just the other night, a Member on the other side of the aisle said all you need is an eighth grade understanding of supply and demand to understand why gas prices are high and how we can lower them by drilling more. Fortunately, for those of us who have more than an eighth grade education, like economists and other experts, we know that America cannot drill its way out of high gas prices. Even the American Petroleum Institute, the mouthpiece for Big Oil, is saying that we cannot drill our way out. "Drill, Baby, Drill" may look good as a bumper sticker, but it's not a serious energy policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill and to defeat the previous question so we can reduce the deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the minority is asking us to walk down a tangent issue by using negative cue words like "subsidy," so let me walk down that for 30 seconds.

Please realize the U.S. oil and natural gas industry does not receive subsidized payments from the government. The word "subsidy" is inaccurate. Tax deductions should in no way be confused with the concept of subsidies. There are, though, tax deductions that go to all industries. Section 199, which has been talked about by the Democrats, is the domestic manufacturers'

deduction. Every industry—manufacturing, producing, growing, extracting—gets a 9 percent of earned income deduction, not a credit, except for oil and gas; but they are limited to just 6 percent. There is similarity.

They've also asked us to try and walk down a tangent in talking about safety, but the ideas of safety are codified in the legislation before us. They then say let's increase our production by raising taxes. What a non sequitur. Even if you raise taxes against somebody else and try to create some kind of straw man to attack, that is simply a non sequitur, because we do not have a tax problem in this country. We have a production problem; we have a jobs problem. These two bills go directly to that problem. They increase production and increase jobs.

We are not trying to pick winners and losers. We want the Americans to be winners, and that's what our choice is to be. These are two good bills in a time of \$4 and \$5 gasoline prices that are devastating jobs and our economy. These bills surely should be something that every Member should support.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230.

We like to stand on this floor and talk about the things we can't agree on.

On this issue, there's more common ground than you might think.

We all seek to end our dependence on foreign oil because it endangers our environment, hurts our economy and weakens our national security.

Our disagreement lies in potential solutions.

In order to lower gas prices we can and must crack down on oil speculators, end big oil handouts, invest in public transit and electric vehicles and increase corporate average fuel economy standards.

The other side of the argument, the one that is presented today and that we will be voting on, would have you believe that all we need to do is increase our domestic oil resources and remove regulations.

Regulations that have purportedly forced us to look outside our nation's borders for oil.

Our answers do not lie in more oil—our answers lie in conservation and smart investments.

They do not lie in increasing our oil supply, because, let's face it, oil prices are based on a global market, and one nod from OPEC would make any increase in U.S. domestic supplies irrelevant.

Our answers cannot be found by damaging the ecosystems the industries along our coast rely on.

And, our answers will not be solutions that defy our military experts who are saying oil ain't the answer.

Earlier this week, I offered an amendment that was not made in order by the Rules Committee—an amendment that said we must look at the damage we could incur before we extract oil and gas.

This same common sense must be applied to our energy plan.

We can proactively move our nation toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil so that we take control of our energy future, protect our nation, our economy and our environment—and we must.

But, these are not our solutions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230.

Mr. Speaker, these bills aren't serious solutions to bring down high gas prices.

Instead, these are nothing more than a political exercise meant to keep the big oil companies happy.

Big oil companies have every reason to be happy these days.

Last week, ExxonMobil announced first-quarter profits of nearly \$10.7 billion.

Let me repeat that—\$10.7 billion. That's a 69% increase over the same three month period last year.

American taxpayers are paying nearly \$4 dollars a gallon for gasoline and we're still giving \$4 billion in subsidies to Big Oil?

Give me a break.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment—as a standalone bill—that would eliminate subsidies for big oil. My amendment would have done nothing to prevent these drilling bills from moving forward.

Ending subsidies for corporations that are making money hand over fist while gouging Americans shouldn't be controversial.

Apparently, my Republican colleagues on the Rules Committee didn't see it the same way. My amendment wasn't made in order.

Instead, here we are today debating legislation that would boost Big Oil's profits even more without doing anything to lower gas prices for American families.

More drilling won't lower gas prices. It's that simple.

Even with an expedited permitting approval process—that ignores any environmental impact assessment—we wouldn't see any of this additional supply in the market for years.

And the notion that we've run out of areas to drill because we've exhausted all current offshore drilling sites is ludicrous.

Oil companies currently have access to nearly 80 million acres to drill for oil, including 38 million acres offshore. But they produce oil on only 4 percent of those acres.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are so fond of saying these days that people should be able to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

I wish they would apply that same "tough love" to the record profit-making oil companies at a time when American families are being gouged at the pump.

I oppose this Rule and the underlying bills and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 245 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1689) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities with respect to oil and gas activities of major integrated oil companies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority

member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 4 of this resolution.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adopting the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 171, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—241

Adams	Coble	Gohmert
Aderholt	Coffman (CO)	Goodlatte
Akin	Cole	Gosar
Alexander	Conaway	Gowdy
Amash	Costa	Granger
Austria	Cravaack	Graves (GA)
Bachmann	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Bachus	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Barletta	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Bartlett	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Griffith (VA)
Bass (NH)	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Benishkek	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Berg	DesJarlais	Guinta
Biggert	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Dold	Hall
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Hanna
Black	Duffy	Harper
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Bonner	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Bono Mack	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Boren	Farenthold	Hayworth
Boustany	Fincher	Heck
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Heller
Brooks	Flake	Hensarling
Brown (GA)	Fleischmann	Herger
Buchanan	Fleming	Herrera Beutler
Bucshon	Flores	Hinojosa
Buerkle	Forbes	Huelskamp
Burgess	Fortenberry	Huizenga (MI)
Burton (IN)	Fox	Hultgren
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Hunter
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Hurt
Campbell	Gallegly	Issa
Canseco	Gardner	Jackson Lee
Capito	Garrett	Jones
Carter	Gerlach	Jenkins
Cassidy	Gibbs	Johnson (IL)
Chabot	Gibson	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Jones
		Jordan

Kelly	Neugebauer	Schock
King (IA)	Noem	Schweikert
Kingston	Nugent	Scott (SC)
Kinzinger (IL)	Nunes	Scott, Austin
Kline	Nunnelee	Sensenbrenner
Labrador	Olson	Sessions
Lamborn	Palazzo	Shimkus
Lance	Paul	Shuster
Landry	Paulsen	Simpson
Lankford	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Latham	Pence	Smith (NJ)
LaTourette	Petri	Smith (TX)
Latta	Pitts	Southerland
Lewis (CA)	Platts	Stearns
LoBiondo	LoBiondo	Poe (TX)
Long	Lucas	Pompeo
Lucas	Luetkemeyer	Pompeo
Lummis	Lungren, Daniel	Posey
E.		Price (GA)
Mack		Quayle
Manzullo		Reed
Marchant		Rehberg
Marino		Renacci
McCarthy (CA)		Ribble
McCaul		Rigell
McClintock		Rivera
McCotter		Roe (TN)
McHenry		Rogers (AL)
McKeon		Rogers (KY)
McKinley		Rogers (MI)
McMorris		Rohrabacher
Rodgers		Rokita
Meehan		Rooney
Mica		Ros-Lehtinen
Miller (FL)		Roskam
Miller (MI)		Ross (FL)
Miller, Gary		Royce
Mulvaney		Runyan
Murphy (PA)		Ryan (WI)
Myrick		Scalise
		Schilling
		Schmidt

NAYS—171

Altmire	Filner	Murphy (CT)
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Baca	Fudge	Neal
Baldwin	Garamendi	Owens
Barrow	Grijalva	Pallone
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanabusa	Payne
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Berman	Heinrich	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hinchee	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Hirono	Polis
Brady (PA)	Holden	Price (NC)
Brayley (IA)	Holt	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Honda	Rahall
Butterfield	Hoyer	Reyes
Capps	Inslee	Richardson
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Ross (AR)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Chandler	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kind	T.
Ciциlline	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Schakowsky
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Lipinski	Serrano
Costello	Loeb sack	Sewell
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
Critz	Lowe	Shuler
Cummings	Lujan	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Markey	Speier
DeGette	Matheson	Stark
DeLauro	Matsui	Sutton
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McDermott	Tierney
Doggett	McGovern	Tonko
Donnelly (IN)	McIntyre	Towns
Doyle	McNeary	Tsongas
Edwards	Michaud	Velazquez
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Vislosky
Eshoo	Miller, George	Walz (MN)
Farr	Moore	Wasserman
Fattah	Moran	Schultz

Waters	Welch	Wu
Watt	Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth
Waxman	Woolsey	

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman	Giffords	Pascrell
Bilbray	Gonzalez	Rangel
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Clyburn	King (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
Crowley	Meeks	Van Hollen
Emerson	Nadler	Weiner
Engel	Oliver	

□ 1059

Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. HAYWORTH and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 167, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—245

Adams	Crawford	Guinta
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Akin	Cuellar	Hall
Alexander	Culberson	Hanna
Amash	Davis (KY)	Harper
Austria	Denham	Harris
Bachmann	Dent	Hartzler
Bachus	DesJarlais	Hastings (WA)
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Bartlett	Dold	Heck
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Heller
Bass (NH)	Duffy	Hensarling
Benishkek	Duncan (SC)	Herger
Berg	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler
Biggert	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Hultgren
Black	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Blackburn	Flake	Hurt
Bonner	Fleischmann	Issa
Bono Mack	Fleming	Jackson Lee
Boren	Flores	Jones
Boustany	Forbes	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Johnson (IL)
Brooks	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Brown (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Jones
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Bucshon	Gallegly	Kelly
Buerkle	Gardner	King (IA)
Burgess	Garrett	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	Kinzing (IL)
Calvert	Gibbs	Kissell
Camp	Gibson	Kline
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador
Canseco	Gohmert	Lamborn
Capito	Goodlatte	Lance
Carter	Gosar	Landry
Cassidy	Gowdy	Lankford
Chabot	Granger	Latham
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	LaTourette
	Graves (MO)	Latta
	Green, Al	Lewis (CA)
	Green, Gene	LoBiondo
	Griffin (AR)	Long
	Griffith (VA)	Lucas
	Grimm	Luetkemeyer

Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson

Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—167

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinches
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone

Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman
Bilbray
Cantor
Clyburn
Crowley
Emerson
Engel

Giffords
Gonzalez
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Meeks
Nadler
Olver

Pascrell
Rangel
Reichert
Rothman (NJ)
Van Hollen
Weiner

□ 1106

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 294, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1230.

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

There was no objection.

RESTARTING AMERICAN
OFFSHORE LEASING NOW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCALISE). Pursuant to House Resolution 245 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1230.

□ 1106

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, the national average price of gasoline has gone up 10 cents in just the last week, and is now about 1½ cents nationally from \$4 a gallon. By comparison, the price was \$1.84 a gallon when President Obama was sworn into office.

In my home district in Central Washington last week, I heard from farmers, the foundation of our region's economy, who are finding it harder and harder to pay these high energy prices. And I have no doubt that my col-

leagues from other parts of the country have heard similar stories from their constituents.

The pain being felt today has been exacerbated by the actions of this administration, this administration which, for the past 2 years, has repeatedly blocked, hindered, and raised the cost to access to our American energy resources.

The House Natural Resources Committee recently passed three bills, H.R. 1229, 1230, and 1231, with bipartisan support, all of which reverse specific actions taken by the Obama administration to block offshore energy production. These bills will increase American energy production. They will create jobs, and they will lower energy prices. These are the first of an array of bills that will be introduced by our committee as part of the American energy initiative that will focus on expanding renewable energy, onshore production, hydropower, coal, critical minerals, and address offshore drilling revenue sharing and other needed reforms.

Today we are debating H.R. 1230, the Restarting America Offshore Leasing Now Act. This bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore Virginia that have been delayed or canceled by this administration.

□ 1110

The Virginia lease sale, for example, was scheduled to happen this year; but due to the Obama administration actions, the earliest this lease sale could occur is now 2017.

This bill will create thousands of jobs and, according to CBO, it will generate \$40 million in new revenue to the Federal Government over the next 10 years.

I will note that very soon after this bill passed out of committee, with bipartisan support, the Obama administration announced that it would move forward on one gulf lease sale. Prior to this sudden action, the Obama administration was on course to make 2011 the first year since 1958 that the Federal Government would not have held an offshore lease sale.

Squeezing one conveniently timed offshore lease sale does not undo the Obama administration's long track record of blocking and delaying American energy production. This bill that we are considering today is necessary to hold their feet to the fire and to ensure that these lease sales move forward.

Americans instinctively understand the pain inflicted by rising gasoline prices, but yet we continue to hear the same excuses on why we shouldn't act. And let me give you several examples.

My colleagues across the aisle will say that expanding drilling will do nothing to lower gasoline prices. The truth is, and this is the important part, it will send a strong signal to the world markets that the U.S. is serious about

producing our own resources and bringing more production, American production, online. Furthermore, this argument has been used by opponents to American energy production for decades. We can no longer delay and prevent access to our own American resources.

My colleagues will also propose increasing taxes on American energy production. Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. They will also propose increasing taxes on American energy production. I have to ask: When has raising taxes lowered the price of anything? And of course the answer to that is never. And it won't happen with energy. Whether it is taxing American energy producers or imposing a cap-and-trade national energy tax, the Democrats' plan will only further increase the price at the pump and ultimately cost jobs.

We are also likely to hear my colleagues reiterate the old "use it or lose it" myth, claiming that there are thousands of acres of nonproducing leases. Mr. Chairman, in reality, "use it or lose it" is already the law of the land. The moment a company pays for and receives a lease, the clock starts ticking. Leases have a time line. If action doesn't occur on that lease, the lease is lost, according to the lease.

In addition, and this is important, too, only about one-third of the leases contain oil or natural gas. Sometimes we think we are very powerful, but one thing we can't do is mandate production where there is no oil or natural gas.

And, finally, my colleagues will undoubtedly attempt to claim that these bills ignore the need to ensure safety in offshore drilling. Nobody has forgotten the tragic Deepwater Horizon accident. And I hear that especially from Members of the gulf, and, Mr. Chairman, I heard that when I was down at the gulf at a hearing only 2 weeks ago. However, we must not forget the fact of the economic threat that high gasoline prices have to our economy and our need to move forward.

The administration has slowly started to issue deepwater permits in the Gulf of Mexico, which is in direct recognition, by the way, that it can be done safely and responsibly or they wouldn't have done it. Yet my colleagues act as if nothing has changed at all as far as safety reforms. But by doing so, they are completely ignoring reality and the actions of their own party's administration.

They are ignoring the facts that regulations have been enhanced and strengthened; that standards have increased; and that new technologies have been developed, tested, and deployed. And, I might add, Mr. Chairman, we heard this at the hearing that I alluded to a moment ago in Houma, Louisiana, 2 weeks ago.

Furthermore, H.R. 1229, which we will debate next week, improves safety by making two reforms to current law. Number one, it requires that the Secretary issue a permit to drill; and, two,

requires that the Secretary conduct safety reviews. Neither of those provisions are in current law today.

In 2008, the last time gasoline prices reached \$4 a gallon, Congress stepped up to the challenge and took bold action to end a decades-long ban on new offshore drilling. Although this administration has effectively reimposed that ban, the American people are once again calling on Congress to act. By passing H.R. 1230 today, Congress can show the American people that we have heard their concerns and that we are taking actions.

So I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill that will create American jobs, lower gasoline prices, and strengthen energy independence.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

One year ago today, we were 2 weeks into the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. We were 2 weeks into what would ultimately become the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history, with more than 4 million barrels of oil spilling into the Gulf. And since that disaster, we have learned many things about the safety of offshore drilling.

We learned that the blowout preventer that the oil industry touted as fail-safe could in fact be sure to fail if an actual blowout was under way. We learned that the only technology the oil industry had been relying upon in the event of a spill was a Xerox machine. The spill response plans for major companies were so similar that they contained plans to evacuate walrus from the Gulf of Mexico even though the walrus had not called the Gulf home in more than 3 million years. And they were such dead ringers for each other that they contained the same name and phone number of the same long-deceased expert.

We learned that the oil companies had neither the resources nor the ability to stop a deepwater blowout. BP spill response included an attempt to shoot golf balls and bits of rubber into the well. When we were told that the industry was relying on the most sophisticated technologies, we assumed that they meant technologies developed by MIT and not the PGA.

And we learned from an independent BP spill commission that the root causes of the Deepwater Horizon disaster were "systemic" to the entire oil and gas industry.

And yet here we are debating legislation that would do nothing to improve the safety of offshore drilling and could actually make drilling less safe. The legislation before us represents a return to the pre-spill mentality of speed over safety.

H.R. 1230 would force the Interior Department to rush to hold new lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico by "deeming" the shoddy environmental analysis conducted by the Bush administration's Mineral Management Service before the BP spill as sufficient for future lease sales in the Gulf.

Just looking at some of the conclusions contained within the Bush administration's 2007 environmental analysis exposes the absurdity of deeming this work as sufficient for new leasing in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster.

In its 2007 multisale Environmental Impact Statement completed in April of 2007, the Interior Department determined, "The most likely size of an offshore spill greater than or equal to 1,000 barrels that is predicted to occur is 4,600 barrels" of oil. The BP Deepwater Horizon disaster led to more than 4 million barrels spilling into the Gulf. That is 1,000 times the size of the largest spill this analysis concluded was likely to occur.

In 2007, MMS analysis concluded that the total volume of oil that would be spilled from all spills in the central and western Gulf over the next 40 years would be roughly 47,000 barrels of oil. That is less than what was spilled in the Deepwater Horizon in 1 day.

MMS concluded that, in 2007, a worst-case scenario, only 19 to 31 miles of Gulf coastline would be impacted by a spill. The Deepwater Horizon disaster resulted in oil reaching over 950 miles of Gulf coastline.

□ 1120

And MMS determined that a deepwater blow-off would not present a cleanup problem because the oil would rise in the water column, surfacing almost directly over the source location, but in fact the oil spewing from the ocean floor remained in enormous subsurface plumes that spread across the Gulf.

The Obama administration is already moving forward to hold these lease sales in the Gulf later this year and early next year, and they are going to be more responsible. Even the Congressional Budget Office analysis of H.R. 1230 concludes, "CBO estimates that implementing the bill would have no significant impact on proceeds from lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico because the proposed schedule is similar to the plan included in the DOI's budget for 2011."

So, really, all the majority is accomplishing with this legislation is ensuring that we don't do any new environmental review of the impacts of these lease sales. Instead of actually reviewing the lessons of the BP spill, the majority wants to lessen the environmental review.

In addition, this legislation would force the Department to move forward with a lease off of the coast of Virginia within one year. Well, I have very bad news for the majority. The overwhelming majority of the area that would comprise this lease sale would infringe on critical training areas for the U.S. Navy. The Department of Defense concluded that 78 percent of the area offered in the Virginia lease sale would occur where military operations would be impeded by drilling structures and related activities. Moreover,

much of the remaining area is comprised of a major shipping channel.

This bill is really a solution in search of a problem. The bottom line is that oil production is at its highest level in nearly a decade and natural gas production is at record levels. We should instead be debating legislation that would protect the lives and the livelihoods of the people in the Gulf and that could actually help consumers at the pump this summer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

Chairman HASTINGS, as you know, I am committed to ensuring that revenue-sharing of the benefits of OCS development are returned to those coastal States where drilling is occurring or may occur, like Virginia. Can you share with me and other Members of this body whether this will be addressed by the committee?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman.

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

The answer is that it will absolutely be a focus and a priority. When I first introduced the bill before us today, I stated that these are only the first steps in this Congress' efforts to increase American energy production.

The committee will continue to move forward on an array of bills that will be introduced in advance as part of the American Energy Initiative. Coming soon will be bills focused on expanding renewable energy, offshore production, onshore production, hydropower, coal, critical minerals and revenue sharing.

Today, only a few select States receive revenue sharing from OCS activities. This committee will be working to reform OCS revenues to ensure that there is a fair treatment to all States that produce oil and gas in the OCS. Revenue sharing will be a priority, and action will be forthcoming.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for his comments. I commend him for this legislation, and I support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. At this time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Most Americans understand the concept of supply and demand, and in fact a third of oil now comes from the gulf. The Department of Energy's information agency tells us that last year's production in the gulf was 20 percent less than projected in 2007, and in 2012 we are going to be getting a half a million barrels a day decline in production from 2010.

What happens when the production goes down and the demand goes up? The price goes up—way up. Add to that the uncertainty and the unrest in the Middle East, and there is no surprise that we have gas prices at \$4 and \$5 now in this country, and who knows where they are headed.

This legislation, if we pass it today and get it enacted, helps turn the key to unlocking the door on domestic energy production. This legislation is not about new lease sales. It is simply catches up with the leases already approved.

Let's pass it.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1230.

This is the first in the Republican "amnesia acts" that ignore what happened last year in the Gulf of Mexico. It would force the Department of Interior to rush into holding new lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Virginia, not far from New Jersey, I might add, even though Congress has not enacted a single piece of legislation to improve the safety of offshore drilling.

The President's spill commission reported that offshore drilling in U.S. waters is four times more deadly than drilling elsewhere in the world, even for the same companies. Clearly there is a safety problem that must be addressed.

And I must emphasize, because they have talked about it again and again, they are talking about high oil prices, high prices at the pump. We feel it. Everybody in America feels it. Do they address it? No, they do not address gasoline prices. It actually accelerates handouts to Big Oil, this legislation does.

In addition to being silent on safety concerns, this prohibits any further environmental review in the gulf based on the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon last year. That tragedy exposed the woefully inadequate ways in which the environmental reviews had been done in the Gulf of Mexico.

Need I remind the Speaker or the majority that there are no walruses to protect in the Gulf of Mexico? As you heard from Mr. MARKEY, that is the level of quality in the environmental review that they want to apply from here on out. The analysis assumed that blowout preventers were capable of preventing blowouts. We know now, we have learned, they are not. The post-spill investigations have clearly demonstrated that the assumptions of the environmental review are not sufficient. I will offer an amendment shortly to drop the language that would deem this environmental review to be adequate.

