United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2011 No. 64

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 11, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RENEE ELLMERS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 2 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, yesterday, I joined members of the Pennsylvania State legislature, gun owners, and the president of the NRA at the Pennsylvania State capital in support of our Second Amendment rights. I appreciate their deep belief in freedom and protecting the Second Amendment that guarantees our citizens the right to own and bear arms. Our Second Amendment is this country's original homeland security. Where this right is freely exercised without government infringement, our citizens live in freedom with a deterrent and defense to violent crimes.

Sadly, Second Amendment rights are under attack from within, most recently, the fast and furious scandal perpetrated by the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives that approved felonious gun sales, directing thousands of illegally purchased firearms to be smuggled into Mexico as part of a sting operation. These actions contributed to the death of a U.S. border agent and perpetuate the lie that U.S. gun dealers supply the bulk of guns to criminal elements in Mexico.

As elected Representatives, it is our duty to respect and defend the freedoms that our Constitution guarantees. Those in the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives that engineered this dangerous strategy that took a life and threatens our freedoms must be held accountable.

SUPPORT THE TROOPS BY BRINGING THEM HOME

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the successful raid on Osama bin Laden's hideaway 10 days ago came with an important, and somewhat ironic, reminder. This mission was carried out in Pakistan where we are not at war and have no troop presence. Meanwhile, next door in Afghanistan, we continue to maintain an enormous military footprint of 100,000 or more troops. We're still there, even though Osama bin Laden hasn't been there since he escaped our grasp at Tora Bora nearly 10 years ago, and most of the al Qaeda leadership fled long ago.

The death of bin Laden clearly underscores the folly of our current policy. This is exactly the right moment to rethink our approach to Afghanistan and national security more generally, especially with the President's deadline for redeployment just 50 days from now in July.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, our military leaders don't seem to be rising to the moment. According to yesterday's Wall Street Journal, officers in Afghanistan have drawn up a plan that would withdraw 5,000 troops by July 1 and 5,000 more by the end of this year. Madam Speaker, that's not even close to an adequate response to the demands of the moment. It's not the bold move that was suggested when the July 1, 2011, drawdown date was first announced; 10,000 fewer troops by the end of the year doesn't even get us to pre-surge levels.

We owe it to the American people to do much, much more. They have sacrificed enough. What do we have to show for the 1,500-plus people we've lost and the nearly $7 billion a month we continue to throw at this mission? If anything, we have emboldened the terrorists instead of defeating them. If anything, we've undermined our national security interests instead of advancing them. If anything, we've weakened America instead of strengthening it.

Americans see that Osama bin Laden is dead; that the military occupation of Afghanistan isn't accomplishing its goals; that we have urgent priorities right here at home. And they are quite rightly asking: Why do we still have boots on the ground in Afghanistan? We also owe it to the men and women who wear those boots to end this war. Our troops have served with honor and valor in Afghanistan. A deeply flawed and morally objectionable policy is not their fault, but they are bearing the untold burden that will not be easily lifted.

Printed on recycled paper.

Earlier this week, USA Today reported on a new military study showing that troop morale is at an all-time low, thanks to the punishing emotional and psychological strain of multiple deployments and intense combat. The percentage of Army soldiers reporting acute stress has nearly tripled since the year 2005. Even if the war ended tomorrow, Madam Speaker, the anxiety and trauma plaguing so many of our troops won't go away anytime soon, if ever; but it's time to let the physical and mental health healing begin. It's time to stop sending our best and our bravest into this grinder.

We have asked enough of them. Madam Speaker, I can think of no better way to support our troops than to bring them home immediately.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the One Hundred Twelfth Congress:

The Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE).

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

The Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. HURT. Madam Speaker, all across Virginia's Fifth District, people are suffering from skyrocketing fuel prices. As I have heard from families and small businesses and farmers who are seeing a negative impact on their bottom lines, we need to take action now if we are going to address this serious problem of skyrocketing fuel prices.

Instead of supporting policies that will help bring down the cost of gas, the Obama administration continues to actively block and delay domestic energy production, causing more pain at the pump, increasing our dependence on foreign oil, and destroying jobs. We only have to look at our soaring energy costs to see the consequences of these failed policies. Gas prices have doubled under the President's watch and are now hovering around $4 per gallon in Virginia; and as these rising prices continue to directly affect all central and southside Virginians and threaten our economic recovery, I believe we should take action now to address this crisis.