Despite the poor safety and environmental record accumulated in the gulf,

H.R. 1230 recklessly puts the Atlantic coast at risk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. HOLT. H.R. 1230 recklessly puts the Atlantic coast at risk of experiencing an oil spill such as what we have seen before. That is why I call this an "amnesia act." There are two more bills we will be seeing here on the floor that are similar.

This is not in the interest of the U.S. consumer, it is not in the interest of fishermen, it is not in the interest of coastal residents. This is not in the interest of America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This bill is the first step for Republicans to bring a new energy policy to this country, the American Energy Initiative. Look at this chart. It says it all. Under Barack Obama and his regulators, the average price of gasoline in this country has gone up from \$1.84 a gallon when he took office to just under \$4. Under his watch, gasoline has more than doubled. We need more supply, and everyone agrees it should be our own energy, not foreign. Under the law of supply and demand, which my friends across the aisle have not found a way to repeal, more supply means lower prices, in addition to thousands of more jobs for Americans and billions of revenue dollars for the Treasury.

H.R. 1230 requires that four promising lease sale areas, three in the gulf and one off Virginia, must be opened up for production. No more stonewalling by this administration and extreme environmentalists. After this bill came out of my committee and the full Natural Resources Committee, this administration belatedly said it would start action on one of these four lease areas. If the only way we can get action is to shame them into it, Republicans will do so. If the administration still refuses, we will do our best to force action by changing the law.

This bill is the first step to get gasoline prices down. The American people deserve no less.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. We are headed toward \$4.25, \$4.50 a gallon by Memorial Day, the usual oil company run-up when the driving season starts, crushing the dreams of American families, small businesses, and our economic recovery. But, hey, the profits are up. It's good.

□ 1130

Republicans say, It's just supply and demand. It's simple. So if we add a small increment to future domestic supply, 5 or 10 years from now, that will bring down the price.

No, it won't. Remember, it's a world price commodity. In fact, supply is up. The U.S. has 12.6 million more barrels in storage than the 5-year average. Demand is down. Americans can't afford the price and the economy is depressed. Libyan lost production has been made up by the Saudis. Every gallon of that has been made up.

So what is really going on? Well, it's market manipulation, price gouging, profiteering and speculation. But the Republicans won't take on their benefactors from Big Oil and Wall Street. Even Goldman Sachs says that \$20 a barrel is excessive speculation. Twenty dollars a barrel. That's 60 cents a gallon. We could stop that tomorrow. Put a tax on speculators. Or encourage the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to regulate what you're trying to block. But you're not going to do that because, hey, that would upset the speculators on Wall Street who are making a fortune.

On the NYMEX Exchange, 45 percent of the trades in one day were driven by computers. They traded twice the world's daily oil consumption, by computer, in one day, driving up the price, and the Republicans say, Oh, it's supply and demand.

It's not supply and demand. It's market manipulation. It's price gouging. It's speculation. Do something about it. Those tools are before us.

Yeah, if you want to have a debate about future domestic supply from natural gas or offshore drilling or biodiesel or whatever, let's have that debate. If you want to get people relief this year, save our economic recovery, save American families, then take on Wall Street, take on Big Oil, take on the speculators. Or I guess you're afraid they won't contribute to your next campaign.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, fortunately the vast majority of the American people and the majority of this House recognize that it is long past time to put American energy independence and prosperity first.

By opening up these resources, we assure energy abundance for the next generation. We begin to arrest the ruinous increase in prices at the pump. We assure productive, high-paying jobs, not only for the thousands of American workers directly employed in the industry but for many times more the employees in support and spin-off jobs. We assure billions of dollars of oil royalties paid directly into this Nation's Treasury at a time when the Treasury is empty. We assure that our growing reliance on foreign sources is reversed.

To those who are clamoring for more tax revenues, this is the healthy way to get them, by removing the impediments that have prevented a prosperous and expanding economy. It is

prosperity and prosperity alone that creates tax revenues.

With this measure, we begin to change the policies that have produced the pathetic and self-inflicted spectacle of the most energy rich nation in the world importing most of its energy.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Well, we certainly know that our constituents are paying too much at the pump, but we also know where that money's going. Almost \$30 billion, just in the last 3 months, went to the top three oil companies, Exxon, Shell and BP. Remember BP? Over \$7 billion just this quarter in profit, not revenue, pure profit. And that's after the American taxpayer, which we say we're so concerned about, shelled out \$5 billion in subsidies to the oil and gas companies. That's profit of more than \$100 billion on an annual basis. That's where the money's going.

And within that profit, not revenue, profit, we're talking about, what do they do with it? Ninety percent of it is used for stock buybacks and dividends to enrich the executives and the shareholders and to spend on TV advertising to convince the American public they're spending on just the opposite. Ten percent is going for drilling exploration.

Now what this legislation would do is to bring us back to a period of even weaker regulation than we had before the gulf oil spill. Imagine, it just happened, 200 million gallons of oil spilled into the Gulf Coast waters, and now we want to make the governing regulations weaker than they were before the spill. And then we want to open up the area off the shore of Virginia where thousands and thousands of jobs are dependent upon the naval operations that take place in those waters which would not be able to be conducted if we go ahead and drill in these waters. Plus much of the remaining 22 percent is devoted to shipping lanes for two of our busiest commercial ports, Hampton Roads and Baltimore. Do we really want to jeopardize those thousands of jobs, not to mention the thousands of jobs in fishing and tourism in places like Virginia Beach?

We should be about creating jobs, not jeopardizing jobs and protecting our environment, not despoiling it. Defeat this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would just note that the two Democrat Senators from Virginia and the Governor of this State are in favor of this legislation.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I am more than happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act.

Last night, I held a telephone town hall with hundreds of my constituents. The overwhelming concern was about the high price of gas. Seniors, students,

working families and small business owners want to know what we're doing to help lower fuel costs. They want us to stop being dependent on foreign energy and start really developing America's resources. Today, we're doing that.

Unfortunately, our colleagues across the aisle believe that raising taxes on oil companies will somehow lower the price of gas. This defies both logic and common sense. Not only would raising taxes ensure job losses in America but it would also result in the increase of America's dependence on foreign sources of oil. Raising taxes on American energy companies would give a competitive advantage to the Russian, Chinese and OPEC countries that are operating without anti-growth, anti-self-sufficient energy policies.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents in southeastern and eastern Ohio understand the negative impact that these proposed tax increases would have on gas prices and they oppose these efforts. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act that will help put our country on the path to energy security.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Santa Barbara, California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this oil spill amnesia bill that threatens our coastal communities.

H.R. 1230 is a collection of bad ideas. It mandates that the administration offer new lease sales, even though they say they're not prepared to properly oversee them. The bill sidesteps safety and environmental reviews, acting as if the Nation's worst oil spill in history never happened. And, it pushes a failed energy plan that pours billions of dollars into already overstuffed oil industry coffers.

The only thing it adds up to, Mr. Chairman, is a false promise. The truth is the Republican majority is hoping to delude the public into believing that this rush to new offshore drilling will provide a quick fix to high gas prices, but the harsh reality is this: The U.S. is never going to have control over world oil supplies or gas prices through drilling. We simply don't have the oil reserves, no matter how much we drill. What we do have is the ability to control prices by lowering our consumption, and that's just what we're starting to do.

For example, the EIA's latest report says we're lowering oil usage thanks in part to the President's fuel savings standards. We will get control over our energy future by making more cars that go further on a gallon of gas and bringing new types of fuel supplies to the table. If in 10 or 20 years oil and gas are still the focus of our energy debate, then we have miserably failed. We will have followed the path that George W. Bush and Dick Cheney charted, and we've seen where that leads: high gas

prices and billions in oil company profits.

It's about time we break free from our addiction to oil. I urge a "no" vote on this misleading bill that accelerates new dirty and dangerous drilling.

□ 1140

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from Washington has 16¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1230, a bill that will restart American jobs.

The current 5-year lease plan would have allowed for the sale of four leases, one off the coast of Virginia and three in the Gulf of Mexico. The President and his agencies are continuing to block these sales. It's time to stop that blocking.

We're talking about jobs. The Nation is faced with 8 to 9 percent continuing unemployment. The jobs offshore are good, high-paying jobs—\$400 a day, \$50,000 per year. Recently, the President had strong rhetoric to Georgetown University, saying that he's going to increase oil and gas production in America. Yet the administration's actions are moving us the opposite direction.

Tax increases kill jobs. That's an economic truth. Our friends across the aisle want to kill American jobs by raising taxes at a time when unemployment is too high, when we're dependent on too much foreign oil. In his speech last month at Georgetown, President Obama said, "The fact of the matter is, is that for quite some time, America is going to be still dependent on oil in making its economy work. We're exploring and assessing new frontiers for oil and gas developments from Alaska to the Mid- and South Atlantic States."

Mr. Chairman, we are with this bill giving the President the bill that he is saying that he's going to implement. Now let him sign it.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. Imagine what we could do for the American consumer at the pump if we stopped lobbing rhetorical grenades back and forth and decided to focus on the concrete things that it is within our power to do today that would lower the price at the pump. There's three things.

One, why are we giving tax breaks to oil companies? You do have to wonder. A trillion dollars in profits. Nothing wrong with that. But do they really need to reach into the pocket of the

American consumer and get \$40 billion on top of that? That's number one.

Number two, have the futures market be about protecting the consumer, not enriching the hedge fund Wall Street speculator. It is astonishing what's going on. And it's so bad that even Goldman Sachs acknowledges that at least \$27 on the price of a \$110 barrel of oil is about speculation. Why in the world do we allow that? Because every time you and I go to the pump, our constituents go to the pump, they're paying for Wall Street and they're paying for tax breaks to oil companies.

The third thing we can do, and we can do it short-term, is go into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Two Republican Presidents and one Democratic President have done that with great effect—lowering the price 33 percent, 19 percent, and 9 percent. It gives immediate relief to the consumer at the pump.

We can do this together if the agenda is about doing something for your constituent and mine and not just having this political food fight. End speculation, end the tax breaks, and go into that asset belonging to all of us, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and bring prices down immediately.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership on this issue.

Our friends across the aisle here want us to use this debate today to demagogue this issue and demonize American energy producers. Let us refocus on what this debate is really about today.

Mr. Chairman, this administration's policy of drill there, not here, has helped produce the record gas prices that we are facing today. Rather than fueling our economy with American energy independence, this administration has fueled overseas oil producers by shutting off domestic exploration. And now, today, we hear the other party tell us that raising taxes on American energy production will somehow make prices go down. This is insane, Mr. Chairman, as any economist can tell you.

We need to end the de facto moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico on the permits there. We need to reopen the West to exploration. We need to open up ANWR for exploration. We need to allow American entrepreneurs to do the work of the free market and get this economy moving again.

Energy production is a segue to job creation. This bill will begin the process of releasing the potential of American energy. This means tens of thousands of American jobs producing American energy for American households and businesses.

I urge my colleagues to help this economy. Pass this bill, and let's put

Americans back to work producing American energy.

God bless you. God bless America.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 3 minutes.

This is the wrong debate to be having here today. The Republicans are debating more drilling without more safety even though the BP spill commission that examined what went wrong last year concluded that there was a "systemic" failure in our country to deal with the safety issues that confront the offshore drilling industry. In fact, they concluded that there are four times greater fatalities in drilling for oil off the shores of the United States than there are in Europe—four times more fatalities. We should be number one in drilling but we should be number one in safety as well.

What the Republicans are doing here today is they are saying that they believe in "all of the above." But the truth is that with this bill they are saying once again it is really an agenda of "oil above all." They have nothing out here on renewable energy resources—wind, solar, biomass, geothermal, plug-in hybrids, all-electric vehicles. None of that is part of their debate. They just go back to the same old agenda of oil above all.

And do we need to give more to the oil industry? We have \$10 billion in profits for ExxonMobil in January, February, and March—\$10 billion they made. Shell, \$8 billion; BP, \$7 billion; Chevron, \$6 billion; ConocoPhillips, \$3 billion. Shouldn't we talk a little bit about safety as we're talking about new drilling off of our shorelines? But no, that's not the Republican agenda.

Should we be talking about taking away the tax breaks from the oil industry, the \$40 billion which the American taxpayer gives to the oil industry? Do we really need to have the oil industry in the consumers' pocket at the gas pump and then in their other pocket as taxpayers to give even more money to ExxonMobil? That's what the Republicans should bring out here for a debate. They do not do that.

The New York Mercantile Exchange, that's where they trade for oil futures. Computerized Program Trading is now 45 percent of the oil futures trading on the commodities-futures trading floor of the New York Mercantile Exchange.

What do the Republicans do to deal with the fact that it has turned into a crude oil casino where gambling is going on as the speculators of our country and the world look at Saudi Arabia, look at Libya, as the price of oil skyrockets, as Goldman Sachs concludes that \$20 a barrel in the increase of the price of oil just comes from the speculation, from the gambling that's going on in the NYMEX? You might as well put "Las Vegas" over the New York Mercantile Exchange. It is a crude oil casino, ladies and gentlemen. What do the Republicans do? They have slashed the budget for the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, who are the cops on the beat. They're

saying we need fewer cops to police these speculators. They slash the wind and solar budget by 70 percent in their budget that just passed last month.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

This is their agenda. Nothing on safety; nothing on wind and solar; nothing on corralling the speculators. And what do they say? What they say is they're going to in fact go into the Medicare budget of Grandma and Grandpa and cut their programs and then put an oil rig on top of Medicare out of the pockets of Grandma and Grandpa and put it into the profits of the oil industry with more tax breaks for them, even as they report the greatest profits in the history of any companies in the history of the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I am absolutely baffled by the rhetoric that I hear here. Let me remind my colleagues that 2½ years ago, in 2008, when gasoline prices went to \$4 a gallon, we Republicans came into the House, even though we weren't in session, and talked about the potential resources that we have in this country to make America self-sufficient. And the American people got it. They got it and they said, you know, we ought to utilize those resources. And they said we should drill; we should drill in the Outer Continental Shelf and we should drill onshore.

□ 1150

The American people get it. Yet the rhetoric we're hearing here is entirely different from the economic issues that we face. Here is the whole point:

When America ended the moratoria on offshore drilling, the prices went down. See, that has never been explained by the other side, but it's pretty darned obvious. When you send a signal to the markets that you're serious about becoming less dependent on foreign energy, the markets respond. They responded 2½ years ago, and they will respond the same way. Yet all we hear from this side is you have to have a bogeyman. There has to be a bogeyman. Everybody is against us.

Baloney. The market is what drives the price of oil, and it's in our best interest in this country to become less dependent on foreign energy, and that's what these three bills do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and for yielding me time.

Let there be no doubt, Americans are worried about the price of gasoline; and its recent spike has, once again, put us on notice. Yet this bill that relieves regulation provides the wrong tools.

Americans know we can do better. We cannot afford to mindlessly give billions of dollars to Big Oil companies while they make record profits. In the short term, we must ensure that speculators and Wall Street quit playing games with the price of oil. Finally, we must provide motorists with fueling options at the pump. It is unconscionable that we would give \$4 billion of taxpayer money to Big Oil companies this year alone while they're on track to make nearly \$100 billion in profits in 2011. With prices this high, does Big Oil really need even more money? Taxpayers know they don't, and taxpayers are hit twice with taxes on gasoline—once at the pump and once on tax day. This must end.

We can help consumers at the pump by going after Wall Street speculators who drive up the cost of oil. We can increase mileage standards, and it's entirely reasonable that they could reach 60 miles per gallon by the year 2025. Also, we can invest in fueling options so that consumers can choose the lowest alternative.

High gas prices are painful. They are painful to American families; they are painful to seniors living on fixed incomes; and they are painful to small businesses; and the Big Oil subsidies that accompany them are painful for our Nation's economy as it recovers from the Bush recession. Let's end these Big Oil giveaways to some of the most profitable companies in the world, and let's provide drivers with alternatives—fueling options, better vehicles—and create the clean-energy jobs of the future.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a valuable member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, this morning, a gallon of gasoline in my hometown of Iron River, Michigan, was \$4.29. Unfortunately, most people are plagued with the fact of knowing that prices are going to go up even further in the next few weeks.

I believe that we in Congress know that there is no silver bullet that is going to lower prices at the pump. However, we have a responsibility here to craft policy and to pass legislation that will increase the supply of crude oil that will be produced here at home. As Members of Congress, it is our duty to take these actions to help lessen the pain of these prices on our families in Michigan and throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, we need to find a long-term solution to high fuel prices. I believe that the full-day markup we held in committee last month was the first step and that passing this bill today will be the next step, but we have many further steps to take.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), one of the most thoughtful members of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I oppose the legislation, which would really open in a wholesale fashion very sensitive areas to offshore drilling. We have to take a lot of care when it comes to doing this offshore drilling, and I don't think that this bill exercises that care.

During the committee's consideration of the bill, I put forward an amendment that would strike that section of the bill that authorizes drilling off the coast of Virginia. I did this because of my concern of the potential impact of a spill in the Chesapeake Bay, which, of course, is a treasure for Marylanders and for all those who live in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The Chesapeake Bay is really the soul of my State of Maryland. It's a national treasure in so many ways.

As for the Virginia parcel, which is called Lease Sale 220 and is a lease parcel that the Republicans would like to put back into play with their bill, when you look at it, about 78 percent of that parcel you have to immediately take off the table because it would occur in areas where military operations would be impeded.

I want to thank my colleague, GERRY CONNOLLY from Virginia, for putting forward an amendment on this bill which would shift the burden and say the Department of Defense has to affirmatively conclude that you will not impede these kinds of military operations in order to drill.

So you take that out of the equation. Then when you take another chunk of it out because you need to keep commercial shipping lanes open, what you're left with is about 10 percent of the parcel that you could actually drill on, and what you could get from that would only supply the demand of the country for one day. So you'd be putting at risk this valuable, sensitive Chesapeake Bay and all of the surrounding areas for getting one day's worth of energy production.

That just doesn't make sense, and I think it undermines the bill on a wholesale basis. It shows that this is not put forward in a way that is sensible. For that reason, I oppose the legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another valuable member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. I would like to thank the chairman of the committee for his leadership and work and for making sure we are addressing the energy needs of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Virginia has the opportunity to develop offshore energy in an environmentally friendly and responsible manner. Like any industrial or commercial activity, energy production has its risks. However, those risks have been significantly mitigated, and offshore energy production can be conducted in a safe and responsible manner. Unfortunately, the administration

has halted any further oil and gas development in the Atlantic Ocean.

Our economy continues to struggle, and any further increase in energy prices will exacerbate that struggle to regain its footing as unemployment hovers at 9 percent. The unrest in the Middle East and in North Africa continues to threaten this Nation's energy security. The failure to promptly address our energy needs could negatively impact the U.S. economy, could stall any recovery, and continue to affect national security.

Energy production offshore of the Commonwealth would create thousands of jobs and generate much needed revenue to reduce the deficit. The Department of the Interior has calculated that Virginia could produce 500 million barrels of oil and 2.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, natural gas being one of the most economically viable and environmentally friendly sources of fossil fuels. A recent study by ICF International concluded that offshore energy production in Virginia would create 1,888 new jobs and generate \$19.5 billion in Federal, State, and local revenues.

I can tell you, in Virginia, as we struggle to find dollars to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and as we struggle to find dollars for transportation, those dollars are much needed. Virginia can lead the Nation in improving our energy security and in reducing our reliance on foreign oil. To do that, we must reinstate the planned offshore oil and natural gas lease sale.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

□ 1200

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to say it, but what we're hearing here on the floor of the House of Representatives in defense of this legislation is snake oil. Somehow the hard-pressed commuters and consumers of gasoline in this country are supposed to believe that if today we unleash all possibility of oil drilling, gas drilling offshore the continental United States, we're going to be producing thousands of barrels of oil. False. We're going to reduce the price of oil today? Equally false. In fact, there's plenty of evidence that the market that drives oil is relatively inelastic.

We heard earlier today on the floor of this House, driving is down, demand is down, supply is up, but so are prices. In fact, if you look at this chart, there's an eerie correlation between oil profits and the spike in the price of gasoline charged to our hard-pressed consumers in the United States.

The other side wants you to believe in a smokescreen that somehow their tax subsidy being changed or lifted by our side of the aisle would, in fact, further increase the price of oil. They

have low taxes. They have low royalties. They have record profits. How has that worked out for the average driver in America? It's produced record gasoline prices.

The Republican policy that will be enshrined today in this legislation has produced these profits and those costs for the average consumer in America. It is wrong, and to argue otherwise is selling snake oil.

I urge the defeat of this legislation on behalf of the consumers of America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chair, we should oppose this bill not because it is too strong, but because it is too weak. Americans do need relief from \$4 a gallon gasoline, and they are not going to get it from this bill either in the short term or the long term. The reason they won't get relief in the short term is we're not drilling in the right places. We need to drill speculators, not just wells. Even Goldman Sachs recognizes that a significant portion of the huge spike in prices is due to rampant speculation in the market, but this bill doesn't do a single thing about that short-term reason for this short-term price. We need to drill speculators, not just wells.

But, secondly, in the long term, this bill does not give us what we need. My friends across the aisle told us they were going to give us an all-of-the-above energy strategy. They haven't given us an all-of-the-above strategy. They are just giving an all-of-the-below strategy, because the only thing they are thinking about are these archaic technologies of drilling holes in the ground.

We use 25 percent of the world's oil. We only have 3 percent of the world's oil supply, even if we drill in Yellowstone National Park. The dinosaurs just didn't die underneath our feet. We need new supplies of energy, of electricity, camalena-based biofuels from Targeted Growth in Seattle, advanced forms of algae-based biofuels from Sapphire Energy and General Atomic and other companies.

We need new sources of energy, not just below our feet but above our feet, and in our minds where we get the intellect to invent these technologies. That's an all-of-the-above strategy. Let's do what we can do to give real short-term relief. Defeat this bill, and we will get a comprehensive energy policy for this country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I won't take 2 minutes.

I've been listening to part of the discussion here, and it just strikes me

that when you see graphics with an oil rig sucking money out of Social Security or Medicare or whatever that was, you know that you have gone beyond the realm of what is logical for a debate or the real facts about what this legislation does.

The bottom line is that it will make it easier for us to become more energy independent, not completely energy independent—it can't go that far—but it will make us more independent than we were before. It will create an environment where jobs can be created by the private sector. It will help, over time, to lower the price of gasoline because it will create more supply in the end. That's what it does. It doesn't put a big oil rig on the top of Medicare and suck money from our seniors. Come on.

This is just a measure to help the situation, to make it better. We've locked off too many areas to oil drilling, and we've not exploited our own supply enough to help bring down price and to help consumers out there in the world.

So that's all this does, and I commend the gentleman for bringing it forward. I urge support for it.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend, Mr. MARKEY, for yielding.

This is about Big Oil handouts, pure and simple. There are no lessons learned, no lessons applied with regard to safety or protection of the environment. You know, if these companies were energy companies, as they like to say, they would invest more in producing sustainable, clean energy alternatives.

In the long run, we all know it. We've got to face the facts. We've got to break our addiction to oil; and if the majority, the authors of this legislation, really wanted to help the motorists, the consumers, they would address speculation. They would end the speculation. They would end the tax giveaways. They would use the strategic oil reserve to short-circuit speculation. The oil companies are not energy companies. They are fleecing machines.

The greatest profits of any corporation in history—and you heard me say a few minutes ago—that the biggest of them, Exxon, had an effective tax rate of about 0.4 percent. This will not help the consumer.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I ran down here to thank my colleagues in this Chamber for finally doing what the American people have been asking them to do and to start the process of stopping to kick the energy problem can in this country down the road. Finally, we're going to take the steps necessary to put people back to work and to start America down a path of affordable domestic energy.

Now, they say that we're robbing Grandma and Grandpa. Grandma and

Grandpa hold stock in those energy companies. Down in Louisiana, Grandma and Grandpa's grandsons and grandchildren work in an industry that provides that energy. Right now, they don't have a job. They're being laid off, or they're being sent to Brazil or Africa or the Middle East to drill for oil out there, while we have spent over \$1 trillion of taxpayer money funding the Department of Energy to wean us off foreign oil.

I just rise to say thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you to my colleagues who have come today in support of this amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. I would defer to the chairman of the committee. If he is the concluding speaker on his side, I am prepared to close on our side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I advise my friend I am the concluding speaker, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself the balance of my time.

So here's where we are. Republicans take over, Republicans say they're ready to put together a plan for our country. It's 1 year after the BP catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico, the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history.

□ 1210

Last year, the Republicans blocked passage of any safety legislation that would learn the lessons of what happened in the Gulf of Mexico. The BP spill commission has come back. They now say that fatalities on U.S. rigs are four times higher than those on European rigs. We should be number one in drilling, and we should be number one in safety. The Republicans refuse to deal with the endemic, systemic problems with safety that have been identified in the American oil industry.

The oil industry is now garnering the largest profits any corporations in the world have ever been able to enjoy, but the Republicans refuse to bring out here legislation which will take away their tax breaks. Oil companies don't need to have tax breaks to do something they are doing anyway. It's like subsidizing a fish to swim or a bird to fly. We don't have to give them taxpayers' money. The Ryan budget slashes benefits for grandma and grandpa, then takes that money and gives it away in tax breaks to millionaires and to the oil industry. Do we really need to tell grandma we're cutting back on her medicare benefits and then taking that money and giving it in oil breaks to the biggest companies in our country? They don't need tax breaks.

And finally, what we should be talking about is the deployment of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The Strategic Petroleum Reserve was used by both President Bushes. It was used by President Clinton. It does work. The New York Mercantile Exchange is where oil futures are traded. It is a casino of crude oil right now. On one day

back just 2 months ago, 45 percent of all of the oil futures trades were computer-generated trades. Those trades were twice the value of all of the oil consumed in the world on a single day. That's what we need to do, to deal with those speculators. And the way to do it is what we have done in the past, deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, deploy it now. Send the fear of losing fortunes into the hearts of those speculators, and you will see the price of oil drop like a rock. That's what we need to do. That's what the consumers need as they are heading into the Memorial Day weekend. That's what people all across our country are wondering—what is going to happen to our economy?

Ten of the last 11 recessions in our country are tied to the rise in the price of oil. That is 10 of the last 11 recessions, ladies and gentlemen. What we saw in 1990 was, President Bush won the war in Iraq in '90 and '91, but because he never deployed the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until it was too late, a mini-recession went through our economy, and President Clinton was able to defeat him. Let's learn this lesson of the link between the rise in the price of oil and recessions that are created in our economy. Deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Ignore this agenda of the Republican Party.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting debate, and there's been a lot of rhetoric thrown around, some of which doesn't even apply whatsoever in any remoteness to the bill that's before us today. H.R. 1230, which we are debating today, simply tells this administration to go through with the lease sales that were already authorized by a previous administration. In other words, all of these lease sales had gone through whatever process they had gone through. Three of them were in the Gulf of Mexico. One of them was off the coast of Virginia.

We are simply saying with this legislation, let's send a signal to the international markets that America is serious about becoming less dependent on foreign oil. And we do that by saying, this administration should go through with these lease sales, which, I might add, Mr. Chairman, we have heard about loss of revenue from the other side of the aisle. These lease sales themselves would provide the general fund with \$40 million over the next 10 years. So what we're doing is really kind of ironic: We are telling this administration to do something it should be doing by law anyway. That's what the scope is. So I urge my colleagues to vote on this bill. We can have other discussion on the other bills in the ensuing days.

As far as the discussion talking about Big Oil, I could probably count the number of colleagues on the other side of the aisle that didn't say something about Big Oil rather than those that did. But what is interesting, you

would be led to believe that the only Big Oil in the world apparently are American companies. I would suggest that that is entirely not true. In fact, when you talk about Big Oil, Mr. Chairman, really who you should be focusing on is OPEC, because crude oil is an international product, or is a global product. There's no question about that.

Yet OPEC controls 45 percent of the market. It is a cartel, Mr. Chairman; there is no question about that. We all know simple economics. If there is a cartel on any commodity, on any commodity, the way that you break the cartel is by increasing the supply. And that's what the combination of these three bills do. It simply sends a signal to the markets—and I have said this over and over—that we are serious about utilizing the resources we have. Several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said, The United States doesn't have any resources. Well, nothing could be further from the truth because if you look at government data on what the potential resources are in the Outer Continental Shelf—and I'm going to say onshore because it's all American potential resources—the potential resources of oil equivalent per barrel, when you combine OCS and onshore, the potential resources are in excess of 2 trillion barrels of oil. That far exceeds what one of my colleagues earlier, Mr. FLEMING from Louisiana, said, It far exceeds what they have in Saudi Arabia. In fact, in other OPEC nations.

This is rhetoric about trying to blame somebody when the issue is really something as basic as having a supply out there that consumers can utilize. What we are saying here is threefold. One of them relates directly to American jobs. Energy sector jobs are good-paying jobs. So let's encourage the energy sector in this country to expand so we can have those good-paying jobs. That's good to get the funk out of our economy. Secondly, we become less dependent on foreign sources because energy is an important part of our growing economy. And if we have a stable source of that in the future, our economy can grow with the surety we will have a stable source of energy.

But probably more important in the long term, Mr. Chairman, the reason why we should pass these bills to send the signal to the market is a national security issue. I mentioned OPEC. There are some countries in OPEC that are outwardly hostile to the United States. One of them is in South America, Venezuela. Why are we relying on them for the supply of our energy when we have these resources that I just pointed out to you in excess of 2 trillion equivalent barrels of oil?

So, Mr. Chairman, this is the first step. This is the first step of starting the process of becoming less dependent on foreign energy, and it is the first step to get our economy recovering by creating good American jobs. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1230.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, on April 20, 2010, the Deepwater Horizon exploded in the Gulf of Mexico, killing eleven crewmen and causing over 4 million barrels of oil to spill into the gulf. Now, barely a year after the worst offshore oil spill in U.S. history, the majority is rushing three reckless offshore drilling bills to the floor as if the Deepwater Horizon disaster never happened.

Under the guise of combating high gasoline prices, today's legislation proposes to mandate the sale of three leases in the Gulf of Mexico and a fourth lease off the coast of Virginia—whether or not appropriate safeguards are in place. Astonishingly, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act actually requires the Secretary of the Interior to rely on demonstrably unrealistic environmental reviews conducted under the Bush Administration for purposes of approving these four leases. For example, these pre-spill analyses assumed that the worst case scenario for a Gulf oil spill would involve 4600 barrels of oil—or about 1/1000 the actual amount of oil spilled by the Deepwater Horizon.

Fortunately, the Obama Administration is taking a more responsible approach. Using the lessons we have learned from the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the Obama Administration has announced that it is prepared to move forward with the three Gulf lease sales by the middle of 2012—after rigorous, post-spill safety and environmental standards have been put into place. Additionally, the Administration has in my judgment correctly concluded that the Virginia lease should be cancelled as posing too great a risk to the economies and environment of the mid-Atlantic states.

Mr. Chair, this bill does nothing to lower gasoline prices. It does nothing to end the billions in wasteful taxpayer subsidies going to oil companies already reporting record profits. It does nothing to invest in America's clean energy future or strengthen America's energy security. In fact, this legislation doesn't even contain a requirement that the oil produced from these leases be sold in the United States rather than exported. The only thing this bill really does is undermine the improved well design, workplace safety and environmental standards the Obama Administration is trying to put in place in order to avoid another Deepwater Horizon disaster.

This legislation is irresponsible, and it deserves a “no” vote.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1230, “Restarting American Offshore Leasing now Act” which will require four specific offshore oil and gas lease sales within the next year. Three of these lease sales will be for locations in the Gulf of Mexico and one will be off the Coast of Virginia.

Although I have reservations about certain aspects of this bill, I nevertheless support it as a step in the right direction for America in our efforts to achieve energy independence. The central issue is promoting oil and gas related American jobs in the Gulf Coasts and to fill our Nation's oil and gas needs as we search for alternative energy sources.

THE NEED FOR FAIRNESS AND BALANCE

We must have fair and balanced discourse that considers our safety, national security, and our environment and does not place oil & gas producers at an unfair disadvantage when these very companies produce vital American jobs and contribute greatly to our economy. I

am informed that there is an amendment or legislative proposal under consideration which will tax the top 5 oil and gas producers more heavily than other producers of such energy (who will receive a tax credit).

We must ensure that we afford fair and equal tax treatment of oil and gas producers and that we do not unduly single out and punish the top 5 oil and gas producers (three of which are U.S. companies: Exxon-Mobil, Chevron and Conoco Phillips). This discriminates against large oil and gas producers who provide valuable American jobs and contribute greatly to our national and local economies; while at the same time we give a tax break and preference to foreign oil companies who do not fall within the top 5 producers. This is neither fair nor balanced and allows oil companies owned by, for example Hugo Chavez and Venezuela, to receive better tax treatment than the top 3 U.S. companies. This hurts American jobs and our economy. I appeal for us to use common sense to avoid disturbing outcomes such as this as we consider oil and gas drilling, permitting and lease sale issues.

Energy is the lifeblood of every economy, especially our local economies on the Gulf Coast. Producing more of energy leads to job creation, cheaper goods and greater economic and national security. However, the U.S. is more than 60 percent dependent on foreign sources of energy, twice as dependent today as we were just 30 years ago.

Although energy is the lifeblood of America's economic security, this growing and dangerous dependence has resulted in the loss of hundreds of thousands of good American jobs, skyrocketing consumer prices, and vulnerabilities in our national security.

The attacks of September 11, 2001 and the current instability in the Middle East places further highlights our need for legislation that will lead to our energy independence. It has always been risky to rely on unstable and unfriendly nations as the source of so much of our domestic oil supply. Currently, offshore petroleum is a source for roughly a third of domestic oil production. Any increase in our own production will place us one step closer to decreasing our dependence on foreign oil.

Energy imports now make up one third of America's trade deficit. Through this bill, America could improve the supply-demand imbalance, lower consumer prices, and increase jobs by producing more of its own energy resources.

According to the U.S. Minerals Management Service, MMS, estimates, America's deep seas on the Outer Continental Shelf, OCS, contain up to 115.3 billion barrels of oil and up to 565 trillion cubic feet of natural gas (the U.S. consumes at least 23 TCF per year) and 86 billion barrels of oil (the U.S. imports 4.5 billion per year). Even with all these energy resources, the U.S. sends more than \$300 billion (and countless American jobs) overseas every year for energy we can create at home.

Given the aftermath of the BP Oil spill, it is easy to understand the importance of addressing all safety concerns prior to the issuance of oil and gas lease sales. Since the disaster, federal safety regulations have been tightened, spill containment response capability has been enhanced and lessons have been learned. The yearlong moratorium on offshore drilling activity gave the Administration the time they needed to carefully evaluate current practices and create an effective regulatory regime.

We must make sure that as we effectively lift the offshore drilling moratorium that we properly fund that department of interior to do its job more quickly rather than cutting their budgets. I have offered an amendment to H.R. 1230 to provide for necessary and proper levels of staffing and training of technical engineers and other personnel as are necessary to review permits for drilling in the outer continental shelf land and offshore gas and oil leasing sales activities.

It is the job of the Department of the Interior to ensure that all lease sales meet the highest reasonable standards for safety. My concern is that H.R. 1230 would require the Department of Interior to act more quickly in their review of lease sale applications than their current resources allow. If the Department of the Interior moves to quickly, no one will benefit from unsafe and inadequate standards.

The Administration has already aggressively restarted drilling the outer continental shelf. To continue drilling safely, the Department of the Interior must be properly funded and staffed with technical engineers to review permits, examine lease sales, and ensure that each application is afforded proper consideration.

As a Representative of an oil and gas producing District and state, I am aware that offshore drilling is an important component of the nation's energy supply and provides many Gulf communities with jobs and income.

We can protect the environment while drilling the outer continental shelf. Providing adequate resources for review will prevent permits from being declined due to time constraints.

Responsible offshore drilling with proper funding and staff for the DOI is a good solution, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to compromise and help the hard working people in Gulf Coast communities get back to work.

We must get the American Gulf Coast oil and gas community back to work. Many people in the oil and gas industry in my district and the people and businesses of the Gulf Coast rely on oil and gas industry jobs and this benefits local economies and our national economy.

Through this bill, America could improve its energy supply and demand imbalance, lower consumer prices, and increase jobs by permitting the United States to produce more of its own energy resources as we pursue forms of alternative energy for the stability of our national energy production and our national security itself.

Mr. Chair, I believe it is very important to allow these oil and gas lease sales and properly fund the Department of the Interior to do its jobs. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1230.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chair, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1230. Just over one year ago, the Deepwater Horizon rig exploded and sank, taking the lives of 11 workers and releasing millions of barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. Instead of learning from the catastrophic economic and environmental consequences of last year's spill, H.R. 1230 would speed up leasing without introducing new safety standards and throwing environmental review to the wind.

One of these leases would be located off the shore of Virginia, just 75 miles from the shores of my home state of New Jersey. Drilling operations could potentially devastate the economy of New Jersey in the event of a spill,

since the tourism and fishing industries support hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of economic activity across the state and region.

Furthermore, this legislation does nothing to address rising gasoline prices. Instead of giving more handouts to Big Oil, we need to crack down on speculators and oil companies who post record profits on the backs of the American public. We should be investing in alternative energy sources such as wind power to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, not subsidizing Big Oil.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, all Americans are concerned about high gas prices and the growing cost they are imposing on our families. We should also be concerned that those high prices might stall our economic recovery. So what can we do to reduce the burden, both for families and for our economy as a whole?

I support safe, responsible drilling. So does President Obama: his administration has already set us on course to re-issue three out of four of the leases in question in this bill. Domestic drilling is definitely part of the solution to meeting our energy needs.

But I also know that offering drilling as the only solution is simply not up to the scale of the challenge we face. Consider that the United States already produces about 1.5 million more barrels of oil per day than it did in 2005. And last year under President Obama's watch, domestic oil production rose to its highest level since 2003. If Republicans were right, that increased production would lower prices—but in fact, oil reached a record of \$147 per barrel during the same period.

Consider the fact that Canada, unlike the U.S., produces about 1.1 million more barrels of oil than it consumes each day. Canada produces far more oil than we do—and if Republicans were right, Canadian gas prices wouldn't be rising at the same rate as ours. But they are—they're feeling the effects, just as we are.

So while I am a strong supporter of drilling, and making use of our natural resources, the fact remains that the issuing of four leases, even in the very near term, will have little to no impact on gas prices today.

In the wake of the devastating BP Gulf oil spill, we need to focus on responsible drilling as we work to increase production. We should not auction off more leases to oil companies without adequate consideration of whether offshore drilling in those locations is safe and without environmental consequences.

That's a reckless course to take, especially when the effect on today's gas prices is essentially nonexistent. While the American people want us to do everything in our power to lower gas prices, they also don't want us to set up a process that could lead to another BP Gulf oil spill.

I believe we can drill and do so responsibly, and we can expedite leases responsibly. Rather than Republicans' one-dimensional approach of simply issuing new leases, let's also ensure that oil and gas companies are diligent about producing on the leases they already own. Let's expedite leases without disregarding the environmental impacts. Let's invest in clean energy technology and efficiency to break our oil addiction—not defund those investments, as Republicans demand. Let's crack down on the financial speculation that drives gas prices up for American families.

And—when even Speaker BOEHNER agrees that the oil companies “ought to be paying

their fair share”—let's end unjustifiable subsidies to some of the world's most profitable companies, subsidies that are only driving our nation deeper into debt.

That's what a real, responsible energy policy would look like—not this bill. I would have supported it if amendments had passed to ensure environmental and safety reviews to prevent another oil spill, and to ensure that offshore drilling does not conflict with military training operations off our coasts. But because Republicans rejected those amendments, this bill remains flawed. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the three oil drilling bills reported by the Republican Majority on the House Resources Committee, including the one before the House today. I urge the House to defeat them.

One year after the largest oil spill in U.S. history revealed huge safety and enforcement problems with ultra-deep offshore drilling, gas prices are going through the ceiling and the oil companies are raking in profits hand-over-fist. Exxon Mobil just posted a first-quarter profit of \$10.7 billion, a 69 percent gain from the previous year. BP reported a first-quarter profit of \$7.1 billion, a 17 percent increase. Royal Dutch Shell earned \$6.3 billion, up 30 percent. Chevron's profit grew to \$6.2 billion, a 36 percent increase. Conoco Phillips reported a first-quarter profit of \$3 billion, up 44 percent.

What is the Republican Majority's response? They want to reward the oil companies with additional offshore leases and reduce the ability of the Interior Department to review offshore oil drilling applications for safety.

Proponents of this bill would have us believe that gas prices will go down if we only open up more coastal areas to ultra-deep-water drilling and reduce safety oversight of the oil companies. This is not true. None of these bills will do anything at all to reduce gasoline prices. Even if we threw caution to the wind and opened up these new offshore areas tomorrow, it would take years for them to produce any oil.

Before opening up new offshore areas, it's fair to ask what the industry is doing with the leases they already have. A new report by the Department of Interior reveals that more than two-thirds of existing offshore leases in the Gulf of Mexico and more than half of onshore leases on federal lands are unused. Tens of millions of acres that have already been leased to industry sit idle. The industry should either use the leases they have or give them up.

At a time when our constituents are feeling the pain of rising gas prices, it is unjustifiable that our tax code subsidizes Big Oil to the tune of billions of dollars a year. The Big Five oil companies reported a combined profit of \$32 billion in the first quarter of 2011 alone. Repealing the three largest tax breaks for the Big Five oil companies would save taxpayers billions of dollars a year. Instead of rewarding the oil companies, we should at last end these unwarranted subsidies to Big Oil.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1230.

It appears to me that the Republican energy plan is higher gas prices and lower safety standards. This fits nicely with their overall agenda for the 111th Congress: end Medicare to pay for tax breaks for Big Oil.

Yesterday, the Republicans on the Rules Committee blocked my amendment that would

require oil and gas companies to publicly disclose their environmental and worker safety record before drilling on the Outer continental shelf.

Earlier this year, Republicans voted to gut the Commodity Futures Trading Commission—the consumer watchdog agency charged with overseeing oil speculators.

And earlier today, even though BP is now reporting \$7.1 billion in quarterly profits—17 percent increase—every Republican in the House voted to block consideration of our Democratic bill, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act of 2011, to stop the billions of dollars in tax giveaways to the biggest oil companies who don't need taxpayer help to get their job done.

Under the Republican budget that the House approved earlier this year, people in their 40s and 50s now will be forced to pay more for health care when they retire than under current law—at least \$6,400 per year more.

But consider this: in the past three months, the top five oil companies made \$30 billion in profits and Republicans in Congress want to give them billions more in tax benefits and subsidies. The same Republicans who voted to end Medicare are now refusing to hold a vote on repealing the generous tax breaks for the largest and most profitable corporations in world history.

Make no mistake about it. Their bill on the floor today won't bring down the price at the pump. It won't end the massive taxpayer giveaways to Big Oil. It won't lead to more fuel-efficient cars. It won't crack down on oil speculators. And it won't improve the safety of offshore drilling—and in fact it will require the Interior Department to accept the very same flawed NEPA documents that helped lead to the BP spill in the Gulf.

I urge a “no” vote on H.R. 1230 because it ignores the lessons of the BP spill and it does nothing to help families or consumers. I don't think Americans want Congress to take money away from seniors only to give that very same money to oil giants.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I also want to mention that two members of the House, Congressman GERLACH and Congressman CULBERSON had wanted to cosponsor this bill but because we had to file the reports on the bills on Monday, they were unable to. I appreciate their support.

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 and shall be considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1230

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act”.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 216 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 216 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For the purposes of that lease sale, the Environmental Impact Statement for the 2007–2012 5-Year OCS Plan and the Multi-Sale Environmental Impact Statement are deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 218 IN THE WESTERN GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 218 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than 8 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For the purposes of that lease sale, the Environmental Impact Statement for the 2007–2012 5-Year OCS Plan and the Multi-Sale Environmental Impact Statement are deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 220 ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFFSHORE VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 220 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall not make any tract available for leasing under this section if the President, through the Secretary of Defense, determines that drilling activity on that tract would create an unreasonable conflict with military operations.