Last week, the House passed a bill that would expand American energy production and create jobs by reopening the oil exploration in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of Virginia that has been delayed or canceled by the Obama administration. It is estimated that offshore energy development in Virginia, which has bipartisan support, could lead to the production of more than half a billion barrels of oil and 2.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and create nearly 2,000 jobs for our State. At a time like this, there is no reason to leave these resources untouched when it will help provide relief to all Americans.

This week, we are continuing our work to maximize American energy production by considering two bills that will end the White House's de facto moratorium on new American offshore energy production in a safe, responsible, and transparent manner. By reversing the administration's anti-energy policies and tapping into these resources to maximize our domestic energy supply, we will take a significant step towards lowering gas prices, reducing our dependence on foreign oil, and creating thousands of jobs for the Commonwealth and our Nation.

□ 1010

I urge support of H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1231 and hope that the Senate and the administration will join us in our efforts to move towards achieving true energy independence by approving all three energy bills the House of Representatives has considered thus far.

DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF NEW NUCLEAR REACTOR TECHNOLOGIES

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I introduced to encourage the development of a vital component to the next generation of nuclear reactors that will provide clean, domestic energy solutions for all Americans.

The Department of Energy initiated the Nuclear Power 2010 Program in February 2002 as a joint public-private program to develop advanced reactor technologies and encourage the private sector to build new nuclear power plants in the United States. My legislation, the Nuclear Power 2021 Act, applies the Nuclear Power 2010 model to small modular reactors. Under the bill, the Department of Energy would be able to enter into public-private partnerships to design and license two small modular reactors by the year 2021.

As my colleagues may know, today's traditional larger reactors range from 1,000 to 1,700 megawatts and cost between $5 billion and $10 billion to construct. In contrast, small modular reactors generate 10 to 300 megawatts and cost about $750 million to construct. These small reactors offer several advantages to large reactors in certain situations, including shorter construction times, increased safety controls, and electricity generation. While large reactors are built on a future generation site, a process that can take up to 5 years, smaller reactors can be manufactured in modular pieces in factories and transported by rail or truck, cutting construction times in half. Small reactors can also be completely manufactured and fueled in a factory. They can be sealed and shipped to the site for power generation, and after use, they can be shipped back to the factory for defueling, minimizing the potential spread of nuclear material.

Additionally, small modular reactors produce a small nuclear reaction which generates less heat, making them easier to shut down in the event of a malfunction. Another advantage of small modular reactors is that, unlike large reactors, they can generate power in any location. While large reactors require millions of gallons of water per day for cooling and must be located near large water sources, small reactors can be water-cooled or air-cooled. This technology could open up new parts of the country to nuclear development, such as the arid West and locations that cannot support larger capacity generation, such as isolated rural areas or regions with smaller grids.

Unfortunately, development and deployment of new nuclear reactor technologies can currently take upwards of two decades. Time and resources are limited for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to develop the institutional capacity to license new reactor designs, and traditional public-private partnerships are often insufficient to mitigate the business risk of bringing small modular reactors to market. This is why I believe this legislation is crucial for developing this all-American technology that could help us lead the world in electricity innovation and generation. I encourage my colleagues to join me in making America more energy independent, creating good-paying American jobs, and working toward the future of clean energy generation by cosponsoring the Nuclear Power 2021 Act.

HARVESTING AMERICAN ENERGY RESOURCES

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I am glad to be able to take the floor after the Member from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) talking about energy because it's something that's on everybody's mind today. He is talking

about nuclear energy, and he concluded with the remarks, What can we do to find American-made energy solutions? What can we do to find American energy independence? What can we do to provide good-paying American jobs? Folks, those things are all intertwined. There is not a product that we produce in this country that does not have an energy component to it. We have to have that access to energy in order to have access to jobs. That's why I'm so proud that in the tail end of last week and the beginning of this week, that's what we're focused on here on the House floor. What can we do to find those domestic energy solutions?

There aren't going to be as many folks here, Madam Speaker, as I look around the gallery, who might have been alive in the 1970s. Madam Speaker, I think you and I were here then. We remember some of those gas lines. Would you believe that we bring less American oil to market today than we did in 1970? Would you believe it's almost half?

We have been blessed in this country with domestic energy resources the likes of which no other country on the planet can claim. And yet we seem to be doing everything that we can to keep those resources in the ground and, instead, send precious American dollars overseas, often to folks who don't like us and would like to see our demise.