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 222 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 222 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2012.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For the purposes of that lease sale, the Environmental Impact Statement for the 2007–2012 5-Year OCS Plan and the Multi-Sale Environmental Impact Statement are deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term “Environmental Impact Statement for the 2007–2012 5 Year OCS Plan” means the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program: 2007–2012 (April 2007) prepared by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The term “Multi-Sale Environmental Impact Statement” means the Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Western Gulf of Mexico OCS Oil and Gas Lease Sales 204, 207, 210, 215, and 218, and Proposed Central Gulf of Mexico OCS Oil and Gas Lease Sales 205, 206, 208, 213, 216, and 222 (September 2008) prepared by the Secretary of the Interior.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 112–73. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an oppo-

nent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 112–73.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, beginning at line 6, amend sections 2 and 3 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 216 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas lease sale 216 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable after compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 218 IN THE WESTERN GULF OF MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas lease sale 218 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable after compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Page 5, beginning at line 1, amend section 5 to read as follows:

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 222 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas lease sale 222 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable after compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Page 5, beginning at line 15, strike section 6.

The Acting CHAIR pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1220

Mr. HOLT. The authors of this bill are so eager to accelerate the giveaways to Big Oil, rather than protect the consumers, the environment and workers, that they, in their legislation, deem that the shoddy environmental analysis conducted 4 years ago, in other words, years prior to the gulf oil blowout, to be sufficient for all future lease sales in the gulf, despite their glaring deficiencies. They deem—in other words, assume, declare—that this is sufficient. Look, this environmental impact statement was not adequate then, and we know it's not adequate now.

“Deem” is a dangerous word in legislation, especially legislation that could jeopardize worker safety and imperil the economic structure of coastal communities.

My amendment would strike the language deeming the pre-spill environ-

mental work to be sufficient and it, therefore, would require a new, updated analysis. And the administration says they intend to and are prepared to apply a strengthened environmental analysis incorporating the lessons learned.

This amnesia bill before us learns no lessons from the worst environmental oil spill in our history. Just look at some of the conclusions contained in the outdated environmental analysis.

The EIS determined “the most likely size of an offshore spill greater than or equal to 1,000 barrels would be 4,600 barrels.” So, in other words, the pre-BP spill analysis concluded that the most likely size of the largest spill that we would see in the Gulf of Mexico would be 4,600 barrels of oil. The Deepwater Horizon produced 4 million barrels spilling into the gulf.

In addition, the analysis concluded that the total volume of oil that would be spilled from all spills over 40 years would be roughly 47,000 barrels of oil. That's less than what spilled from the Deepwater Horizon in 1 day.

The EIS concluded that, in the worst-case scenario, something like several dozen miles of gulf coastline would be affected by the spill. In reality, it affected 950 miles of coastline, across all the Gulf States.

The earlier EIS review that they would say should apply for all future drilling determined that a deepwater blowout would not present a clean-up problem because the oil would rise in a water column, surfacing almost directly above, that's their words in the EIS, that they would deem to apply, surfacing almost directly over the source location. In fact, we know the oil spewing spread in subsurface plumes for miles and miles and miles across the gulf.

For commercial fisheries, the environmental statement said “a subsurface blowout would have a negligible effect on the Gulf of Mexico fish resources or commercial fishing.” In reality, the BP spill closed 88,000 square miles of the gulf to fishing.

These are just a few examples of how this is an inadequate environmental statement. Have we learned nothing from the largest oil spill in gulf waters?

It is so thoughtless and so boilerplate that it talks about protecting walrus in the Gulf of Mexico. This was a thoughtless environmental impact statement, surely not worthy of the people who live along the coast. This environmental impact statement is surely not worthy of those who make their living either in the oil business or the fishing business or any other business.

The fact is, we have far more information now than we did in 2007. And after immense cost, really hard-earned knowledge, we certainly should not proceed as if nothing has happened without reassessing our assumptions and our analyses. The Department of the Interior is working to hold these

sales mandated by this bill, but in a reasonable timeframe.

Any leases should reflect the lessons learned from the BP spill. In other words, it should reflect reality, not some dream world. They live in a dream world economically; they live in a dream world environmentally. It is clearly a world where walrus live in the Gulf of Mexico.

My amendment, I think, is a reasonable way to proceed. It would require that we do new environmental work that builds on the hard-earned lessons that we learned from the largest oil spill in the gulf waters. It ensures that future leasing in the gulf fully considers the environmental impact of drilling.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. The EIS work conducted thus far for the lease sales, and keep in mind, these lease sales were already okayed, is complete, thorough and sufficient to safely and responsibly conduct these lease sales.

It is important to note that this is only one of many environmental analyses that these leases will undergo before any drilling can start. At each of multiple stages, additional detailed environmental and safety reviews will be conducted.

The language in this bill, underlying bill, allows the administration to move forward with these lease sales in a timely manner, but does not allow drilling until at least several more layers of thorough environmental assessments and reviews are conducted on each lease sale sold at these sales. I think that's what the gentleman was getting to. The underlying bill allows that to happen.

These additional environmental studies will allow for the latest and best available information following the oil spill to be included in the studies and applied to any drilling that will take place.

In totality, the library of environmental reviews will end up totaling tens of thousands of pages, Mr. Chairman, and hundreds of hours by environmental scientists, engineers, biologists, and other professionals.

But this amendment isn't about environmental protection. This amendment is about removing the timelines in this bill to conduct these four lease sales. Keep in mind, these lease sales were already agreed to by a prior administration. The real effect of this amendment is to allow President Obama to block increased energy production by continuing to push these lease sales off past 2012 or 2017, in some cases. The

real impact of this amendment is that we are right back where we started when the President canceled these lease sales, sending jobs and energy production overseas.

This administration's actions to delay these lease sales and their long record of anti-energy roadblocks is why 2011, this year, may be the first year since 1958 that no lease sales will occur in the OCS. It is for this reason that OCS revenues in 2011 will fall by more than \$9 billion compared to 2008.

By validating the existing EIS work, the bill ensures that these lease sales will move forward this year, generating revenue for taxpayers and ensuring that our leasing program continues in a timely manner, while also allowing for additional safety measures to be taken.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Here we go again. Delay, delay, delay. The poor people of my district will have to sit there, unemployed and wait again. We've gotten environmental study after environmental study after environmental study that will happen after these lease sales. This does not prevent the additional environmental studies that will take place anyhow. All it will do is force those companies to take up to three more years before we can get to our business of drilling so we can get to our business of providing for the American people affordable energy. Again, it's a delay tactic.

How do I know that? Because I can tell you that this administration pulls delay tactic after delay tactic after delay tactic in permitting wells in the Gulf of Mexico. They lift the moratorium, and then they don't issue permits.

So what do they do now, the other side of the aisle, my colleagues on the other side? They say, well, it looks like we have a piece of legislation in front of us that's going to finally start to open the gulf back up. So let's see how many roadblocks we can put in front of it.

□ 1230

I urge my colleagues, defeat this amendment. Let's get on with the business of providing this country with affordable energy and let's get this economy rolling and let's get back to creating jobs.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 112-73.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, beginning at line 19, strike "if the President, through the Secretary of Defense, determines that drilling activity on that tract would create an unreasonable conflict" and insert "until the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, certifies that drilling activity on that tract would not create a conflict".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this simple amendment requires the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to certify that moving forward with Lease Sale 220 will not impede naval or other Department of Defense operations off Virginia's coast.

The Department of Defense issued a report which stated that 78 percent of the area of Lease Sale 220 is currently used by the Navy for equipment testing, practicing with live ordnance, underwater training, and other critical operations.

There may not be a readily available alternative for live ordnance testing. And, of course, we wouldn't want live ordnance being used near oil wells, now, would we?

As you know, Norfolk is the largest naval base in America. It is critical for our national security and has beneficial side effects, obviously, for the regional economy. But billions of dollars have been invested in Norfolk and in that test bed area.

Perhaps it is possible for offshore oil exploration or wind energy development to be compatible with continued naval operations. That is why we asked for certification. But if energy development forced the Navy to relocate, our national security would suffer, preparedness would suffer, and billions of dollars of extra cost in Federal expenditures would be incurred. Virginia's economy of course would also suffer, as we could lose more than \$10 billion in annual contracting income derived from that base.

This amendment ensures that energy development would not cripple naval operations by simply requiring the President with the Secretary of Defense to certify that moving forward with Lease Sale 220 won't impede naval operations and harm national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

While I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to accomplish, the underlying bill already protects the Defense Department's responsibilities in the Outer Continental Shelf of Virginia. So this amendment is totally unnecessary.

Because preserving the working relationship between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior is of great importance to the Virginia congressional delegation and to the Natural Resources Committee, H.R. 1230 already ensures the mutual goals of national security and energy independence by requiring that the lease sale be conducted with stipulations on surface use, as well as additional requirements to make certain that the leases issued in this area would not impact defense operations.

I also want to point out that bipartisan support for energy production offshore of Virginia does exist. According to a study by the Southeast Energy Alliance, offshore energy development in Virginia could create nearly 2,000 jobs in Virginia and produce more than one-half billion barrels of oil and 2.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

This natural gas is important, because in the last few years the Dominion liquefied natural gas terminal in Baltimore, Maryland, received huge amounts of foreign natural gas. Developing energy production in offshore Virginia could displace foreign natural gas as well as mean more energy for Virginia.

Now, in context, one-half billion barrels of oil is enough to fuel all 4 million cars in Virginia for more than 4 years, and 2.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas could heat all 3.2 million Virginia households for more than 11 years. And, developing resources off Virginia's coast could generate nearly \$19.5 billion in revenues to Federal, State, and local governments.

Virginians, along with their Governor, both Democratic Senators, and a majority of the congressional delegation here in Congress, and the city council of Virginia Beach, off of which much of the development would take place, do support offshore leasing and development because they understand it can bring much-needed jobs and revenues to the State.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend from Colorado for his remarks. But, frankly, if he is so certain of the protections contained in this legislation, then surely this extra special amendment to make sure that Virginia is protected would not find objection on the other side of the aisle.

I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Northern Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend and colleague.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Atlantic fleet is based at the Norfolk Naval Base and

operates in the same waters that this legislation proposes to sell for oil and gas development. Does the Republican majority really want to jeopardize those thousands and thousands of jobs that are identified with that naval base?

According to a report issued by the Secretary of Defense, there should be no lease sales in 72 percent of the proposed lease area that this bill directs be sold to oil and gas companies because it is in conflict with live ordnance, air-surface missile, and gunnery exercises, shipboard qualification trials, carrier qualifications, and development and operational follow-on testing and evaluation, and an additional 5 percent would interfere with aerial operations and should not host permanent surface structures such as drilling rigs.

In other words, more than three quarters of the area that this legislation directs be sold to oil and gas companies is in conflict with our national security interests, and a good deal of the remaining 22 percent is within shipping lanes of the country's two busiest commercial ports, Hampton Roads and Baltimore.

Mr. Chairman, our coastal waters are a shared resource that host a number of competing and sometimes incompatible uses. Clearly, direct national security interests should be weighed at least alongside the indirect benefit of unproven oil and gas developments that won't occur for many, many, many years to come.

This amendment would ensure national security interests would prevail. But it also underscores the point that the majority seems too anxious to dismiss: The interests of our coastal fisheries and the tourism industry. Those industries generate billions in income and sustain the livelihood of millions of Americans. Their future is placed at risk when Congress passes laws that disregard the lessons past disasters have taught by mandating shortcuts to more drilling.

I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment and reject the underlying bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I yield 1 minute to my friend from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

This amendment will ensure that necessary safeguards are in place to protect military training operations, NASA missions, and port access in certain offshore areas.

In the Commonwealth of Virginia, the United States Navy trains extensively in the Virginia Capes Operations Area off the coast of Virginia. Additionally, NASA's Wallops Flight Facility on Virginia's Eastern Shore requires a clear and unrestricted rocket and target launch range off Virginia's coast.

I have long had reservations about drilling off the coast of Virginia. I be-

lieve the environmental, economic, and national security risks for that drilling far outweigh any potential benefits. But if drilling will occur, this amendment will ensure that commonsense and responsible processes will be in place to safeguard against obvious negative consequences to our military, to NASA, and to port operations.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1240

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Before I yield back, I just want to say I appreciate again the reassurances from our colleague from Colorado, but many of us in Virginia want to be sure.

Again, this amendment is simple. It does not stop oil production or oil drilling offshore. It simply requires, first, a certification that the all-important naval base at Norfolk is protected and that the testing bed offshore is not in jeopardy, given the billions of dollars we have invested in national security in that area and its importance to our regional economy. We think it is a reasonable protection, a reasonable measure.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that the Governor of Virginia supports this, the majority of the House Members from Virginia support this without the amendment, and the Democratic Senators from Virginia have in the past agreed to legislation identical in wording to what this legislation says about offshore activity. So because the offshore activities are adequately and responsibly dealt with in the bill as it is, I would urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 112-73 on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 240, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—174

Andrews	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Gutierrez	Payne
Baldwin	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bass (NH)	Heinrich	Peters
Becerra	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Himes	Polis
Berman	Hinchev	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Rahall
Blumenauer	Holt	Reichert
Bono Mack	Honda	Reyes
Boswell	Hoyer	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Inlee	Richmond
Braley (IA)	Israel	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Capps	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Johnson (IL)	T.
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Jones	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Keating	Schiff
Chu	Kildee	Schrader
Cicilline	Kind	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Kissell	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Scott, David
Clay	Langevin	Serrano
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Shuler
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Sires
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Costello	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Loeb sack	Speier
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Cummings	Lowe y	Sutton
Davis (CA)	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Maloney	Tierney
DeGette	Markey	Tonko
DeLauro	Matsui	Towns
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Dicks	McCollum	Van Hollen
Dingell	McDermott	Velázquez
Doggett	McGovern	Visclosky
Doyle	McIntyre	Walz (MN)
Edwards	McNerney	Wasserman
Ellison	Michaud	Schultz
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watt
Fattah	Moore	Waxman
Filner	Moran	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Woolsey
Fudge	Neal	Wu
Garamendi	Owens	Yarmuth
Gonzalez	Pallone	Young (FL)

NOES—240

Adams	Austria	Barton (TX)
Aderholt	Bachmann	Benishke
Akin	Bachus	Berg
Alexander	Barletta	Biggert
Altmire	Barrow	Billirakis
Amash	Bartlett	Bishop (UT)

Black	Griffith (VA)	Paul
Blackburn	Grimm	Paulsen
Bonner	Guinta	Pearce
Boren	Guthrie	Pence
Bostany	Hall	Peterson
Brady (TX)	Hanna	Petri
Brooks	Harper	Pitts
Broun (GA)	Harris	Platts
Buchanan	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Bucshon	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Buerkle	Hayworth	Price (GA)
Burgess	Heck	Quayle
Burton (IN)	Heller	Reed
Calvert	Hensarling	Rehberg
Camp	Herger	Renacci
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Canseco	Holden	Rigell
Cantor	Huelskamp	Rivera
Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Carter	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Rogers (MD)
Chandler	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Coble	Jordan	Rokita
Coffman (CO)	Kelly	Rooney
Cole	King (IA)	Roskam
Conaway	Kingston	Ross (AR)
Cooper	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (FL)
Costa	Kline	Royce
Cravaack	Labrador	Runyan
Crawford	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw	Lance	Scalise
Critz	Landry	Schilling
Culberson	Lankford	Schmidt
Davis (KY)	Latham	Schock
Denham	LaTourette	Schweikert
Dent	Latta	Scott (SC)
DesJarlais	Lewis (CA)	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dold	Long	Sessions
Lucas	Lucas	Shimkus
Luetkemeyer	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Lummis	Lummis	Simpson
Lungren, Daniel	E.	Smith (NE)
Mack	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Manzullo	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Marchant	Marchant	Southerland
Marino	Marino	Stearns
Matheson	Matheson	Stivers
McCarthy (CA)	McCauley	Stutzman
Sullivan	Sullivan	Terry
McClintock	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
McCotter	McCotter	Thornberry
McHenry	McHenry	Tiberi
McKeon	McKeon	Tipton
McKinley	McKinley	Turner
McMorris	McMorris	Upton
Rodgers	Rodgers	Walberg
Meehan	Meehan	Walden
Mica	Mica	Walsh (IL)
Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Webster
Miller (MI)	Miller (MI)	West
Miller, Gary	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Mulvaney	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Murphy (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Myrick	Myrick	Wittman
Neugebauer	Neugebauer	Wolf
Noem	Noem	Womack
Nugent	Nugent	Woodall
Nunes	Nunes	Yoder
Nunnelee	Nunnelee	Young (AK)
Olson	Olson	Young (IN)
Palazzo	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman	Hunter	Pascrell
Bilbray	Johnson, Sam	Pompeo
Crowley	King (NY)	Rangel
Emerson	Meeks	Rothman (NJ)
Engel	Nadler	Rush
Giffords	Oliver	Weiner

□ 1306

Ms. JENKINS and Mr. ROSKAM changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. ELLISON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 240, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—176

Altmire	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Andrews	Grijalva	Payne
Baca	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Baldwin	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Becerra	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Higgins	Polis
Berman	Himes	Price (NC)
Billirakis	Hinchev	Quigley
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Reyes
Blumenauer	Holt	Richardson
Boswell	Honda	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Braley (IA)	Inlee	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Israel	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Capps	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	T.
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Jones	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Keating	Schiff
Chu	Kildee	Schrader
Cicilline	Kind	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Kissell	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Scott, David
Clay	Langevin	Serrano
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Shuler
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Sires
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cooper	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Costello	Loeb sack	Speier
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Critz	Lowe y	Sutton
Cuellar	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Markey	Tonko
DeFazio	Matsui	Towns
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Deutch	McCollum	Van Hollen
Dicks	McDermott	Velázquez
Dingell	McGovern	Visclosky
Doggett	McIntyre	Walz (MN)
Doyle	McNerney	Wasserman
Edwards	Michaud	Schultz
Ellison	Miller (FL)	Waters
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Watt
Farr	Miller, George	Waxman
Fattah	Moore	Welch
Filner	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Fudge	Napolitano	Wu
Garamendi	Neal	Yarmuth
Gonzalez	Owens	Young (FL)
Green, Al	Pallone	

NOES—240

Adams	Austria	Bartlett
Aderholt	Bachmann	Barton (TX)
Akin	Bachus	Bass (NH)
Alexander	Barletta	Benishke
Amash	Barrow	Berg

Biggert	Grimm	Paulsen
Bishop (UT)	Guinta	Pearce
Black	Guthrie	Pence
Blackburn	Hall	Peterson
Bonner	Hanna	Petri
Bono Mack	Harper	Pitts
Boren	Harris	Platts
Boustany	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Pompeo
Brooks	Hayworth	Posey
Broun (GA)	Heck	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Heller	Quayle
Buechson	Hensarling	Reed
Buerkle	Herger	Rehberg
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Burton (IN)	Holden	Renacci
Calvert	Huelskamp	Ribble
Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Campbell	Hultgren	Rivera
Canseco	Hunter	Roby
Cantor	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Capito	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Jordan	Rokita
Chandler	Kelly	Rooney
Coble	King (IA)	Roskam
Coffman (CO)	Kingston	Ross (AR)
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (FL)
Conaway	Kline	Royce
Costa	Labrador	Runyan
Cravaack	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Crawford	Lance	Scalise
Crenshaw	Landry	Schilling
Culberson	Lankford	Schmidt
Davis (KY)	Latham	Schock
Denham	LaTourette	Schweikert
Dent	Latta	Scott (SC)
DesJarlais	Lewis (CA)	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dold	Long	Sessions
Donnelly (IN)	Lucas	Shimkus
Dreier	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Duffy	Lummis	Simpson
Duncan (SC)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)
Duncan (TN)	E.	Smith (NJ)
Ellmers	Mack	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	Manzullo	Southerland
Fincher	Marchant	Stearns
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Stivers
Flake	Matheson	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Sullivan
Fleming	McCaul	Terry
Flores	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Forbes	McCotter	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McHenry	Tiberi
Fox	McKeon	Tipton
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Turner
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Upton
Gallely	Rodgers	Walberg
Gardner	Meehan	Walden
Garrett	Mica	Walsh (IL)
Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Webster
Gibbs	Miller, Gary	West
Gibson	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gohmert	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gosar	Noem	Wolf
Gowdy	Nugent	Womack
Granger	Nunes	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Olson	Young (AK)
Griffin (AR)	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Griffith (VA)	Paul	

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman	Giffords	Pascarell
Bilbray	Johnson, Sam	Rangel
Crowley	King (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
DeLauro	Meeks	Weiner
Emerson	Nadler	
Engel	Oliver	

□ 1313

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, 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. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 245, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LUJÁN. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Luján moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1230 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 5, after line 14, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

SEC. 5. NO FOREIGN SALES.

The leases offered for sale under this Act shall specify that all oil and natural gas produced under such leases shall be offered for sale only in the United States.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, American families are hurting right now. When the cost of gas at the pump rises, that means that the cost of groceries goes up, the cost of goods goes up, and the cost of just getting to work goes up. The American people need relief; and the way this legislation is written, it will do nothing to decrease the price at the pump, and it will do nothing to lower the international price of oil.

All day today, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have suggested that drilling more is the solution to high gas prices. If my Republican colleagues really believe that increasing drilling in the U.S. will lower gas prices, then we should all be able to agree that oil produced in America should stay in America to help American families and American businesses.

That's why I am offering this final amendment today—to ensure that oil resources that are produced through leasing under this act are kept here and sold here in the United States. Simply put, this means, if we produce it here, we should keep it here for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I come from a State that has oil and gas production, and we know how important domestic produc-

tion is. We don't disagree that production in the United States is important. Personally, I favor a more comprehensive plan to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil, one that includes natural gas, wind, solar, one that grows new industries and creates jobs that cannot be outsourced out of the United States.

While I disagree with my Republican colleagues' approach, I think that we can all agree that something must be done to reduce the price of gasoline for consumers. The American people want us to work together to lower gas prices, plain and simple. They know our country is far too reliant on foreign oil, and they want us to do something real about it, plain and simple. Mr. Speaker, some things deserve to be repeated, and I'll tell you that the American people want us to come together to lower gas prices, plain and simple.