Folks, energy independence isn't just a tag line. It's not just about $4 prices at the pump. It's about national security. It's about, what is our vision for the future of this country? Is it a vision of dependency upon our enemies overseas? Or is it a vision of independence where we're bringing American resources out of the ground with American workers, creating American capital?

It's not just, Drill, drill, drill. I'm a big believer in drill here, drill now. But that's not because we're not sensitive to what's happening in a changing energy environment across this planet. Would you believe, for example, that in this country, we use less energy per capita today, fewer Btus today, than we did just 5 years ago, than we did 10 years ago, than we did 20 years ago, than we did 30 years ago. To say that we need energy independence, to say that national security depends on getting our resources out of the ground is not to say that conservation isn't a part of the model as well. It is. We're doing it, we're doing it successfully, and we should continue to do it, but we have to get our resources out of the ground.

Would you believe that as a percentage of the energy that we use in this country, that petroleum is in decline? Each and every year, we use less oil per capita than we used the year before, but that doesn't mean that we don't still need to get American oil out of the ground. In fact, we are importing more oil today than we did just 10 years ago, than we did just 20 years ago. We have the resources here. We know of more oil that's in the ground in America today than we have ever known of before, and yet we choose to send our dollars overseas to import that energy instead.

There are three bills we're working on here, Madam Speaker, and you know them well. H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act. Can you believe, Madam Speaker, that in a time of record-high gas prices that we have the second-largest shallow water drilling operation in the country going out of business for lack of work? For lack of work. Oil prices are headed back towards historic highs, and American drillers are going out of business for lack of work. And it's not just the company, Madam Speaker; it is each and every one of the American men and women who work on those drill rigs who are out of work because we can't get permits issued out of Washington, D.C. Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act.

H.R. 1231, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. We have these resources. We have this national security need. We have men and women who want to go to work to solve that need, and we won't let the permits out of Washington, D.C. Washington, D.C. has not been the solution here. Washington, D.C. has been the problem.

Folks, if what you want to say is, We're going to pass a bill on this floor that's going to ban automobiles, and we just won't use any more gasoline, fair enough. If what you want to say is, We're going to pass a bill on this floor that's going to ban plastic and say, we're just not going to produce any more, fair enough. If you are going to pass a bill that says, We're not going to produce any more fertilizer in this country, who needs it, fair enough. But until you do—and I would vote ''no'' on each one of those proposals—but until you do, we need American oil, and we need to get it out of the ground, and we need to get it out of the ground now.

Madam Speaker, I am tremendously grateful for the leadership you have shown in bringing these bills to the floor, and I thank you for the time.

RESILIENCE OF THE CITY OF MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I represent the Tennessee Ninth Congressional District, which is Memphis. Memphis has been in the news quite a bit these past few weeks, and partly it's been for a bad reason: a flood, the greatest flood since 1937 on the Mississippi River. There has been a massive flow of water across lands and into our downtown and other areas, and it's affected a lot of people. I have toured the damage. There are at least 1,500 people whose homes have been lost. They are in shelters. They have lost possessions.

□ 1020

But the city of Memphis is coming together with a lot of volunteerism to help those people, and the Federal Government, through FEMA and the Corps of Engineers, is doing all it can to protect property and protect people and offer them shelter and food. And because it's a disaster area, we'll be helping them get back on their feet once again. It's a tragedy for those people and a tragedy for a lot of other people up and down the river.

But the fact is the city of Memphis is open and open for business, and most of the city of Memphis is not affected by the flood. Contrary to what you might see on the news, the entire city is not underwater. The business sections, most of the city, are totally dry, and people are going to work, flying Federal Express planes all over the world to deliver packages. International Paper and all the businesses that are there are fully operational.

Our Memphis Grizzlies are still alive and playing tonight in the NBA Western finals, and the people of Memphis are filling the FedEx Forum when they play and cheering them on and bringing the city together in the spirit that Memphians have come together for years.

The city of Memphis has had problems over the years. A yellow fever epidemic in the 1870s almost destroyed the city, but it didn't. The city came back and came back even stronger.

The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King on the 4th of April, 1968, was an awful moment in our city history and one we had to overcome. But the city did. And on that site, the Lorraine Motel, has been built a great civil rights museum, the National Civil Rights Museum, like a phoenix from the ashes telling the story of the civil rights movement and the movement out of slavery and out of Jim Crow into an era where an African American could and has been elected President of these United States.

The city of Memphis and the people have an indomitable spirit. They have come back from problems in the past and will continue to do so.

Yesterday, the city of Memphis received great news when President Obama announced that of all the schools that applied in this Nation in the Race to the Top program to be recognized and to be honored by his presence as the commencement speaker for graduation, that Booker T. Washington High School, a high school created in the 1800s, a Jim Crow school, an African American school in the 1800s, which has done spectacularly well in academics, increased their graduation rate from the fifties into the 81st percentile, best in the State on algebra scores and other scores, and great improvement and shown innovation, was chosen as the school in the country to have the President come to their graduation. He will speak at the Booker T. Washington High School graduation next Monday in Memphis. It will be his

first visit to Memphis, and the city of Memphis has looked forward to his visit. I look forward to his visit, and have encouraged the President to come to Memphis, and I hope he'll come more times after that.

But for those students and other students who need to have inspiration and hope, particularly at this time when there is flood and many people have been dispossessed, it's so important that the President be there and give those students hope and encourage them to continue to make good grades and to lift themselves up.

Many of the students at Booker T. Washington lived in housing projects, Cleaborn Homes, which was recently demolished to make way for a HOPE VI project, the fifth of six in the city of Memphis, which has gotten rid of projects but given people private residences or apartments and a better way of life. Those students saw their homes destroyed, but they've worked hard in their school and stayed at Booker T. Washington High School and will be honored by the President's visit.

They, like everybody else in Memphis, cheer for the Memphis Grizzlies, and the Grizzlies cheer towel is one that I bring you today. ''Believe Memphis.'' Believe Memphis has carried the Grizzlies, an eighth-seeded team, to the championship game. The city believes. The city is strong. We urge you to come to Memphis, have some ribs, have some music and enjoy our hospitality.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1951 U.N. REFUGEE CONVENTION

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

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 60th anniversary of the 1951 Convention related to the Status of Refugees. The Convention was historic in spelling out a set of basic human rights that should be afforded a refugee. It was initially directed toward European refugees in the aftermath of World War II, but was expanded in 1967 to include refugees from all around the world. The U.N. Convention defines who a refugee is, and outlines assistance that refugees should receive. It stipulates that refugees should not be returned to a country where they fear persecution.

My district in the San Gabriel Valley of California is home to a large and diverse refugee population who fled persecution from countries such as Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. In Los Angeles County they come from places as far as Iran to El Salvador.

Since arriving on our shores, many of the refugees have established themselves as civic leaders, small business owners and hardworking Americans. Some are working with resettlement agencies to help new refugee populations integrate, settle their families, and restart their lives.

The open arms with which our Nation welcomes refugees from around the world reaffirms America's commitment to human rights. And on this 60th anniversary, I look forward to continuing the U.S. commitment to human rights through strengthening of our refugee resettlement program.

RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE U.S. MILITARY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak again about rape and sexual assault in the military. But first I want to recognize the role our military played in bringing Osama bin Laden to justice. Taking down the world's most notorious man, someone responsible for the deaths of thousands of innocent Americans, is a tremendous accomplishment. Our Nation is so proud of the service of our members of the military.

The news about killing Osama bin Laden is another reminder that military service is one of our Nation's highest callings. This is precisely why we cannot, as a country, allow a few bad actors to besmirch the honor of the Armed Forces. And we certainly cannot condone a system that is designed to protect the perpetrators and punish the survivors.

Just as the military sought justice for the victims of September 11, we must continue to seek justice for those who have served their country, only to be raped or sexually assaulted by one of their own.

As a reminder, the numbers are staggering. The Department of Defense has said that over 19,000 members of the military were raped or sexually assaulted in 2010. Those are the Department of Defense numbers. And only 13 percent of them actually report the assaults.

I made a pledge to share the victims' stories every week until Congress and this administration does something more than offer lip service. I recently set up an email account so survivors could share their stories with me. The address is StopMilitaryRape@mail.house.gov.

Today I want to share one of those emails. A servicewoman wrote:

I endured over a year of harassment while stationed at Point Loma, California. My class leader was a fleet returnee that referred to women by a number of derogatory names. He and two other men in the class would grope women. They would then publicly grope each other to prove that they were equal opportunity harassers.

The class leader also would accuse women of being ''on the rag,'' or he would ask us if our vagina hurt. What would happen if one of your colleagues asked you if your vagina hurt? And yet this is largely permitted in uniform. It is permitted with a culture of fear that would rival the prison experience or the tyranny of gang infested neighborhoods.