At a time when gas prices are at historic highs, if we're going to produce more from American drilling, we should keep it in America to help Americans. We've heard from the other side that the solution is as simple as producing more oil in the U.S., but that's not going to lower costs in international energy markets. That's not how it works.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. domestic oil production is already at its highest level in almost a decade, and that's a fact. In the last 2 years, oil production from the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf has increased by more than a third, and that's a fact. So, while we see our domestic production going up, the price at the pump is going up even higher, and that's hurting families.

Without this amendment, there is nothing in the Republican bill that would guarantee that oil produced under this act would stay in the United States to offer relief for the American people. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we can change all of that, and we can do it together and do what's right for the American people. We can support this amendment that simply says that oil produced in the United States under these leases would stay in the United States.

My Republican colleagues will tell us that this bill is about sending a message to OPEC and to the world that we are willing to produce our own oil. If we're going to send a message, Mr. Speaker, let's send the message that when we drill on the taxpayers' land that America's oil should stay right here in America to lower prices at the pump, plain and simple.

To my colleagues, when you go home to your districts this weekend, ask your constituents if they think oil produced in the U.S. should be kept in the U.S. and refined in the U.S. for American consumers, American families, and American businesses or if they think it should be shipped out of the country.

What do you think they'll say?

Quite simply, that is the choice, and that is all this final amendment says.

It will not kill this bill. If it is adopted, it will be immediately incorporated into the underlying bill, and the bill will be voted upon immediately. Let's do something for the American people, and plain and simple, let's support this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1320

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion to recommit.

Quite frankly, this amendment is redundant, unnecessary, and another attempt to divert attention from the real issue of increasing energy production in order to create jobs, lower energy costs, and improve national security by lessening our dependence on foreign oil.

First, Mr. Speaker, exports are already subject to the Export Administration Act. Before any oil or gas can be exported, the President must find that the exports will not diminish the total quantity or quality of petroleum available to the U.S. and the national interests and are in accord with the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1969. If the President finds that exports are in violation of the Export Administration Act, an executive order can halt all these exports if Congress finds that the exports are in conflict with the national interests, and they can act accordingly.

Now, having said it is covered under law, let's really get to the bottom line. This is another distraction from the same people that brought us cap-and-trade. Now, that should probably say everything right there because I find it absolutely ironic my good friend from New Mexico making this argument that if we went out and talked to our constituents if they would like to buy American-made energy, he suggested they would say overwhelmingly yes. Well, of course, they would. They would also say why aren't we drilling for sources here in the United States, offshore in the Gulf of Mexico and onshore; and that's what these three bills do.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to recommit and pass the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 238, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—171

Altmire	Garamendi	Murphy (CT)
Andrews	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Baca	Green, Al	Neal
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pallone
Barrow	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Payne
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peterson
Blumenauer	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Boren	Hinchey	Price (NC)
Boswell	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Holden	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Holt	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Honda	Ross (AR)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Inslee	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Israel	Rush
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Carney	(TX)	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Schiff
Chandler	Jones	Schrader
Chu	Kaptur	Schwartz
Ciçilline	Keating	Scott (VA)
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Serrano
Clay	Kissell	Sewell
Cleaver	Kucinich	Sherman
Clyburn	Langevin	Shuler
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Costa	Levin	Speier
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Courtney	Lipinski	Sutton
Critz	Loeback	Thompson (CA)
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Lujan	Tonko
DeFazio	Lynch	Towns
DeGette	Maloney	Tsongas
DeLauro	Markey	Velázquez
Deutch	Matheson	Viscosky
Dicks	Matsui	Walz (MN)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Wasserman
Doggett	McCollum	Schultz
Donnelly (IN)	McDermott	Waters
Doyle	McGovern	Watt
Edwards	McIntyre	Waxman
Ellison	McNerney	Welch
Eshoo	Michaud	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Miller (NC)	Woolsey
Fattah	Miller, George	Wu
Filner	Moore	Yarmuth
Fudge	Moran	

NOES—238

Adams	Bono Mack	Coble
Aderholt	Boustany	Coffman (CO)
Akin	Brady (TX)	Cole
Alexander	Brooks	Conaway
Amash	Broun (GA)	Cooper
Austria	Buchanan	Cravaack
Bachmann	Bucshon	Crawford
Bachus	Buerkle	Crenshaw
Bartlett	Burgess	Culberson
Bartlett	Burton (IN)	Davis (KY)
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Denham
Bass (NH)	Camp	Dent
Benishek	Campbell	DesJarlais
Berg	Canseco	Diaz-Balart
Biggart	Cantor	Dold
Bilirakis	Capito	Dreier
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Duffy
Black	Cassidy	Duncan (SC)
Blackburn	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Bonner	Chaffetz	Ellmers

Farenthold	Lance	Ribble
Fincher	Landry	Rigell
Fitzpatrick	Lankford	Rivera
Flake	Latham	Roby
Fleischmann	LaTourette	Roe (TN)
Fleming	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Flores	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Forbes	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Fortenberry	Long	Rohrabacher
Fox	Lucas	Rokita
Frank (MA)	Luetkemeyer	Rooney
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen
Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel E.	Roskam
Gardner	Mack	Ross (FL)
Garrett	Manzullo	Royce
Gerlach	Marchant	Runyan
Gibbs	Marino	Ryan (WI)
Gibson	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise
Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Schilling
Gohmert	McCaul	Schmidt
Goodlatte	McClintock	Schock
Gosar	McCotter	Schweikert
Gowdy	McHenry	Scott (SC)
Granger	McKeon	Scott, Austin
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Sensenbrenner
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Sessions
Griffin (AR)	Rodgers	Shimkus
Griffith (VA)	Meehan	Shuster
Grimm	Mica	Simpson
Guinta	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)
Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Hall	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Hanna	Mulvaney	Southerland
Harper	Murphy (PA)	Stearns
Harris	Myrick	Stivers
Hartzler	Neugebauer	Stutzman
Hastings (WA)	Noem	Sullivan
Hayworth	Nugent	Terry
Heck	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Heller	Nunnelee	Thornberry
Hensarling	Olson	Tiberi
Herger	Owens	Tipton
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Turner
Huelskamp	Paul	Upton
Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen	Walberg
Hultgren	Pearce	Walden
Hunter	Pence	Walsh (IL)
Hurt	Petri	Webster
Issa	Pitts	West
Jenkins	Platts	Westmoreland
Johnson (IL)	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Johnson (OH)	Polis	Wilson (SC)
Jordan	Pompeo	Wittman
Kelly	Posey	Wolf
King (IA)	Price (GA)	Womack
Kingston	Quayle	Woodall
Kinzinger (IL)	Reed	Yoder
Kline	Rehberg	Young (AK)
Labrador	Reichert	Young (FL)
Lamborn	Renacci	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman	Giffords	Rangel
Berkley	Hirono	Reyes
Bilbray	Johnson, Sam	Richardson
Crowley	King (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
Cummings	Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta
Emerson	Nadler	Van Hollen
Engel	Olver	Weiner
Gallegly	Pascrell	

□ 1339

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 297 had I been present I would have voted "aye." I was unfortunately detained and unable to vote.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 297, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 149, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—266

Adams	Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee
Aderholt	Gohmert	Olson
Akin	Gonzalez	Owens
Alexander	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Altmire	Gosar	Paul
Amash	Gowdy	Paulsen
Austria	Granger	Pearce
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Pence
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Barletta	Green, Al	Petri
Barrow	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bartlett	Griffith (VA)	Platts
Barton (TX)	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Bass (NH)	Guinta	Pompeo
Benishek	Guthrie	Posey
Berg	Hall	Price (GA)
Biggert	Hanna	Quayle
Bilirakis	Harper	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Harris	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Rehberg
Black	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Blackburn	Hayworth	Renacci
Bonner	Heck	Reyes
Bono Mack	Heller	Ribble
Boren	Hensarling	Richardson
Boswell	Herger	Richmond
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Hinojosa	Rivera
Brooks	Holden	Roby
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Buerkle	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rokita
Calvert	Jackson Lee	Rooney
Camp	(TX)	Roskam
Campbell	Jenkins	Ross (AR)
Canseco	Johnson (IL)	Ross (FL)
Cantor	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Capito	Johnson, E. B.	Runyan
Cardoza	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kelly	Scalise
Cassidy	King (IA)	Schilling
Chabot	Kingston	Schmidt
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Chandler	Kline	Schweikert
Coble	Labrador	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Landry	Sessions
Conyers	Lankford	Sewell
Cooper	Latham	Shimkus
Costa	LaTourette	Shuler
Cravaack	Latta	Shuster
Crawford	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Critz	Long	Smith (NJ)
Cueellar	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Davis (KY)	Lummis	Stearns
Denham	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Dent	E.	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Mack	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Terry
Dold	Marchant	Thompson (MS)
Donnelly (IN)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Dreier	Matheson	Thornberry
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McCauley	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Turner
Ellmers	McCotter	Upton
Farenthold	McHenry	Walberg
Fattah	McIntyre	Walden
Fincher	McKeon	Walsh (IL)
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Walz (MN)
Flake	McMorris	Webster
Fleischmann	Rodgers	West
Fleming	Meehan	Westmoreland
Flores	Mica	Whitfield
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gardner	Myrick	Yoder
Garrett	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Noem	Young (FL)
Gibbs	Nugent	Young (IN)
Gibson	Nunes	

NOES—149

Andrews	Hanabusa	Payne
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Baldwin	Heinrich	Perlmutter
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Peters
Becerra	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Hinchey	Polis
Berman	Hirono	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Quigley
Blumenauer	Honda	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Bralley (IA)	Inslee	Ruppersberger
Paul	Israel	Rush
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Capuano	Jones	T.
Carnahan	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Keating	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Kind	Schiff
Chu	Kissell	Schrader
Ciilline	Kucinich	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Clay	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Lee (CA)	Levin	Sherman
Levin	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Lipinski	Lipinski	Slaughter
Loebbeck	Loebbeck	Smith (WA)
Lofgren, Zoe	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Lowe	Lowe	Stark
Luján	Luján	Sutton
Lynch	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Maloney	Maloney	Tierney
Markey	Markey	Tonko
Matsui	Matsui	Towns
McCarthy (NY)	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Dicks	McCollum	Van Hollen
McDermott	McDermott	Velázquez
Doggett	McGovern	Visclosky
Doyle	McNerney	Wasserman
Edwards	Michaud	Schultz
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Waters
Eshoo	Miller, George	Watt
Farr	Moore	Waxman
Filner	Moran	Welch
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Napolitano	Woolsey
Garamendi	Neal	Wu
Grijalva	Pallone	Yarmuth
Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)	

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Giffords	Olver
Bilbray	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Crowley	Johnson, Sam	Rangel
Emerson	King (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
Engel	Meeks	Weiner
Gallegly	Nadler	

□ 1359

Messrs. MILLER of North Carolina, SCHRADER, BUTTERFIELD, and PRICE of North Carolina changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 298, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the RECORD that on May 5, 2011, I missed the six rollcall votes of the day, as I was attending a wreath laying ceremony at Ground Zero with President Obama.

Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote No. 293, on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 245.

Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote No. 294, On Agreeing to H. Res. 245—Rule providing for consideration

of both H.R. 1229—Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act and H.R. 1230—Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote No. 295, on Agreeing to the Holt Amendment.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote No. 296, on Agreeing to the Connolly (VA)/Moran (VA)/Sarbanes (MD) Amendment.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote No. 297, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1230 with Instructions.

Finally, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote No. 298, on Passage of H.R. 1230.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 2011, I was absent for 6 rollcall votes because I joined the President at a wreath laying ceremony in honor of victims of 9/11 in New York.

If I had been here, I would have voted: “no” on rollcall vote 293; “no” on rollcall vote 294; “yes” on rollcall vote 295; “yes” on rollcall vote 296; “yes” on rollcall vote 297; and “no” on rollcall vote 298.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I was at Ground Zero in New York with the President and 9/11 families and therefore was unavailable for votes in Washington.

However, if I had been here this is how I would have voted: rollcall No. 293: “yea”; rollcall No. 294: “yea”; rollcall No. 295: “no”; rollcall No. 296: “no”; rollcall No. 297: “no”; and rollcall No. 298: “yes.”

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, I hereby give notice of my resignation from the United States House of Representatives, effective Monday, May 9, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time. Included is a copy of the letter I submitted to Governor Brian Sandoval.

Serving Nevada's Second Congressional District has been one of the greatest honors of my life. No state has been harder hit by the recession than Nevada. My state has the unfortunate distinction of leading the nation in unemployment, foreclosures, and bankruptcy. There is no question that our nation needs to change the way we do business if we are going to get our economy back on track. It has been a privilege to join my House colleagues in the fight to restore fiscal responsibility to Washington and work towards a more prosperous future for our great nation.

I look forward to continuing our important work in the United States Senate.

Sincerely,

DEAN HELLER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2011.

Hon. BRIAN SANDOVAL,
Governor, State of Nevada, State Capitol, Carson City, NV.

DEAR GOVERNOR SANDOVAL, I hereby submit my resignation as United States Representative of Nevada's Second Congressional District, effective Monday, May 9, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time.

Serving Nevada's Second Congressional District has been one of the greatest honors of my life. As you know all too well, no state has been harder hit by the recession than Nevada. There is a lot of hard work ahead to get our state and nation moving in the right direction. Nevadans across our state have been struggling with job loss, high gas prices, and foreclosures. There is no question that our nation needs to change the way we do business if we are going to get our economy back on track and get Nevadans working again. These issues will remain my top priorities in the United States Senate.

I look forward to our continued work together to promote policies that strengthen our economy and improve Nevadans' quality of life.

Sincerely,

DEAN HELLER,
Member of Congress.

□ 1400

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1081

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1081.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, May 10, 2011, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. PASTOR, Arizona

RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF ENHANCED INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES IN WAR AGAINST TERROR

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we have appropriately celebrated the successful mission to take out Osama bin Laden, there has been one discordant note sounded in the Halls of Congress, and that is with the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States. There still is a reluctance on the part of this administration to recognize the major contribution made to this country by those who were involved in enhanced interrogation techniques which resulted in part of the information, the intelligence information, that allowed us to find Osama bin Laden.

The reason I bring this up is this administration has said in the past that certain types of enhanced interrogation techniques equaled torture. I do not believe that to be true, and for that to remain on the record subjects those men and women who have done a tremendous job for this country, which has resulted in one of the successful missions, in addition to other missions that have taken place in our war against terror, subjects them to the cloud of prosecution in the future and the accusation that they involved themselves in forms of conduct that would be defined as torture by some of the highest officials in the United States. That is something that we cannot allow to happen.

When we have the CIA Director indicate that we did receive information as a result of some of these activities, it seems to me that we are duty bound to clear up the record and to thank those men and women, not condemn them.

FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE NEEDED FOR TEXAS

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

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, Texas is burning. Since November, Texas has experienced over 9,000 wildfires that have burned over 2 million acres and destroyed more than 400 homes and several thousand structures. These fires continue to rage, threatening the lives and property of Texans.

The State of Texas and local governments, along with our firefighters and our other first responders, have done a magnificent job of responding to the threats of these wildfires. However, the resources of the State and the local government have been stretched responding to fires we have already had; and the threat of wildfires continues. Without additional assistance, the capacity to respond to future wildfires will be greatly diminished. That is why Governor Perry requested a major disaster declaration and Federal disaster assistance. Unfortunately, President Obama denied this request.

Mr. Speaker, many in Texas and in my district can't seem to understand the President's decision. Governor Perry intends to appeal the President's decision, and I hope the President will reconsider.

REMEMBERING THOSE LOST IN THE APRIL STORMS

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring everyone's attention to the extraordinarily destructive storms that have raged throughout the South and particularly in my home State of Arkansas. In my home State, we have seen flooding and tornado damage wreak havoc on local communities. We have seen the lives of our loved ones tragically taken before their time.

Last week, I personally surveyed the damage in central Arkansas in my district. In the little town of Vilonia, a town north of Little Rock, 70 homes were destroyed and an additional 50 were damaged. I toured Little Rock Air Force Base and saw the damage to structures there and the damage to our C-130s that are so important to our national security. In Hot Springs Village, I saw the damage left in the wake of the latest round of the storms that claimed the life of an 8-month-old boy there. He is one of the 22 Arkansans killed by the storms in April.

I ask my colleagues and all Americans listening today to keep the families affected by this tragedy in their thoughts and prayers.

RECOGNIZING THOSE WHO TRAINED AT THE NAVAL STATION GREAT LAKES

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, when the President sought to take out America's most wanted and dangerous enemy, he called on an elite team of the United States Navy to execute the mission.

The 10th District of Illinois is home to an important Navy base. The Naval Station Great Lakes is the first stop of every single Navy recruit. It is likely that those who executed the mission in Pakistan on Sunday started their training at this base. Today, I want to recognize those who got the job done and the outstanding training provided at Naval Station Great Lakes.

I applaud the continued heroic efforts of our Armed Forces and intelligence personnel, and particularly those who under the cover of a dark Pakistan night dropped into a fortified compound to give justice to millions of people around the world.

Mr. Speaker, our fight against those who want to destroy democracies around the world continues, but today we can press ahead as confident as ever in our Nation's ability to confront and triumph over evil.

MARKING THE HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

(Ms. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the Holocaust Days of Remembrance. In 1938, there was a family that lived in Vienna, Austria. The father was a successful tea merchant. The boys were both talented and bright. And when the Anschluss came and the Nazis arrived, the younger son watched as his mother signed away all of their possessions.

The mother made her way to the United States, because she had relatives here. The older of the two boys was smuggled out of Austria in the trunk of a car. The younger boy was taken to an orphanage, a boy's orphanage in Belgium.

The father, Sigmund, was not able to obtain passage, as the boys eventually did to the United States, and he ended up in the free city of Shanghai, where he reestablished his tea business. He kept writing to his wife, Rose, over the ensuing 2 years, and then she stopped hearing from him. It turned out that Sigmund Haimovitz had died in Shanghai of malaria.

His younger son, Henry, was my father-in-law, and I want to remember Sigmund Haimovitz and his brave family and all those who perished as a result of the terrible events of the Holocaust.

IMPORTANT POINTS FOR AMERICA TO CONSIDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCSHON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to have an hour to invest in laying out some points here that I think are important for you to consider. And as America listens on, hopefully it will stimulate some of the thought process and help bring people to some conclusions.

The first thing that I think that any one of us wants to speak of and to is the President's announcement which took place very late on Sunday night that the Special Forces team had been successful in taking out Osama bin Laden.

Our first response to that news, that happy news for all of America, I think, is to congratulate the team that fast-roped down into that compound, those who put their lives on the line to put an end to the life of perhaps the most evil man on the planet, Osama bin Laden. And I congratulate the President of the United States for issuing the order and making the decision to go into that compound in the fashion that they did.

□ 1410

He had a number of options. As the news has reported, and I accept this to

be fact, that the President sat in and led five different discussions to evaluate the quality of the intelligence that was available and the tactics that might be used in that compound and that he gave the order.

Some have said it was the most courageous order a President had given in their memory or lifetime. They were all from the administration. It was a good order, there's no question. I don't think it was the most courageous. It didn't lack courage. But there are a number of other big decisions that stand up there, I think, in a higher profile than this one. But it was the right decision, it was a good decision, and the President had to take a chance.

He could have ordered a massive bombing raid on that compound and, as some have said, turned it into a glass parking lot, which would have raised the level of the degree of success but firmly eliminated the chance to show that Osama bin Laden was in that compound. He could have dropped a single bomb, a one-ton-plus bomb from a Predator, that would have had a reasonable chance of succeeding in taking out the most evil man on the planet. Or he could have just done nothing. Or he could have ordered the Special Forces in to fast-rope inside that compound and do what they did. Of those options, I believe the President chose the right one, and I congratulate him for that decision.

Yet in sitting here and listening to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN) talk about the situation with the intelligence that we had, it is clear to me, and it has been clear to me for a long time, that one of the essential links in the intelligence that led us to Osama bin Laden in the compound in Pakistan was information that was given up in part by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in enhanced interrogation encounters that he had, probably before he went to Gitmo. That information then was worked, it was matched up with other information, and the thread was followed. In fact, the courier was followed to the compound in Pakistan.

It's ironic that the President of the United States campaigned against such enhanced interrogation tactics. It's ironic that many whom I serve with on the Judiciary Committee lined up against George W. Bush and accused him of ordering torture against people who had been attacking and killing Americans, terrorists of the like of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and a very small number of others.

I agree with the gentleman from California. Waterboarding is not torture. If it were torture, we would be torturing our own Special Forces troops. I would be willing to wager—and this I can't verify not knowing the identities of the individuals who did fast-rope down into that compound—that a number of those very same forces that went into the compound that took out Osama bin Laden in their training were likely waterboarded as a part of their training. I've sat in my of-

fice and I've gone out in the field and I've talked to those Special Forces personnel who were waterboarded as part of their training. It is not a painful procedure, but it is one that gives one the sensation that they are drowning. It's easy enough to go on the Internet and read the material there, Mr. Speaker. It's an enhanced and effective interrogation technique, and in all of the research that I did—and I read back in story after story of this and had others dig down in it—I found one case where there was a fatality that was nearly a century ago that was because of the brutal tactics that they used in conjunction with the waterboarding. In any case, there are many Americans that are alive today because of the information that our people were able to acquire because of enhanced interrogation techniques, and it's ironic that President Bush approved the methods that acquired the thread, the significant thread of information, without which no one can explain to me how we would have found Osama bin Laden in that compound.

And so the very President who campaigned against the tactics that George Bush was employing is the one that was able to take the information from those tactics and make the right decision to take out OBL. I'm glad that George Bush made the decisions that he made. I'm glad that he was strong and courageous and defended America's ability to gain information in the fashion that they did, because anyone will tell you that was involved with the interrogations, especially of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, that once he understood what waterboarding was, he sang like a canary. If he had not warbled in the fashion that he did, I don't think we would be celebrating in the fashion that we are the end of the life of the most evil man on the planet.