I reported the behavior and the class leader was relieved of his duties. He was already on a suspended bust for sexual harassment that he committed while on recruiting duty in his hometown. I then was ostracized for reporting bad behavior. This class leader told all the male students at this training center to make sure that whoever went to sea with me should make me pay.

Another petty officer deployed on a mission a month ahead of me. He told the ship that I was a feminist and a lesbian that got someone that was on a suspended bust into more trouble.

While stationed aboard that ship, I was groped and harassed by my work center supervisor. When we went to sea, he would send everyone back to their barracks by saying that he and I would finish cleaning up. Then he would rape me.

The ship sailed for the Caribbean. We sailed through hurricanes and tropical storms off the coast of Florida. I was put on consecutive watches with this guy and he raped me most of the time we were on watch together. I did get some reprieve because in high seas he would get seasick. Once he got sick all over me while he was raping me.

□ 1030

I tried to report this rape and harassment to my chain of command. My senior chief took me out to the fan tail of the ship and told me that the chain of command knew that I was a feminist and a Democrat; and, if I said anything more about this, I would just be proving that I wanted to get the rapist in trouble.

I attempted suicide, but backed out at the last minute. It still makes no sense.

Well, it doesn't make sense. I have received countless emails like this and will continue to share them in the weeks ahead. Again, I invite survivors to tell their stories by writing to StopMilitaryRape@mail.house.gov.

During a time of such tremendous pride for our military, we should commit ourselves to removing the stain of rape and sexual assault from this great institution once and for all.

INSTITUTE FOR INCLUSION IN THE LEGAL PROFESSION

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession.

Lawyers serve an important role in our society, and yet the legal profession, like many others, is in need of serious improvement in the diversity of its membership. There are a number of individuals and organizations who are working to change that fact, and, thanks to their efforts, there has been progress. Yet the legal profession, which above all should stand for fairness and equality, is still a long way

from being open and welcoming to all irrespective of individual characteristics and background.

The Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession, a new group with a promising approach to diversity and inclusion in the legal profession, was established in Chicago, Illinois, in September 2009.

The Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession is addressing the contrast between the increasingly diverse society in which we live and what certainly appears to be an entrenched lack of diversity and inclusion. The Institute is working to improve diversity and promote inclusion through comprehensive outreach and innovative programs.

For example, the Institute asks hard questions and finds the answers to them. Working with legal, judicial, professional, educational, and governmental institutions, the Institute provides programs and tools to promote equity in the legal field. IILP uses a new and, in many ways, unique approach. Its comprehensive programs include lawyers, judges, and law students to address all facets, all practice settings, and all types of diversity within the legal profession. Beyond working to overcome the barriers facing diverse lawyers, it looks at the pipeline for new legal talent. This aspect is key. By helping diverse students become law students, enter the legal profession, and eventually become successful lawyers and judges, the profession will become more diverse and inclusive.

A few examples of the work of the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession include a pledge to the profession where lawyers across the country are being asked to dedicate a minimum of 1 day of service to work with young people to educate them about the legal profession and encourage them to join it; Professionalism in Practice, a program where law students and judges learn from each other about the profession and, in doing so, about diversity and inclusion; the ''Business Case for Diversity: Reality or Wishful Thinking?'' a research project that provides the first hard data examining the impact of the business case for diversity and the state of diversity; and, ''The State of Diversity and Inclusion in the Legal Profession,'' which is an annual report and series of symposia designed to educate the bar about its current state, cutting-edge issues surrounding diversity and inclusion and the most promising programs, efforts, and initiatives aimed at making entry into and success within the legal profession more accessible to all.

The mission and work of the IILP is an important contribution to social justice in the United States. I consider it an honor to recognize the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession and invite all Members to join me in recognizing them for the importance of their mission and the great work they are undertaking.

H.R. 71

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. We have had a very challenging week, Madam Speaker, and I thank you for the time.

It is a time of great patriotism and great respect for the institutions of democracy that this country represents. It is a statement that says that we will not be an offender, but we will be a defender. We will defend our values; we will defend our soil; we will defend the people of the United States.