So, I agree with the gentleman from California that the cloud of investigation around the American interrogators who are being investigated for the tactics that they were assured by the Justice Department were constitutional and were legal and now we have a Justice Department with a different opinion, it's putting some of our interrogators through an investigation with the cloud of an eventual indictment hanging over their head for doing the same type of tactics that were used with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and a very few others to gather the information that allowed us to take out Osama bin Laden. This paradox needs to be resolved, Mr. Speaker, and I am hopeful that the President will give the order for the Justice Department to accept the conclusions that were drawn by the Bush administration and adopt that policy so that Americans can continue to be protected and safe in the face of this threat that we have from without, this threat that comes from radical Islam.

We are fighting radical Islam. Radical Islamists are seeking to kill Americans on a regular basis because they

disagree with western civilization and our philosophy. It's why they attacked us on September 11. That's why they attacked the Khobar Towers. That's why they attacked the Twin Towers the first time in the early nineties. That's why they attacked the USS Cole, the Marine barracks, the list goes on and on, the times that we have been attacked by people who reject our free society. They feel threatened by the liberty and the freedom that is America. They're threatened by the free enterprise that we are. They're threatened by the robust nature of our culture and our economy and our innovativeness where we lead the world in patents and trademarks. Because of that, we need to stand strong and hold ourselves confident.

I point out, also, that the probability that the intelligence was correct and that Osama bin Laden was inside the compound where the attack came from our Special Forces on Sunday, the probability that he was there was a probability that was probably less than 50 percent chance. The President took the chance. If they had gone in and attacked the compound and Osama bin Laden had not been there, I would like to think we would have never heard about it, Mr. Speaker. I don't have any information that says that they tried any other compounds or tried any other locations, although I suspect that we have checked a few more places. I'd like to think we checked a lot of caves up there in the mountains in Pakistan. It's where a lot of us thought he was. That's where our intelligence was telling us that he was. So I would like to think that we were going into some of those locations. But if they had gone into that compound in Pakistan and Osama bin Laden had not been there, we would have never heard about it, which is appropriate and proper, because the odds of this kind of intelligence being spot-on are always less than 100 percent, and in this case I believe it was less than 50 percent. In fact, if you compare the value of the intelligence that said there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq before we went in there, when you had a universal intelligence conclusion that was drawn by the Israelis, the French, the Americans, as the universal global intelligence said, Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. The probability of those weapons being there in Iraq if you analyzed it from the intelligence we had at the time made that probability for WMD in Iraq greater than the probability that Osama bin Laden was even in the compound last Sunday when the attack came.

I make these points, Mr. Speaker, so that we can look back across this continuum of history and understand that intelligence isn't an exact science. It's a series of judgment calls. It's a series of connecting different threads of information together and following hunches and then coming to that and following the hunch and making the decision. President Obama made the

right decision. The value of the intelligence we had, it wasn't a 100 percent piece of information that he had to work with, so whatever was the hunch, whatever was the conviction that caused him to make that decision, there's times you're going to be right and there's times you're going to be wrong. He was right this time. I'm glad he made the decision. I'm glad the world has seen the end of Osama bin Laden.

With regard to whether a photograph should be published of Osama bin Laden to give the world a higher measure of proof, I will give some deference to the opinion that came from the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, MIKE ROGERS of Michigan, who said his measure is, does it make it harder for American military to work with, say, the Afghan people for intelligence and information on the ground in Afghanistan?

□ 1420

Does it make it harder or does it make it easier? Are the chances better or worse that our troops on the ground in Afghanistan will have a more successful time if the picture comes out or if it doesn't?

In addition to that position, I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that if the rumors that it's a hoax grow so great that they're able to use those rumors to recruit more al Qaeda, and if the rumors that it's a hoax strengthen the recruitment of the Taliban, then we should release the picture or the pictures or enough information that people can be completely convinced. I don't have any doubt Osama bin Laden was in that compound; Osama bin Laden is in the bottom of the Arabian Sea. And I don't have any doubt.

But we may have to get to the point where we have to erase the doubts, and I suspect it will be very hard to keep the pictures of this operation completely with a lid on them, although if anybody can do it, our Special Forces can. If that's their order, I expect that they will. I just don't know that the Pakistanis aren't sitting on something now that would get released.

Just another little irony I would point out as I transition, Mr. Speaker, into a little bit different subject matter. The compound is reported to have had 12- to 18-foot walls around it with barbed wire on top. It's pretty interesting that the Secretary of Homeland Security made a trip over to that part of the world to advise Afghanistan on border security and compared the Afghanistan-Pakistan border with the U.S.-Mexican border. It's interesting that the Secretary of Homeland Security has long said: You show me a 50-foot wall; I'll show you a 51-foot ladder.

It's interesting that the 12- and 18-foot walls weren't scaled by Special Forces personnel with 13- and 19-foot ladders. They put helicopters over the top of the compound and fast-roped down inside. The wall was effective and the wire on top of it was effective.

That's why they put them there. They don't build all of these walls with wire on top all around the world if they're not effective. It isn't like ladders aren't available in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

My point is, and I often facetiously respond to this idea, that if you show me a 20-foot wall, I'll show you a 20-foot ladder, as if that just makes fun of anybody that thinks we can protect our borders with a wall. If anybody has been to a military compound, you will know there are fences and walls around the military compound. Why is that? It's to keep out enemy infiltrators. No, they don't keep out everybody. You have got to still guard it. People come along with wire cutters and they come along and dig underneath and they will detonate and blow a hole in a concrete wall. They did that in the wall around the Embassy in Saigon, if you remember. So it isn't that they're the only solution.

And when I say we need to build a fence, a wall and a fence on our southern border, Mr. Speaker, I'm not advocating that we build that and walk away and let somebody come up to the other side with a 21-foot ladder. I'm suggesting that, first of all, we don't have to build 2,000 miles of fence, wall, and fence, that we just build a fence, a wall, and a fence with a patrol road in between in those locations and build it until they stop going around the end.

If anybody has been down to the border, you will see the beaten path that goes through, sometimes right through what they're declaring to be fence, the 600-some miles of fence that they declare that we have. 646 I think is the last number that I saw. And when you go down and look at the real fence that's there, some of it is triple fencing that they call tertiary fencing. That's a little too sophisticated for me. If you go to the San Luis area in southwest Arizona, you can see 24-foot-high fences, triple fences. When I was down there last, I asked them directly, Has anyone defeated this triple fencing? Their answer, after several evasive responses and me point-blanking the question several times, was, No, they go around the end. Of course they do. It's a short fence. It doesn't go far enough. And so people go around the end.

So we just keep building a fence, a wall, and a fence until people stop going around the end. If we end up with 2,000 miles of fence, wall, and fence, we must have needed it because they were continuing to go around the end.

We can do this, and we can do this for a lot less money than we're spending today to chase people across the desert 70 and 100 miles north of our border.

Here's how the math works out, Mr. Speaker. We're spending about \$12 billion protecting our southern border. That's 2,000 miles. Already, smart people have done this calculus and taken \$12 billion and divided by 2,000 miles and come up with a unit price conclusion that we're spending \$6 million a

mile to defend our southern border—\$6 million.

Now, imagine this. For me, I'm an Iowa guy and I live out in the country on a gravel road, and it's a mile to concrete from where I live in any direction. So my west road, no one lives on it. It's a full mile of gravel.

If Janet Napolitano came to me and said, Congressman, I've got a proposal for you. I need you to guard this mile. Will you guard this mile and see to it that the people that go across it—you can let 75 percent of them through. No problem. Let 75 percent go through. And the 25 percent that you're required to stop, or you should be stopping, you just have to turn them around and send them back south again. And, by the way, I'm going to pay you, Congressman, \$6 million a mile to defend this mile of your gravel road. I'd look at that and say, Could you give me a 10-year contract? That's what we do here in this Congress. We budget out for 10 years. That's \$6 million a mile for 10 years. It's \$60 million for the budget window of 10 years to guard a single mile.

The population that's going across that, 75 percent of those that try are getting through; 25 percent are being interdicted. This is a little bit dated information, but it's testimony before the Immigration Committee.

And so if they were going to pay me \$60 million to guard this mile and I didn't have any kind of efficiency standard except turn 25 percent of them back, or so, first, I'm going to want an efficiency standard. I want a 100 percent efficiency standard. We ought to be developing infrastructure that gets us to that point. And so it wouldn't take me \$60 million to build a fence, a wall, and a fence on that mile, that mile that runs from my house west. That's \$6 million a year for 10 years, \$60 million.

I would tap into the first year's annual budget and take one-third of it, \$2 million, and I would build a fence, a wall, and a fence for the full mile. So it's 3 miles of structure. I would put a concrete wall in the middle of it. It would have a concrete foundation that made it difficult to dig underneath.

And one thing you know about concrete is you don't get through it with wire cutters. You don't get through it in a simple fashion like you might with a wire fence.

I would put a concrete wall in the middle. I'd have a fence down near the border. I'd move in about 60 or 100 feet and put a concrete wall in that's about 14 feet tall with wire on top, and I'd put another fence inside that. So if they got over my concrete wall, there's another corral. I would then hire fewer Border Patrol, and with needing less equipment, less pension plans, less benefit packages, I would put the first front money up in the infrastructure. You know that by the time they get through the fence, the wall, and the fence, you'll have a chance to catch them. We would put the sensory de-

VICES in, put the cameras up, put the vibration sensors in. Maybe we could get Boeing to perfect their system and add that to the fence, the wall, and the fence.

But it is foolish for us to think that we can just keep hiring more and more Border Patrol—we've more than doubled our Border Patrol—and then back off into the desert 70 or 100 miles and begin chasing people around in the sagebrush. That's not the way to do this. We need to shut off the bleeding at the border. This is not a recreational sport to be defending our border and chasing people down in the desert. If we can stop them before they get into the United States, that is the preferred way to go.

I have gone across the English Channel from England over to Calais, France, where the Brits have leased a chunk of ground because they want to stop the illegals before they get across the channel. They have leased this piece of ground from the French and they've set up a high security system there, and the trucks that come through go on ferries, and the ferries haul them across the English Channel, cars and trucks, just a constant rotation of ferries going back and forth across the English Channel.

The British have leased this piece of ground. They raised their technology and their manpower there to preempt access into the United Kingdom because they would rather deal with them on French soil than they would on British soil, because the British laws get a little sloppy like ours do. Once you pick somebody up inside the interior of the United States, they've got an opportunity to appeal, be adjudicated. It can cost us a lot of money.

□ 1430

The important thing is to keep them out of the United States. Let's build a fence, a wall, and a fence. We can do the whole thing for about \$2 million a mile, and that leaves \$4 million the first year left over to hire Border Patrol and to pay them wages and salary benefits and retirement packages and to give them some equipment with. Then the next year, there's another \$6 million available every year—a little maintenance on that wall but not a lot. So that's a \$60 million contract, Mr. Speaker, for a decade on a single mile. You put \$2 million up front, and now you've got \$58 million to play with.

I'll submit that we can do a better job by building infrastructure and using it to protect our border than we can by hiring a lot more personnel and chasing people around in the desert. It is a simple business equation. This political arena doesn't lend itself very well to simple business equations, but that is one, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to continue to push to build a fence, a wall, and a fence; and yes, we need to put something on top of that. I don't care if it looks a little bit bad. If they don't want to see wire on top of the wall at the border, why do the Mexi-

cans build walls at the U.S. border with concertina wire on top? They're not offended when they put up it up. Why would they be offended if we put it up, Mr. Speaker?

It's part of our immigration situation that we need to address, and I'll continue with that in that "stop the bleeding at the border." That is the way to do it. We can force all traffic through our ports of entry, and we should beef up our ports of entry, widen them out, and invest in infrastructure there. We should put personnel there so that we can use surveillance techniques that are state of the art so that we can efficiently move through the traffic that is relatively safe and that is unlikely to have contraband in it. Then we can even better scrutinize those pieces of traffic that are likely to have illegal persons or illegal contraband in them. That would stop the bleeding at the border in a significant way.

We forget that 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America comes from or through Mexico—90 percent. The drug enforcement people tell me that, of every illegal drug distribution chain in this country, at least one link in that distribution chain is someone who is here in the United States unlawfully. Many times, the whole chain is a chain of custody of illegal drugs going from Mexico through and up into the United States—pick Chicago—and all the way to the end user, and the drugs never go into any hand except of somebody who's here illegally in the United States. Imagine, 90 percent of the illegal drugs in America come from or through Mexico.

Headless corpses are showing up by the dozens in Mexico, and they're starting to show up here in the United States. I went to a meeting in Columbus, New Mexico, a town hall meeting. There were people there who, on their way to church, drive parallel to the border. On their way to church on a Sunday morning, four heads were on display for them to see, which was a warning to, apparently, the other drug cartel. This is spilling over into the United States. Those heads were on the Mexican side, I'll point out, Mr. Speaker, for the point of accuracy, but they're showing up on the U.S. side of the border.

The drug trade here in the United States is extremely lucrative. I've been trying to get these numbers from the drug enforcement personnel, and they've been very hard to get. Yet Fox News reported that the illegal drug trade in America is a \$40 billion industry—\$40 billion. It has been reported that at least \$60 billion is wired from the United States into points south. A lot of that may come from the wages of people who are working here in the United States—and a lot of them working here illegally. There are around 8 million illegals working in America, taking jobs that legal immigrants or American citizens should be doing. But there is \$60 billion a year wired south.

Half of it, \$30 billion, goes into Mexico, and the other \$30 billion goes into the Caribbean, Central America and some into South America—\$30 billion into Mexico, the other \$30 billion scattered around in the rest of the southern part, south of us, in the Western Hemisphere.

We don't know and they don't speculate on how much of the \$60 billion is just laundering illegal drug money. I don't know the basis of the \$40 billion number that Fox News reported on the value of illegal drugs that are consumed in America. That's just the only number that's out there that I can find. I don't think we have the basis of enough intelligence to be able to bring a real solution to this.

I don't think our people at the top have done enough work to quantify the problem. They're not talking about the problem. Instead, I see an emphasis on our southern border, a shift that took place under the Obama administration, that causes some of our Border Patrol to pivot. Instead of looking south to say, Hold it. Don't come into the United States illegally, they started to turn around and look north and try to interdict cash and guns that are coming from the United States and going into Mexico. A lot of these guns, by the way, are perfectly legal in the United States but not legal in Mexico.

So do we have the personnel to filter that at the Mexican border?

It's fine to interdict the cash, because that raises the transaction costs of those who are smuggling drugs into the United States, and it's fine to work and cooperate with the Mexicans if they need a little help on guns that become illegal when they get across the border; but we need to focus on people who are smuggling illegal drugs into the United States. We need to focus on illegal people who are being smuggled into the United States. The value of this has not quantified the loss in American lives. Quantifying the loss in treasure is one thing: \$60 billion wired south, \$40 billion worth of illegal drugs consumed in the United States, violence in Mexico, and headless corpses by the dozen.

I began to ask these questions some years ago, have finally had some response, Mr. Speaker. It's as a result of two studies that I've commissioned over the years by the Government Accountability Office, GAO studies. One came out in April of 2005, and the other one came out just this past month—released within the past few weeks, actually, but it's dated March of 2011.

We've had witnesses come before the Immigration Subcommittee. First, they'll say America is a Nation of immigrants, as if that's the be all-end all of the conclusion we should draw and that we shouldn't try to limit illegal immigration into America, let alone eliminate it, because America is a Nation of immigrants.

My response to that, Mr. Speaker, is: Yes, sure enough. Could you point out for me a nation on the planet that is

not a nation of immigrants? I asked that question of witness Ms. Hernandez some few years ago. I asked if she would care to tell me of a nation that is not a nation of immigrants.

She sat there at the witness table—under oath, mind you—and presented as an expert witness. Her eyes kind of rolled a little bit back in the back of her head; and she said, Well, that would be the Incas and the Aztecs.

So I said, Who, according to an anthropologist, came across the Bering Straits about 12,000 years ago. Would you like to try again, Ms. Hernandez?

Of course, she didn't want to try again, and no one has succeeded in pointing out a nation that is not a nation of immigrants. The closest you could come is with the Japanese, and there are two ethnic groups in Japan that are identified by their locales and by the accents and the languages that they have. They believe that both of them came from Polynesian origins centuries and centuries ago.

Every nation, Mr. Speaker, is a nation of immigrants. People have migrated around this planet since Adam and Eve left the Garden of Eden, and they always will. So we don't carry a certain responsibility towards setting aside the rule of law in America because we are a Nation of immigrants. We have a responsibility to preserve, protect and defend the pillars of American exceptionalism—and of course, the rule of law is an essential pillar of American exceptionalism.

So that question of, first, are we a Nation of immigrants, yes, we are; but we are a Nation of laws, and we must adhere to and protect the rule of law.

When we look at the policies that we have, it's important for us to shut off the jobs magnet here in the United States, not only control/stop the bleeding at the border, but we have to shut off the jobs magnet here in America. One of the ways that we do that is to enforce our laws, of course. E-Verify is an important tool. It's a Web site-based software program that allows an employer to run, I call it, the name, rank and serial number—the Social Security number—of an employee through that database. It will go back, and it will search the Department of Homeland Security's database, the Social Security database, NCIC, and come back and tell you if that information represents that that individual can lawfully work in the United States. We use it. I've tried to fool it and I've tried to scramble it, and the longest delay I can get out of it is 6 seconds.

□ 1440

It's very fast. It's very accurate. The software package is only as accurate as the data behind it, and when we find a mistake in E-Verify, it's almost always because someone got married and forgot to change their name or some piece of information like that that needs to be upgraded. Easily fixed. The only way you make E-Verify even better is to use it and use it and use it so that

database gets cleaned up, and it's set up to do that with a 72-hour notice of cure.

So using E-Verify is a good tool. I have a better tool out there that I will soon be introducing, Mr. Speaker, and I have introduced it in previous Congresses. I've been waiting for the right time, and we will set up a press conference and roll out a bill called the New IDEA Act. Now, they say there are no new ideas in this Congress, that it's a just repackaging of old ideas. This one I think actually is a relatively new idea, and it comes from this concept that, well, who enjoys enforcing the law? Who's effective in it? Who do the American people believe will come forward and enforce the law?

And as I was thinking that through, it occurred to me that the IRS probably has the maximum respect of all of the law enforcers in America. They have better tools to work with than many of the other agencies out there, and we expect they will come in and they will conduct an audit, and they're going to look to see if they can find something wrong with your tax return. Anybody that's been through an audit doesn't want to go through another audit. Frank Luntz put out some numbers that showed that a majority of Americans would rather be mugged than go through an IRS audit; 58 percent would rather have a root canal than go through an IRS audit. I'd like to have the IRS helping us with immigration law.

So I drafted legislation called the New IDEA Act. It's the New, and the acronym IDEA stands for Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. What it does is it clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible, and then it gives the employer safe harbor if they use E-Verify. So, if the employer in good faith runs their employees through E-Verify, it will give the employer that credit that he used E-Verify, and he can deduct the wages if E-Verify should happen to be wrong, for example, and it won't be.

But otherwise, if the IRS then comes in during a normal audit—we don't accelerate audits, we don't initiate any more audits than we'd normally have—but if the IRS comes in during a normal audit, they would run the Social Security numbers and information of all the employees through E-Verify, and if any of those employees were kicked back at them as not lawful to work in the United States, the IRS then would take a look. They'd give the employer an opportunity to cure, but they would look at that data and say, all right, I'm sorry, the wages that you paid this illegal are not going to be a business expense for you, so they come off the Schedule C and they go over into the profit column in your tax form.

Imagine if you're an employer and you paid \$1 million to illegals and the IRS came in to do the audit and they said, I'm sorry, that \$1 million that you had as a business expense is not an

expense. You can't expense wages and benefits paid to illegals. So now that \$1 million goes over into the profit side, and the IRS looks at that and says, you know, you're going to have to pay interest on that. You had a tax liability that you unlawfully claimed. You're going to have to pay interest on that tax liability, and you're going to have to pay a penalty, and you have to pay the principal, which is a tax liability.

So if it rolls it over to a 36 percent tax rate, plus the interest, plus the penalty, the net result is that turns your \$10 an hour illegal into about a \$16 an hour illegal, which means that there will be Americans out there that will be taking those jobs at \$12, \$13, \$14, and \$15 an hour that didn't have an opportunity to do that before because illegals were in there working for \$10. This will open up jobs for Americans.

We saw a big number of new jobless reports pop up today. This unemployment number is not getting better. It is just zigzagging and stagnating at a number that hangs in there close to 9 percent. This is a very, very slow recovery. One of the things we can do to help recover is to pass the New IDEA Act, let the IRS come in and do their normal audits, and employers will decide that they don't want to wait for the IRS to get there. They will want to clean up their workforce as soon as they practically can.

That's part of the beauty of this. This isn't a hard and fast piece of legislation that requires employers to fire all their illegals at once. They can make their decision on when they will take the risk, but what it does do is accumulates a 6-year statute of limitations. So that if an employer gets by this year without an audit and he keeps illegals on the payroll the next year without an audit, he has to go a full 6 years before that first illegal year drops off, and he's still liable for the IRS to go back through the books a full 6 years, which means that employers are going to look at this, and they're going to think, I'm paying \$1 million out to illegals; if I get to the end of a 6-year cycle and the IRS comes in and audits me, they're going to deny \$6 million that I have written off as business expenses, put that over into the profit side, and you could be looking at \$6 million worth of income, and all of that with interest and penalty attached to it. And so your \$6 million probably becomes something greater than \$3 million in penalties out of the \$6 million that were formerly a write-off.

That's how this liability accumulates with a 6-year statute of limitations. That's why employers, even though they may not be able to transition their workforce into a 100 percent legal workforce the first year, the pressure to do so every year will be so great because getting through 6 years without an IRS audit and knowing that you're going to carry with you a full 6 years of risk will cause employers to clean up their workforce on their own.

One of the problems we have is trying to get the administration to enforce immigration law. We can pass a law. We can make it mandatory that everybody use E-Verify. I will probably have an opportunity to vote for that, and I will. But we cannot require the executive branch to enforce the law. The President of the United States takes an oath to take care that the laws are faithfully enforced. That's part of the Constitution, and it's true for the executive branch employees, including Eric Holder, the Attorney General; including Janet Napolitano, the Secretary of Homeland Security. But we can't make them enforce the law.