I have served on the Homeland Security Committee as the dust was rising from the site of 9/11. When I traveled to New York, I walked along sidewalks where there were walls of letters and pictures of loved ones who had not been designated as being lost and people were trying to see if loved ones were in hospitals. I saw the pain. And so the capturing and the demise of Osama bin Laden is the finishing of an era and a story. And we are to commend the President of the United States, the Navy SEALs, the JSOC and intelligence communities, and the United States military and persons around this Nation who are part of this great effort.

Well, we live in a different world now. As the facts are unfolding in Pakistan, as evidence has been reviewed by the various tapes, we know that terrorism and al Qaeda is an active entity around the world. The United States is not the only target, but we are and will continue to be in the eye of the storm.

As we have heard representations from terrorists and to-be leaders and wanna-bes about what they intend to do to retaliate, it is important for us to be responsible with the resources that we have. And so for over a year I have introduced H.R. 71, the FAMS Augmentation bill, the Federal Air Marshal. And I call on, today, for the administration and the Congress to work together to increase the number of air marshals on domestic flights, on long-distance flights, and to increase the numbers of air marshals traveling on inbound flights to the United States. What more do we need?

Over the last couple of days, any series of incidents that have occurred, and thanks to the brave passengers now well aware since 9/11 and flight attendants for whom I have fought consistently to get more training, unarmed, obviously, and many without training, are now being confronted with individuals who are charging now reinforced pilot doors, some going to the exit doors, over the last 4 days a series of incidents that no one knows whether or not they will stop.

Now, we know that some allegations have been that individuals are suffering from mental challenges, and we understand that. We also know that, to date, no one had a weapon, and so the Transportation Security Administration is doing its job. But this is happening. That is what air marshals are for: to protect the traveling public, flying more than they have ever flown, paying higher prices for bags and food, and now we expect them not to be safe and secure. It is time now to augment and to pass H.R. 71 and to increase the number of air marshals.

Now, we have an issue of a deficit and a debt. My question is, as someone would say: Are we going to be penny-wise and pound-foolish? Are we going to not safeguard the American people because there happens to be the mantra on this side of the aisle, Republicans, who don't want to spend a dime for anything? Well, my friends, we have to invest in the American public. We have got to be able to build infrastructure, and at the same time we have got to be responsible spenders.

But I will tell you this. I will take spending for national security any day with bringing home the troops from Afghanistan, because that mission is complete. Now we must invest in American people. And I'm angry about this, that we would be so cheap that we would not provide the resources to give us new and additional trained Federal air marshals, many of whom come from the United States military. Many of these soldiers coming home would make excellent air marshals.

□ 1040

Many of them come from the U.S. Marshals Service and many other marshals services.

What is more precious than the mother and father and children and relatives that are traveling to visit loved ones or for business, and they are coming home to the United States and we are putting them in jeopardy because we do not have the air marshals to protect them against these unknown threats?

So my challenge today is stop being cheap, stop nickel-and-diming security, stop not understanding that we have the responsibility to go ahead and secure the American public. Today I call for more air marshals on the Nation's airplanes, and I call for it now. H.R. 71 should be passed immediately.

PUERTO RICO'S COMEBACK STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, the United States stands at a crossroads. Responsible leaders recognize that a bipartisan fiscal strategy must be crafted to reduce deficits. A deal will require courage on the part of its proponents, because each revenue raiser and spending cut is bound to trigger opposition.

Unless officials can persuade voters that sacrifice and self-restraint now are essential for stability and strength later, a deal will not happen. Even with public buy-in, leaders must be ready to

take action, despite the political perils, and be prepared to raise the national interest above their personal interests and reelection. It will not be easy, but it must be done.

For officials in Washington who are in search of a comeback story, I suggest the case of Puerto Rico. In January 2009, the U.S. territory stood on the brink of disaster. The new government had inherited a deficit of $3.3 billion. As a percentage of revenue, this was the largest deficit of any U.S. administration. The new administration was even forced to take a loan to meet its first payroll. Major rating agencies had downgraded Puerto Rico's credit to near junk status. Simply put, the island's economy was about to implode.

Leaders in San Juan faced a stark choice. Like their predecessors, they could usher Puerto Rico down this unsustainable path, paralyzed by the fear that tough choices would antagonize voters; or they could place their responsibility to protect Puerto Rico's future above their desire to preserve their poll numbers.

Fortunately for Puerto Rico, the new leadership chose the right course. For 2-plus years, Governor Luis Fortuno and the island's legislature have taken decisive action to impose fiscal discipline and create a leaner, more responsible government. They have cut government spending by nearly 20 percent, sharply reducing the deficit as a percentage of revenue. Indeed, by this metric, the island has moved from last in the Nation to a fiscal position that is better than 30 States. The rating agencies have rewarded Puerto Rico's progress, with Moody's giving the island its highest rating in 35 years.

To achieve savings, the government cut expenses and political appointments and was compelled to reduce its payroll. In my experience, rational leaders do not lay off workers because they think this will play to their political advantage. To the contrary, few actions are likely to arouse greater public displeasure. After all, work does more than put bread on the family table. It gives men and women dignity and a sense of purpose. But the Government of Puerto Rico's actions were absolutely necessary and were taken despite serious political risks.

Measures were taken to cushion the blow for those workers who were let go, and layoffs did not include teachers or first responders. More importantly, the government factions prevented an economic disaster, which would have resulted in far greater suffering and job loss.

It is important to emphasize that these decisions were not partisan. Governor Fortuno is a Republican and I, as Puerto Rico's only Representative in Congress, am a proud Democrat, and I supported his policies. The island legislators who voted to advance this agenda are affiliated with both national parties. And unlike in some States, Puerto Rico's leaders did not politicize ARRA or other Federal funding which served as a lifeline for the island. Rather, they have worked to put every dollar to good use.

So for leaders in Washington who say it will be impossible to achieve bipartisanship in the budget debate, the case of Puerto Rico should provide a measure of hope. As it nurses the economy back to health, the Puerto Rico Government is also advancing a long-term, pro-growth strategy. For example, the government has reduced individual and corporate tax rates and ensured that everyone contributes their fair share; boosted sales of housing and commercial properties through other incentives; and worked to address Puerto Rico's high energy costs and dependence on foreign oil, including through the development of a natural gas pipeline that will create thousands of jobs, lower carbon emissions and significantly reduce energy bills for individuals and companies on the island.

In closing, Puerto Rico's leadership has proven that it is possible to work across party lines to control spending and create growth. I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to work in this same spirit and to set aside partisan differences to secure the long-term fiscal health of the country we love.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Wallace Shepherd, Second Baptist Church, Santa Barbara, California, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bless You, Lord, in this season, while our homeland faces difficult decisions and conflicts across many nations.

We bow before You this day, requesting Your mercy and Your grace. Grant this Congress Your guidance as they work collectively as one. We pray, dear Lord, as resolutions are prepared, that there will be a united commitment to the development of comprehensive laws.

Lead this Congress and Nation in the direction of tranquility that reflects the intent of our forefathers. Endow us as a Nation to be humble, as we transcend the norm, without forgetting those that are in need. Anchor our hearts with prudence, as we consider the development of our youth. Protect our troops, as they fight for democracy and freedom throughout the world. Steer us on the path of righteousness with temperance. Bless our government, and bless this Nation.

In Jesus Christ's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. ELLMERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND WALLACE SHEPHERD

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a valued constituent and a good friend, Dr. Wallace Shepherd.

Dr. Shepherd came to the Second Baptist Church of Santa Barbara as pastor in 2006. Since then, Pastor Shepherd has reestablished Santa Barbara's Martin Luther King Day event as a capstone celebration on the central coast of California.

He is an active board member of the Endowment for Youth program, which supports the education of underprivileged children through tutoring and scholarships. Dr. Shepherd also helped to found Eco Faith, a nonprofit organization that promotes conservation of energy in churches and houses of worship.

He has been appointed evangelism director of the Central District of California, and also the vice president of the Third Sunday Fellowship for Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. But as our House has just witnessed, he is at the core a powerful presence and a humble servant in the name of his faith.

I am honored to welcome him here to Congress, and thank him for his invaluable service to our community and to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

H.R. 1425

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1425, the Creating Jobs Through Small Business Innovation Act. This bipartisan bill is being marked up today in the House Small Business Committee.

Our bill reauthorizes the SBIR and STTR programs, which have a proven track record of creating jobs, stimulating small business growth, and helping startups succeed by providing the impetus to start projects that otherwise would not have gotten off the ground. But, most importantly, our bill does not cost anything. This program simply requires that the Federal agencies slice out a portion of their overall budget for small firms to compete for research and development for new innovative ideas.

The SBIR program is set to expire on May 31. As chairwoman of the House Small Business Committee on Health and Technology, I believe it is vital that we expedite reauthorization of the SBIR program so that small businesses can continue to compete for the contracts that will springboard ideas, create jobs, and spur economic growth.