I've been in the business of seeking to embarrass the administration into enforcing the law now into my ninth year here because we don't have the tools. We can call them forward now that Republicans have the majority. We can have hearings, bring the press into the hearings because the press helps us a lot. They convey that message back to the American people, and the American people understand that there are things they should be outraged about. But we have no tool other than to cut their budget or embarrass them, or I guess there's more Draconian methods that would not be used, and I won't mention those for fear that they will start an unnecessary rumor.

But all of that said, Mr. Speaker, the IRS will come in and do this work, and it won't be about us trying to embarrass them into enforcing the law. It will be about the IRS coming in to turn it into a revenue generator. It will be. The New IDEA Act, Mr. Speaker, is a tool that can do the most to bring our immigration laws in this country under enforcement and to reduce the numbers of illegals that are in the United States the most dramatically with the least amount of cost. In fact, it's a plus-up because it will generate more revenue for the Internal Revenue Service.

Another point on the border, to roll back down to the southern border, Mr. Speaker, and to make this point is that we have a tourism industry that has to do with anchor babies. Anchor babies are babies that are born in the United States to an illegal mother, and the practice over the years has been to grant automatic citizenship to babies born on U.S. soil. It is not a law. It is not a constitutional requirement. It's just a sloppy practice that began that's getting worse and worse and worse.

We have now in this country somewhere between 340,000 and 750,000 babies born to illegal mothers in America that get automatic citizenship. They're anchor babies. They sneak into the United States, many of them, for the purposes of having the baby. They get the little birth certificate with their little footprints on there. Then they either stay here or they go back to their home country and wait until that child comes of age, and they use that child to apply to bring in the family, the nuclear family, then the extended family,

and it's out of control—340,000 to 750,000 a year automatic citizens to America that have essentially unlimited ability to bring their families into the United States.

□ 1450

We have testimony before the Immigration Committee that shows us that if you look at immigrants, legal immigrants, and base it on merit, you would think a country would want to establish an immigration policy that was designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States of America. Wouldn't any country have an immigration policy that was designed to help them? I mean, it is not selfish of America to want to have an immigration policy that's good for this country. We cannot be the relief valve for all the poverty in the world.

For every some 6.3 billion or so people on the planet—maybe it's more than that—they can't all live in America. There are more than 5 billion that have a lower standard of living than the average Mexican. So if we think we're going to be the relief valve of poverty in the world, and we bring into America 1 million to 1.5 million legally, and across the border comes—there are numbers that I have seen testified to that show as many as 4 million illegals in a year. Many go back and forth. They are carrying drugs on their back. Maybe they're visiting family. The net number I guess we don't know. It seems to shake out pretty odd that you can have that much border crossing, and the numbers don't accumulate.

When I came to this Congress 8-plus years ago, the number was 12 million illegals in America. Now they're giving us estimates that there are maybe 11 million illegals in America. How does that work? Did that many people die? Did we give that many people citizenship that came in here illegally? So I think that number is significantly higher than 11 million or 12 million. I think it's been growing every year for a generation. I think it continues to grow.

Anchor babies, babies that are born to illegal mothers in the United States that get automatic citizenship, cause people to sneak into the United States to have the baby because they see citizenship in America as cashing in to the giant ATM, the giant ATM which is America's welfare cash machine.

Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation has done a lot of research on welfare benefits—he has broken it up in a number of different ways—that go to households where there is at least one illegal that's in it.

I need to come back at a later date, Mr. Speaker, and take up the cost to the American taxpayer of benefits that go to households that are oftentimes headed up by an illegal. When we look at what has happened on the floor of this Congress in the last 4 to 5 years, when the SCHIP legislation passed this

Congress, they weakened their requirements of proof of citizenship for Medicaid.

So free medical care for people who are lower income is being provided to people that should actually be deported back to their home country because the standard that you had to show proof of citizenship that was written into the old Medicaid legislation was struck and replaced with a requirement that you attest to a nine-digit Social Security number. That's the standard. They lowered it that low because the people on that side of the aisle wanted to pay Medicaid benefits to illegals. They want to give them a path to citizenship. They want to give them an opportunity to vote.

I look back at what Ronald Reagan said: What you tax, you get less of; but what you subsidize, you get more of. If you reward people for coming into the United States illegally, and you reward them with welfare packages and plans, you are going to get more people in the United States illegally, and you are going to get more people that are signing up for more welfare.

We have in this country 77 different means-tested welfare programs in the United States of America. There isn't one person in this United States Congress that could stand down here on the floor without a cheat sheet and name every one of them. And there isn't one person in this United States Congress that can actually understand how each one of these 77 means-tested welfare programs interrelates with each other, let alone how it affects the decisions of individuals on whether they are going to get a job or sit at home. If you are on rent subsidy and heat subsidy and food stamps, and list all the other Federal programs that are there, why would you work when you are rewarded for not working?

I look at the labor situation in America. There are 8 million working illegals in America. There are a number of others out there that we probably didn't find in the data that we have. So here we are with the unemployment numbers of about 15 million Americans who are registered as unemployed. There is another 6 to 8 million that are past the data. They've quit trying, so they're no longer technically called unemployed. They just quit looking for a job. There is another 6 to 8 million of those. You are up to over 20 million Americans that are on unemployment, drawing it, or have given up applying for it.

But when I start to add to that number of roughly 20 million, 22 to 23 million Americans that are unemployed or have given up trying and aren't working, and I go to the Department of Labor's statistics, their own statistics that come from the Department of Labor, and I begin to add up the American workforce—that workforce number is a little foggy in my memory—it's 140-some million people in America's workforce. If you start adding those who are not currently working—and I

start at age 16 because that's a legitimate age.

You can collect unemployment at age 16 if you have earned enough that they paid in on your behalf—the teenagers between age 16 and 19, there are 9.7 million that aren't in the workforce at all, not even a part-time job of any kind. Yes, they may be students; but there's nothing wrong with working and going to school. That's what a lot of people did, and it builds character. You add to that those that are from 20 to 25 years old, and you go on up the line in different age categories. I went up to age 74 because we pay unemployment at age 74, and Wal-Mart hires at age 74 and so do a lot of other employers. So the age of the workforce I am using is 16 to 74. It's a legitimate bracket. We could narrow that in a little bit, and we would have fewer numbers.

But here's the point: Of the 8 million working illegals in America, there are 80 million Americans of working age that are not in the workforce; 80 million people of working age that are simply not in the workforce. They might have checked out. They are sitting back on some of the 77 means-tested welfare programs. They might be independently wealthy and decided to retire. If so, good on them. But they are not in the workforce for one reason or another, or they are working in the black market. It might be that some of those people are selling drugs who are not in the workforce. But if people say there are jobs out there Americans won't do, name one. Name one job that Americans won't do. I can take you and show you an American that's doing every single job definition that there is in this country.

The reason that you see people here illegally and they're out-competing Americans is because they'll work for less. They'll pile up in a house with many more people living in the same dwelling. They are not a threat to the employer to file workmen's comp or an unemployment claim.

So they are a lower liability for the employer. The employer can bring in a crew of illegals, get a job done, dispatch them down the line; and once they leave that job, they are no longer a liability to them. So it's like being able to lease a machine to come do a job. You say, take the machine back, and park it in the lot, and you are done. You don't have to worry about the depreciation or the maintenance. That's what has happened. In a way, it's a bit inhuman to see this going on.

If we enforced our immigration law, it opens up at least 8 million jobs for Americans or legal immigrants; and if people say there aren't enough Americans to do those jobs, nuts. We have to hire one out of every 10 that's sitting now on the couch and put them to work. Why wouldn't you want to increase and enhance the average annual productivity of our people? Why would you not?

What if we were on a big cruise ship, but it was powered by sails and oars?

So many people have to be trimming the sails. So many people have to be pulling on the oars. Somebody has got to be in the kitchen cooking. Somebody has got to be swabbing the deck. Somebody has got to be up there in the wheelhouse navigating, and somebody has got to be steering. With all of that going on, if you didn't have enough people at the oars to pull the load, would you pull that cruise ship off on an island somewhere and load on a bunch more people to pull on the oars? Or would you go after the 80 million people that are sitting on the couch now and have some of those people get up off the couch and grab an oar and pull?

I want to increase the production of America. I want to increase the average annual productivity of Americans. If we do that, we increase our standard of living. If not, if more of us sit back and don't go to work and don't produce anything, and we bring others in to do the work that we say we are now too good to do, then our broader standard of living goes down, and you need more and more welfare programs to pay the people that are not working, and you still have to carry the social costs for the people that are working underneath the market value.

You can't sustain a household for some of the wages that are being paid to illegals. That's why they are tapping into welfare benefits. That's why they use their child that has been born in America as an anchor baby as a means to get access to the welfare program.

□ 1500

And so here we have an America that's underemployed, 80 million people of working age that are not in the workforce. A lot of them are living off of the sweat of the brow of somebody else in the form of the 77 means-tested welfare programs that are out there. They don't have an incentive to go to work, but we pay them with tax dollars if they'll just stay peaceful, stay in their houses, don't cause any trouble. Let's not have any violence in the streets. If you do all that, then we'll hire these other people that are in the United States illegally at substandard wages and subsidize them both.

What sense does that make, Mr. Speaker, for a Nation to not be upgrading its standard of living by increasing the average productivity of our people?

And why would we not be defending the rule of law? And why would we reward people that sneak into the United States to have a baby so they can tap into all this giant ATM?

We've got to put an end to anchor babies. I have the legislation to do it, Mr. Speaker, and I have scores of cosponsors on the anchor baby legislation that I introduced very early in this session with some good gentlemen from Georgia, in particular. ROB WOODALL came in and was ready to step up on that, and there are others. TOM GRAVES is part of that. I appreciate the work that they are doing, and I'm happy to

join with them and work together on those issues.

But we have to have a Nation of laws and a Nation that respects the rule of law. We have to shut off the bleeding at the border.

We need to get more of our Americans to work. You notice I didn't say back to work, Mr. Speaker. We're sometimes into the third and fourth generation where they didn't work at all. They have learned how to game the system, and we've accepted it. We no longer require the welfare-to-work part of this; that you get 5 years total and then you have to go to work. What we see happen is 77 means-tested welfare programs. Nobody can monitor all of that. And the will of the American people isn't such because now half the households don't pay income tax. But they go vote. And they vote themselves largesse from the public treasury. They vote themselves welfare benefits. There are people here that pander to that, and they understand that their political base is expanded when they expand the dependency class in America.

So what did they do?

They passed legislation in here under Speaker PELOSI over and over again that expanded the dependency class in America because it strengthened their political base. ObamaCare is a huge key of expanding the dependency class. It says we're going to promise you that every American has access to health care, every single one. It wasn't an issue. But they conflated the two terms, the term health care and health insurance.

Anyone in America can show up in the emergency room and be treated. That's access to health care, and it's probably superior to most nations. I'm sure it's superior to most nations in the world. I don't know a nation that it's not superior to.

But then it was the promise that, well, it's really not very good. It's expensive that you show up in the emergency room without insurance, so what we really want to do is give everybody their own insurance policy and insure another 30 million people.

So I look at that, and I do the math and I ask the question, who's really not insured and doesn't have affordable options?

These numbers came from the United States Senate, the Republican Senate Conference, the Senate staff, and it came down to this. You start with about 306 million Americans, and then you begin to subtract those that are insured, those that are on Medicare, those that qualify, those that are on Medicaid, those that are qualified for Medicaid but don't sign up, those that are covered under their employer, and those that are eligible under their employer and don't sign up, and you begin to reduce this number of 306 million Americans down. First you take the insured, subtract that from 306, and then you begin to identify the Americans that are uninsured. That was those that are here illegally. I'm not inter-

ested in funding their health insurance package. I think it's wrong and immoral for us to do that. They're not on my list.

When you boil it down, Americans without affordable options numbered 12.1 million. Now, that is a lot of people, but it's less than 4 percent of our population. Yet ObamaCare sought to disrupt and transform and change and socialize the health insurance industry in America, 100 percent of it, the health care delivery system, 100 percent of that, in order to reduce the number of uninsured Americans without affordable options from some number that's less than 4 percent down to some other lower number.

At what cost?

The cost of American liberty, cost of the United States Constitution. The cost of our freedom.

ObamaCare is a malignant tumor, and it is metastasizing in the heart and soul of the spirit of the American people.

We are a vigorous people. We are a people that have skimmed the cream of the crop off of every donor civilization on the planet, Mr. Speaker. The vigor that came from people that had a vision and a dream, that came here across the pond in one way or another because they wanted to access the liberty and the freedom that we have here is a different kind of a vigor than saying, well, we got good vigor from Great Britain, and we got it from France and Germany and Italy, wherever else, Eastern Europe and around the planet, Greece, name it. No, we got the best of every donor civilization. We got the vigor from every donor civilization. We got the dreamers from every country that sent legal immigrants here, that gives America a unique vigor. It's different than any other country in the world. That's the reason why we succeed. It's the reason why we can take free enterprise and do something with it. It's why America has risen to become the unchallenged greatest Nation on the planet.

We have all of the rights that come from God that are defined so clearly and well, not just in the Declaration, but in the Constitution and especially in the Bill of Rights, and you add to that free enterprise, and you add to that this vigor that comes from legal immigrants from all over, from every civilization, and you have an America that has a spirit and an attitude that's unique on the planet.

It is unsuitable to take a free people and tie the yoke of ObamaCare around their neck. I will draw the line. I want to see shutting off all funding to ObamaCare tied to the debt ceiling bill, Mr. Speaker. Before we even discuss the debt ceiling, I want a guarantee that all of our troops get paid on time. In the event of a debt ceiling limit or a shutdown of any kind, uniformed troops in the United States or anywhere in the world serving Uncle Sam need to know their paycheck is going to be wired into their account on time

every time, no matter what is going on here in the United States Congress.

Second point, TOM MCCLINTOCK's full faith and credit bill that sets up the priority on how we would pay our debts in the event of a debt ceiling limit being reached. We can set those priorities, and it needs to be, pay the interest on those who have loaned money to America first and move our way on down the priority list.

Do those two things, send them out of this House, send them over to HARRY REID in the Senate, and he can decide. Pick them up and send them to the President of the United States and let him sign, let the President sign both of those bills, the Gohmert bill, the McClintock bill into law.

That, Mr. Speaker, would be the qualifier before we'd even begin to discuss what we would do about the prospects of raising a debt ceiling.

But for me, I'd put the cutting off of all funds to ObamaCare on that debt ceiling bill and say there can be no raising of the debt ceiling here by the House of Representatives unless we shut off all the funding that's going to implement or enforce ObamaCare, at least until such time as the Supreme Court should rule.

The President is delaying the action of the Supreme Court. He could have asked for an expedited review of ObamaCare. We all know it's going to the Supreme Court. The President is delaying the decision in the Supreme Court the same way that he delayed bringing his birth certificate out.

Mr. Speaker, it is so important that we not chase good money after bad, that the Supreme Court rule on ObamaCare. At least then, then let Congress decide when they might appropriate rather than these automatic appropriations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1510

PROVIDE FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do appreciate the recommendations of my friend from Iowa. And I certainly agree, we should be passing a bill that would require no leeway for the Treasury's Secretary, that he should pay our debts as they come due and also make sure the military is paid on time. We know that Social Security is already going to be mandatory spending in the event of a shutdown. And that way we are allowed to pursue the issues that are most critical and that is, really, in the interest of children. That term is used so often. It is really true now. We have got to cut the ridiculous, irresponsible spending to preserve this Union.

But there are two problems out there that are seeking to destroy this country. One is passively to destroy this

country, and that is our gross, irresponsible overspending: \$2.1 trillion coming in and \$3.75 trillion going out. We won't last much longer as a country if that continues.

The other is not passive. It is very active. And our great military and intelligence communities did a fantastic job apparently in taking out the most wanted man last weekend in the world, the man responsible for possibly more murders than anyone currently in existence on the planet, but certainly he had killed more Americans than anyone else alive on the planet today. And that was, of course, Osama bin Laden.

But there has been a great rewriting of history. And since we know—it has been made very clear that there are radical Islamist jihadists that want to destroy our country—it is ridiculous not to defend ourselves. We took an oath to defend the Constitution.

We are supposed to provide for the common defense. It is the most important responsibility that we as a Federal Government have, because if we do not provide for a common defense, then it matters not what we try to do in the way of Medicare and Medicaid. All kinds of problems occur in the U.S.

If we don't defend ourselves, there are plenty of evil groups who would love to destroy our way of life. In the case of the radical Islamic jihadists, they believe that as much freedom as we have in America leads to decadence and debauchery and that we need one leader, one religious leader, an ahmadi, to preside over one giant, worldwide caliphate.

So for those of us who realize on both sides of the aisle we make a lot of mistakes, people across the country make a lot of mistakes. No one at the current time on Earth is perfect. We realize still that freedom to make our own choices is what the Founders intended, and that is because they believed that the Creator—as they referenced in the Declaration, God referenced in other places, Providence in other places, they believed that that was God's choice for our life, that we have choice.

And even though God knew that we would make bad choices, when people can freely love of their own volition, their own choice, as a father I know that means so much more than if you demand that a child or someone in your care act like they love you.

So thank God. He desires our love and our praise. As a result, we were given freedom of choice. You don't have to look too deeply into founding documents and diaries and journals to realize just how much the Founders, the Continental Congress members, believed that.

So it gets interesting when people try to rewrite history and especially in the process of failing to properly provide for the common defense.

We had the Attorney General of the United States before the Judiciary Committee this week, and of concern to me and many others has been the refusal of this Justice Department to

prosecute the unindicted coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial.

The evidence used in that case had been adduced from back in 1991, 1993. There was a treasure trove of material found, I believe, in 2004 here, just across in Virginia. There was a sub-basement that had tremendous amounts of documents reflecting the plans and intentions and strategy for the effort to bring down the government as we know it, our way of life as we know it, and that was by radical Muslims.

I am also thankful that there are a majority of Muslims who are moderates. They don't believe jihad means to go about destroying those who oppose what you are doing. They believe that jihad means an internal change of life. And when someone has a moderate Muslim for a friend, he has a friend for life. It kind of reminds me of southern hospitality.

But, nonetheless, we do our moderate Muslim friends no favors in failing to oppose the radical Islamic jihadists, because make no mistake, if we do not defend this Nation against the radical Islamic jihadists, then some of the people that would lose their lives, at a minimum lose their freedoms, would be moderate Muslims, because being a moderate is not abided in the world of a radical Muslim. If you don't believe just as they do, then it is okay to take your life.

So that's why I say we are no friend to our moderate Muslim friends if we do not defend this Nation against the radicals, because our moderate Muslim friends will be targeted if we do not do our job in defending the Nation, which brings me back again to the Holy Land Foundation trial.

The Bush administration, acting on information that was obtained through the 1990s through the Clinton administration Justice Department, FBI, and especially since 1993, the efforts made by the FBI, the incredibly professional work that was done, it was amazing how well they put a case together. Unfortunately, when the case was tried the first time, it led to a hung jury. In the pleadings—and I have many of the documents here. Not all of them. There are boxes and boxes of documents, and I understand even now, under Attorney General Holder, the Justice Department has boxes and boxes of evidence, documents, wiretaps that have not even been translated. You would think that would be fairly important before a decision was made on whether or not to pursue the unindicted coconspirators.

Now, it is not always the case, but in this case the unindicted coconspirators were actually listed. If one goes through the list of unindicted coconspirators, you find groups like the Islamic Society of North America, aka ISNA; you find the North American Islamic Trust, aka NAIT. It is amazing. You find Founders of CAIR, C-A-I-R.

So it was intriguing, after having five convictions on all 108 allegations in the Holy Land Foundation trial that

went on in Dallas, that this Justice Department would ultimately decide we are not going to pursue any of those other coconspirators or joint venturers, who the evidence shows clearly provided financing for a known terrorist group, Hamas. The documentation is substantial.

□ 1520

And this is only a tiny thimbleful of the evidence that was in the case.

But when I look here at the Islamic Society of North America, at some of the evidence that came out, we have journal voucher after journal voucher showing the money that was taken out and used to ultimately assist in terrorism or to fund a terrorist group. You see all these journal entries. There are deposit slips in here making clear all kinds of things in the way of money. All kinds of amounts were transferred to assist in the funding of terrorism.

In fact, at the conclusion of the first part of the case with the five defendants, some of the unindicted coconspirators filed a motion to require the Federal District Judge in Dallas to strike or eliminate all of the names of the unindicted coconspirators, or at least their own, and an assistant U.S. Attorney in Dallas named James Jacks did a very good job in rebutting that and laying out in his brief before the Federal District Court how there were significant amounts, tremendous amounts of evidence that showed that the unindicted coconspirators' names should not be stricken from the record. And the judge in his memo order on the case came back and said basically there is a prima facie case.

In fact, the judge said here—this is in his memo decision, and this is Judge Solis, a Federal judge in Dallas—"The government has produced ample evidence to establish the associations of CAIR, C-A-I-R, ISNA, Islamic Society of North America, and NAIT, the North American Islamic"—I have it here, what the T stands for—"with HLF, the Islamic Association for Palestine and with Hamas. While the court recognizes that evidence produced by the government largely predates the HLF designation date, its evidence is nonetheless sufficient to show the association of these entities with HLF, IAP and Hamas," and being conjunctive together and not disjunctive. The judge goes on to say, "Thus maintaining the names of the entity on the list is appropriate in light of the evidence proffered by the government."

He goes further in his opinion and says, "The explanatory memorandum includes a section entitled 'Understanding the Role of the Muslim Brotherhood in North America,' which states that the work of the Ikhwan in the United States is a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and sabotaging its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and God's religion

is made victorious over all other religions.”

Also contained in that document is a list of the Muslim Brotherhood’s “organizations and the organizations of our friends,” which includes ISNA, NAIT, the Occupied Land Fund, which was HLF’s former name, and the United Association for Studies and Research. During the early years of the OLF and HLF operation, OLF raised money and supported Hamas through a bank account that it held with ISNA and NAIT.

Indeed, OLF operated from within ISNA in Plainfield, Indiana, where defendant Baker was employed. The Muslim Brotherhood supervised the creation of a “Palestine Committee,” which was put in charge of other organizations such as HLF, IAP, UASR, and ISNA. The July 30, 1994, meeting agenda for the Palestine Committee lists IAP, HLF, UASR, and CAIR as working organizations for the Palestine Committee.

The order is pretty extraordinary in following the pleadings as filed by a quite capable assistant U.S. Attorney at that time, now interim U.S. Attorney in Dallas, and stating basically there is a prima facie case here. In fact, this has come to the attention of a number of us, not insignificantly, what to do with Patrick Poole and his research, Andrew McCarthy and his research, and other individuals who have been prosecutors, people who are familiar with the system, how the system works.

PETE KING, himself, has a very pointed letter that was sent to the Attorney General, asking for answers, and yet he really didn’t get much of an answer. In fact, his letter reads this way. It was dated April 15.

“Dear Attorney General Holder, I write to inquire about your decision not to prosecute the 246 individuals and organizations named as unindicted co-conspirators in a Hamas terror finance case.”

Actually, it is the largest terror finance case in American history. If you don’t cut off the money, the terrorism will continue, and if the terrorists have tremendous amounts of money, it is a lot tougher to defeat them as our enemy, our sworn enemy, sworn to destroy our way of life. If you cut off their funding, it is a lot easier to be at war with someone in a tent, riding a camel, than it is someone who has jets, RPGs and the most sophisticated weaponry and the ability to build million dollar compounds to hide in.

Of course, money also opens the possibility for bribes, which makes it a whole lot easier to hide in plain sight, because people are willing to look the other way. We don’t know if that was occurring in Pakistan. There is a lot still to be learned in that situation.

But Chairman KING, PETE KING, goes on and says, “I have been reliably informed that the decision not to seek indictments of the Council on American Islamic Relations and its co-

founder, Omar Ahmad, the Islamic Society of North America and the North American Islamic Trust was usurped by high-ranking decisions at the Department of Justice headquarters over the vehement and stated objections of special agents and supervisors of the FBI, as well as the prosecutors at the U.S. Attorney’s Office in Dallas, who had investigated and successfully prosecuted the Holy Land Foundation case. Their opposition to this decision raises serious doubt that the decision not to prosecute was a valid exercise of prosecutorial discretion.”

Chairman KING goes on and says, “I request you provide answers to the following questions:

“What are the reasons for the Department’s decision not to prosecute CAIR, ISNA, NAIT, and Mr. Ahmad, who is a CAIR cofounder and former head of the Palestine Committee of the Muslim Brotherhood in the United States?”

“Who made the final decision not to prosecute?”

“Who, if anyone, from the Executive Office of the President consulted with, advised or otherwise communicated with the Department of Justice in electronic, oral or written form regarding the Department’s decision to not seek indictments of CAIR, ISNA, NAIT, and Mr. Ahmad?”

“How does and will the Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation address the potential for CAIR, ISNA, NAIT to engage in terrorism financing?”

“What policies with regard to those organizations have you implemented to address that threat?”

“The answers to these questions should provide some explanation for declining a prosecution that is strongly supported by the record from the Holy Land Foundation trial.”

Then the chairman goes through and cites some of the information from that case, and he goes on and says, “Hamas has been designated as a terrorist organization by the Department of State since October 9, 1997, and its status was reconfirmed by the most recent annual report of the National Counterterrorism Center, issued April 30, 2010.

□ 1530

“Hamas shamefully conducts cowardly suicide bombings against civilian targets inside Israel.” He goes on and sets out some further information there.

It also should be noted that Chairman LAMAR SMITH, when it was brought to the attention by some of us on the committee, also sent a letter to the Attorney General, requesting information about these very same things. In fact, there was a memo that was involved, and Chairman SMITH on behalf of the Judiciary Committee requested a copy of the March 31, 2010, memo entitled: “Declination of Prosecution of Omar Ahmad” from Assistant Attorney General David Kris to Acting Deputy Attorney General Gary Grindler.

As I understand it, Chairman KING got a response; very unsatisfactory. Basically, they’re not telling him anything. If they follow that tradition, Chairman SMITH is not likely to get much of an answer. But it causes great concern because we have the Attorney General, who has testified before the committee this week that no one in his Department was involved in advising or consulting over that. Yet we have information about a memo which may contradict the Attorney General directly. If that’s the case, he would have given false information before a committee not once but a number of times during his testimony before the House Judiciary Committee. I hope and pray that’s not true, but there’s one way to find out.

Instead of providing the memo that was requested, he referred Mr. TRENT FRANKS, when he asked, to a Dallas Morning News article that quotes Mr. Jacks as saying there were no political factors involved in that decision. Well, I have a copy of that article as well. I also have a copy of Mr. Jacks’ pleadings where he did a very nice job of setting out that there was a strong case—in essence, a prima facie case—against these people wanting to have their names eliminated as coconspirators in the pleading. He also filed a pleading with the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Now, I know as a former judge and chief justice that lawyers are not supposed to file pleadings and try to persuade based on facts that they believe or know not to be true. It’s called fraud upon the court, and there’s punitive action that lies in that case. But the information that U.S. Attorney Jacks provided to the district court and to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals appears to be very authentic and very well done. Obviously, a very capable lawyer. There are no punitive actions that can be taken for misleading a newspaper. On the other hand, perhaps he doesn’t know what was in the memo that was requested from March of last year.

But we’re now getting into some very serious grounds when the Attorney General of the United States will not be forthcoming, changes his answers a number of times about who consulted or didn’t consult; who’s in his department, who’s not in his department; who participated. So we’ve got a lot of explaining to get to. I hope there are legitimate explanations. But one thing is very clear, Mr. Speaker, and that is when the Attorney General is holding evidence that will answer the questions that were asked and prove if anyone is lying and who is lying and when they lied, it is not at all comforting to say, We’re not giving you evidence that might contradict something that’s been said by the Justice Department, but we will refer you to a newspaper article that an interim U.S. Attorney gave, who serves at the will of the United States President. So then, again, as a former judge, you’re not

looking for evidence which may support or not.

Could there be politics at play in this kind of decision? Well, about this Islamic Society of North America, ISNA, it's interesting. I got a transcript of the speech, because I got it off of the White House Web site today, made by the Deputy National Security Adviser to the President of the United States, Barack Obama, his being Denis McDonough. This was actually, it says, for immediate release March 6, 2011. This is printed, like I say, from the Web site. These are the remarks of the Deputy National Security Adviser to the President, Barack Hussein Obama, in which he starts his remarks like this:

Thank you, Imam Majid, for your very kind introduction and welcome.

By the way, these are remarks to the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, ADAMS, ironically.

Thank you, Imam Majid, for your very kind introduction, and welcome. I know that President Obama was very grateful that you led the prayer at last summer's iftar dinner at the White House, which, as the President noted, is a tradition stretching back more than two centuries to when Thomas Jefferson hosted the first iftar dinner at the White House.

Well, "iftar" refers to the evening meal when Muslims break their fast during the Islamic month of Ramadan. Iftar is one of the religious observances of Ramadan, and is often done as a community with people gathering to break their fast together. Iftar is done right after sunset time. Traditionally, a date is the first thing to be consumed when the fast is broken.

But if you look at the true history of the country, Thomas Jefferson did invite a leader from Tunis to break bread with him at the White House, and it was at the conclusion of Ramadan, but there's no evidence to indicate whatsoever that this was a traditional iftar dinner.

You get back to the facts. In the second paragraph, he says—and this is Denis McDonough, Deputy National Security Adviser—Our Founders understood the best way to honor the place of faith in the lives of people was to protect their freedom to practice religion. In the Virginia Act, establishing religious freedom, Thomas Jefferson wrote that all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion.

He goes on in his remarks, and he says, Thank you also for being one of our Nation's leading voices for the values that make America so strong, especially religious freedom and tolerance.

Parenthetically, I'm not sure if tolerance includes funding terrorist activities against Israel and the United States, but that's a parenthetical question on my part.

Back to Mr. McDonough, Whether it's here at the ADAMS Center or as president of the Islamic Society of North America, you've spoken with

passion and eloquence not only about your own Islamic faith but for the need to build bridges of understanding and trust between faiths.

This is incredible. The Deputy National Security Adviser is thanking the president of a coconspirator—named, at least, as a coconspirator, joint venturer in the Holy Land Foundation trial. He was not merely introducing him at this proceeding, but was also thanking him for being a confidant who led the White House in prayer in their iftar proceeding in the White House. The president of a coconspirator to fund terrorist activities is leading Muslim prayers in the White House.

I realize my time has expired. I just know we need to work hard so that this country's time will not expire.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RANGEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 6, 2011, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1424. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minimum Quality and Handling Standards for Domestic and Imported Peanuts Marketed in the United States; Section 610 Review [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0030; FV10-996-610 Review] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1425. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0115; FV11-932-1 IR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1426. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Amendment To Allow Additional Exemptions [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0072; FV10-927-1 IR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1427. A letter from the Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Development Utilities Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees (RIN: 0572-AC06) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1428. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Decision and Order Granting 180-Day Extension of Compliance Date for Residential Furnaces and Boilers Test Procedure Amendments [Docket Number: EERE-2008-BT-TP-0020] (RIN: 1904-AB89) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1429. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs for Use in Animal Feeds; Florfenicol; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0002] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1430. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Jackson, Mississippi) [MB Docket No.: 11-8] received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1431. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Western Electric Coordinating Council Qualified Transfer Path Unscheduled Flow Relief Regional Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM09-19-000; Order No. 746] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1432. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Control of the Processing and Use of Stainless Steel (Regulatory Guide 1.44, Revision 1) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1433. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Models for Plant-Specific Adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-422, Revision 2 "Change in Technical Specifications End States (CE NPSD-1186)", for Combustion Engineering (CE) Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) Plants Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process (CLIP) [NRC-2010-XXXX] received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1434. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-128, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1435. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-001, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1436. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-031, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1437. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-130, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1438. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-58, "Allen Chapel A.M.E. Senior Residential Rental Project Property Tax Exemption Clarification Temporary Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1439. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-53, "District of Columbia Board of Elections and Ethics Primary Date Alteration Amendment Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1440. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-54, "Third & H Streets, N.E. Economic Development Technical Clarification Temporary Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1441. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-55, "Real Property Tax Appeals Commission Establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1442. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-56, "Clean and Affordable Energy Fiscal Year 2011 Fund Balance Temporary Amendment Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1443. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-57, "Not-for-Profit Hospital Corporation Board Chairperson Designation Temporary Amendment Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1444. A letter from the Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's 2010 Freedom of Information Act Litigation and Compliance Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e)(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1445. A letter from the Executive Director, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1446. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1447. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1448. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Title II of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1449. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1450. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1451. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report on the exterior boundary of Yellow Dog Wild and Scenic River Ottawa National Forest, Eastern Region, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1452. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Terrorism Victim Expense Reimbursement Program [Docket No.: OJP (OVC) 1539] (RIN: 1121-AA78) received April 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1453. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's 49th annual report of activities for fiscal year 2010, pursuant to Section 103(e) of the Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 and Section 208 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1454. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2011-22) received April 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1455. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Sunset Date for Attorney Advisor Program [Docket No.: SSA-2009-0048] (RIN: 0960-AH05) received March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1456. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Endocrine Disorders [Docket No.: SSA-2006-0114] (RIN: 0960-AD78) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1457. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report entitled "Fourth Report to Congress on the Evaluation of the Medicare Coordinated Care Demonstration — Extended" in response to the requirements Section 4016(c) of Public Law 105-33, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1458. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Determining Medical Necessity and Appropriateness of Care for Medicare Long Term Care Hospitals, pursuant to Public Law 110-173, section 114(b)(2) (121 Stat. 2502); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1459. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Programs: Changes to the End-Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System Transition Budget-Neutrality Adjustment [CMS-1435-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AQ94) received April 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. AMASH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1735. A bill to require the President to transmit to Congress a plan with timeframe and completion date and reports with status updates on the transition of United States military and security operations in Afghanistan to the Government of Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 1736. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Mother's Day; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the Federal tax on fuels by the amount of any increase in the rate of tax on such fuel by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1738. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase, extend, and make permanent the above-the-line deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1739. A bill to repeal the Federal sugar program; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1740. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State to refuse or revoke visas to aliens if in the security or foreign policy interests of the United States, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review visa applications before adjudication, to provide for the immediate dissemination of visa revocation

information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1742. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a presumption of service connection for illnesses associated with contaminants in the water supply at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, and to provide health care to family members of veterans who lived at Camp Lejeune while the water was contaminated; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1743. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BARROW):

H.R. 1744. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the employer health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BERG):

H.R. 1745. A bill to improve jobs, opportunity, benefits, and services for unemployed Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1746. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish signal quality and content requirements for the carriage of public, educational, and governmental channels, to preserve support of such channels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 1747. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the rule treating certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5-year property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1748. A bill to provide consumers relief from high gas prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JONES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Flor-

ida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1749. A bill to enhance reciprocal market access for United States domestic producers in the negotiating process of bilateral, regional, and multilateral trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 1750. A bill to strengthen the strategic force posture of the United States by implementing and supplementing certain provisions of the New START Treaty and the Resolution of Ratification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 to require that weather radios be installed in all manufactured homes manufactured or sold in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1752. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations requiring a label to be displayed on the packaging of certain baby monitors to warn that the signals of such monitors may be intercepted by potential intruders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 1753. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1754. A bill to permanently increase the conforming loan limits for the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation and the Federal National Mortgage Association and the FHA maximum mortgage amount limitations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JONES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BACA, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1755. A bill to enable Federal and State chartered banks and thrifts to meet

the credit needs of the Nation's home builders, and to provide liquidity and ensure stable credit for meeting the Nation's need for new homes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 1756. A bill to reauthorize the National Oilheat Research Alliance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1757. A bill to make permanent the estate tax provisions enacted as part of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1758. A bill to reduce and prevent the sale and use of fraudulent degrees in order to protect the integrity of valid higher education degrees that are used for Federal employment purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 1759. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to increase the amount of Gulf of Mexico oil and gas lease revenue shared with Gulf States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1760. A bill to reauthorize the Great Ape Conservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1761. A bill to reauthorize the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BONNER (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 1762. A bill to establish a Gulf Coast Restoration Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1763. A bill to close the loophole that allowed the 9/11 hijackers to obtain credit cards from United States banks that financed their terrorist activities, to ensure that illegal immigrants cannot obtain credit cards to evade United States immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1764. A bill to prohibit appropriated funds from being used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to authorize hunting under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1766. A bill to ensure efficiency and fairness in the awarding of Federal contracts in connection with natural disaster reconstruction efforts; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow expenses relating to all home schools to be qualified education expenses for purposes of a Coverdell education savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the Coverdell education savings accounts to allow home school education expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1769. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to implement a drug testing program for applicants for and recipients of assistance under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1770. A bill to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STARK, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 1771. A bill to increase public confidence in the justice system and address any unwarranted racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1772. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to reduce injuries and deaths caused by cell phone use and texting while driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 1773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the research credit permanent, increase expensing for small businesses, reduce corporate tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 1774. A bill to provide for an evidence-based strategy for voluntary screening for HIV/AIDS and other common sexually transmitted infections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WEST, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 1775. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a criminal offense relating to fraudulent claims about military service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 1776. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a program to improve roadway safety infrastructure in all States to enhance the safety of older drivers and pedestrians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WEST, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LONG, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. AKIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 1777. A bill to provide consumer relief for artificially high gas prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Mr. HIRONO):

H.R. 1778. A bill to assure quality and best value with respect to Federal construction projects by prohibiting the practice known as bid shopping; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 1779. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reduce the number of civil service positions within the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1780. A bill to ensure the safety of all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, chil-

dren, older individuals, and individuals with disabilities, as they travel on and across federally funded streets and highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. TIERNY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CHU, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1781. A bill to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McCOTTER:

H.R. 1782. A bill to implement the recommendations of the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1783. A bill to provide for enhanced mortgage-backed and asset-backed security investor protections, to prevent foreclosure fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1784. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for annual screening mammography for women 40 years of age or older and for such screening and annual magnetic resonance imaging for women at high risk for breast cancer if the coverage or plans include coverage for diagnostic mammography for women 40 years of age or older; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1785. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution from charging a fee for admission to any exhibit which is part of the permanent collection of any museum or facility which is part of any bureau established in or under the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1786. A bill to provide for the application of sections 552, 552a, and 552b of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as

the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act), and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) to the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1787. A bill to revise the composition of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution so that all members are individuals appointed by the President from a list of nominees submitted by the leadership of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow reimbursement from flexible spending accounts for certain dental products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1789. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide standards and procedures to guide both State and local law enforcement agencies and law enforcement officers during internal investigations, interrogation of law enforcement officers, and administrative disciplinary hearings, to ensure accountability of law enforcement officers, to guarantee the due process rights of law enforcement officers, and to require States to enact law enforcement discipline, accountability, and due process laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 1790. A bill to prohibit assistance to Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WEST, and Mr. RIVERA):

H.R. 1791. A bill to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 101 South United States Route 1 in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the "Alto Lee Adams, Sr., United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler systems as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler systems as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1793. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to deter public corruption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 252. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Train Day; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H. Res. 253. A resolution affirming the rich spiritual and religious history of our Nation's founding and subsequent history and expressing support for designation of the first week in May as "America's Spiritual Heritage Week" for the appreciation of and education on America's history of religious faith; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. BACHUS):

H. Res. 254. A resolution encouraging people in the United States to join together in prayer for the victims of the destructive tornadoes and flooding in the South and Midwest and the devastating drought and dangerous wildfires in the South and Southwest; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

14. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3028 urging the Congress to adopt legislation prohibiting the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating greenhouse emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

15. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Wyoming, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 urging the Congress to adopt legislation prohibiting the EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

16. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Memorial 41 urging the Congress to reauthorize Section 5056 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

17. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3019 urging the Army Corps of Engineers to immediately cease wrongful denial of access and wrongful requirement of payment for the natural flows of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 1735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause one (provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; and Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment to the Constitution: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited

by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"Amendment XVI to the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 1739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Interstate Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, "the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States." As described in Article 1, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress." I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has "the judicial power" that "shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States." Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating "The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court."

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in *Marbury v Madison* in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can determine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina:

H.R. 1742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (related to providing for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States)

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill addresses federal oversight and management of federal land. Accordingly, pursuant to:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 17, which provides that Congress has the power and authority to: "exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings.

(Emphasis added). Thus, the Constitution's Places Clause confers the express and exclusive constitutional authority to Congress to

manage Federal Property, including federally owned property used for any “needful” government purpose. The federal government’s duty to raise and maintain a military force subsumes a duty to maintain and take care of its veterans from such military forces. Thus, a veterans’ center is a “needful building” to fulfill a core constitutional duty, and thus Congress has the exclusive authority to manage it and give it a name. *James v. Dravo Contracting Co.*, 302 U.S. 134, 143 (1937) (taking the “view” that the phrase “other needful buildings” embraces “whatever structures are found to be necessary in the performance of the functions of the federal government). For these reasons, the bill seeking to name a veteran’s center is constitutionally permissible.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 1745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 1746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

Article 4, Sec. 3, Clause 2

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 1751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. Maloney:

H.R. 1753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Authorization

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Congress has the power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states”

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I § 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 1759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 1762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution as upheld by the Supreme Court of Missouri v. Holland, 252 U.S. 416 (1920)

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

“The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;”

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 1773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 1774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 in Article 1 relating to the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 1775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 1776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

And

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This resolution is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 1779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

2) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 1782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina:

H.R. 1783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (Relating to the General Welfare of the United States)

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce)

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes), and clause 18 (to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for the carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 1789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 1790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1—The Legislative Branch, Section: 7—Legislative Process: Clauses 1–3—Revenue Bills.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 1791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 1792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 7, and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 23: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 104: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 114: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 198: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 210: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 329: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 389: Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 412: Mr. ISSA and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 420: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. RIGELL.
 H.R. 431: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 436: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 440: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 451: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. COLE, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 458: Ms. BERKLEY and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 459: Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 466: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 468: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 497: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 509: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 513: Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 527: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 567: Mr. QUAYLE.
 H.R. 601: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 645: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 654: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 664: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 672: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 674: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. QUAYLE.
 H.R. 709: Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 716: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 719: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 721: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 735: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 765: Mr. GARDNER.
 H.R. 787: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 807: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 808: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 812: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 814: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 822: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 880: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 904: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 913: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 964: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 965: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 966: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 968: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 971: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 973: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 984: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 985: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIREN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1005: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1032: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1036: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 1041: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 1044: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 1057: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1058: Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 1066: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. CHU, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1070: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
 H.R. 1075: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 1093: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 1111: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. RIGELL.
 H.R. 1113: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1116: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 1119: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1121: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1123: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARDOZA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1126: Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

- H.R. 1145: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 1168: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. BARTLETT.
 H.R. 1171: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1172: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1180: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 1187: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 1189: Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.R. 1193: Mr. MORAN and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1195: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1208: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1219: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1236: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1254: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 1259: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1262: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 1265: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 1269: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 1274: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 1297: Mr. WU.
 H.R. 1315: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 1317: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1319: Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 1337: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 1348: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1351: Ms. CHU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1356: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1383: Mr. HANNA and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1391: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 1402: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 1404: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 1416: Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. QUAYLE, and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 1417: Mr. STARK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. SUTTON, and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 1448: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1449: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1466: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1483: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1515: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 1527: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1530: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1537: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1551: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 1558: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 1573: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 1574: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1578: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1623: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1656: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1659: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1681: Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 1686: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 1687: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 1691: Mr. WEST.
 H.R. 1692: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CHU, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FARR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 1693: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 1695: Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CHU, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STARK, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 1705: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 1712: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 1721: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.J. Res. 13: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. HARRIS.
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. LONG.
 H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. OWENS.
 H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H. Res. 83: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H. Res. 87: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H. Res. 94: Ms. CHU and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H. Res. 106: Mr. HULTGREN.
 H. Res. 166: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H. Res. 211: Mr. FLORES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H. Res. 214: Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. STARK, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BACA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. REYES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H. Res. 217: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H. Res. 234: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOLD, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. JONES, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. CARDOZA.
 H. Res. 241: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. ISSA.
 H. Res. 244: Ms. BERKLEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 1081: Mr. STEARNS.