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 20 weeks this Chamber has been discussing ways to reduce our Nation's deficit, debating the merits of cutting one program or another, most times including important initiatives like job training funds, education, and health-related services.

The fact of the matter is that we have to cut spending. The issue is not whether to reduce the deficit, but how we do it.

If we really want to get serious about the deficit, we would stop handing out billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies which price gouge at the pumps.

Oil company profits are at a record high, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are using high gas prices as an excuse to keep giving them billions in taxpayer handouts. Taxpayer-funded giveaways for big oil add to the deficit. My constituents gain nothing at the pumps, nor do Americans all across this country. Instead, we should be focusing on measures that would actually bring down the price of gas at the pump.

It is time to bring to the House floor measures which would 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. These measures could provide immediate relief to our constituents from the rising price of gasoline that truly threatens our economic recovery and the well-being of hardworking middle class families.

JOBS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, we've been here for about 5 months so far. It's easing up on June. It won't be long until it's summertime. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has not brought a single bill to create a single job.

I was very pleased to hear the gentlewoman from North Carolina say that they are marking up a bill on jobs. It would be the first one, if it ever gets here. That's a shame, because I think when people voted last November, they were thinking, hey, we've got to do something about some jobs. And yet the Republican majority has dallied away and done everything but work on jobs.

Yeah, they've tried to take away the Affordable Care Act and take away health care from people who really need it. Yeah, they've tried to do a whole lot of things, push a social agenda. They've done all these things, but they have yet to focus on the one thing that Americans need most, which is a job.

If you want to reduce the deficit, you've got to have people making some money, and that means getting some jobs. People pay taxes. People would love to pay taxes, but they would do it if they had work. But they don't have work because our Republican majority has got other things to do.

Remember, jobs are the key. I am looking forward to Republicans bringing a bill to the floor.

MEDICARE/GAS PRICES RELIEF

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 this body voted to create Medicare and Medicaid to ensure that all seniors and disabled Americans would always have access to health coverage, and those today expect the same kind of coverage for themselves and their children.

But over the years, my Republican colleagues have tried to weaken the programs and privatize safety nets like Social Security. Sadly, history is repeating itself. Instead of focusing on priorities, like creating jobs and lowering gas prices, Republicans have put forward an agenda that ends Medicare as we know it.

So far this year, Republicans have voted—and we can't say they haven't. They have voted to eliminate guaranteed Medicare coverage for seniors, convert Medicare to a voucher program, reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, and extend tax breaks for big oil companies that ship jobs overseas. Even worse, new data shows the Republican budget will kick 44 million low-income Americans off Medicaid.

We must stop this insanity. Let's work together to preserve Medicare and lower the deficit.

□ 1210

STICKING IT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, it's happened. Gas is over four bucks a gallon. It's killing our economic recovery, American families and small businesses.

Now, Goldman Sachs, not exactly a friend of the consumer, says that 60 to 85 cents per gallon is purely useless, speculative activity. And what are the Republicans running the House of Representatives going to do about that? Nothing. They're going to pretend that future possible leasing off Virginia 10 years from now will do something about today's prices. It won't.

But why are they like, bait-and-switch? Why are they passing these phony bills and not taking on the price gouging and the speculation? Because that would mean taking on Big Oil and Wall Street. And, guess what? They're always looking forward to the next campaign, and Big Oil and Wall Street have been so generous to the new majority that they don't want to upset them. So they want to pretend they stand with their constituents and consumers, but they're really standing behind Big Oil and Wall Street.

Congratulations, guys. You just stuck it to the American people and the economy.

SUPPORTING MENTAL HEALTH MONTH

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, May is Mental Health Month, and as the cochair of the Mental Health Caucus, I bring to you information, especially on the military.

Since 2001 to current date, we have had 2,103 military service personnel die by suicide, suicide, my friends, in the Iraq and Afghan wars. In the Afghan war alone, it is over 1,000, more than some of the figures we have listened to recently.

One in five servicemembers suffer from major depression, posttraumatic syndrome, or traumatic brain injury, TBI. It affects the military and their families, their children. There's lots of divorce because of this and substance abuse that continues as they age.

We must expand mental health services to our military personnel and their families. Through their blood and their service they have earned it. We owe it to them. We've made some strides, but

we've got a long way to go, Mr. Speaker. We need to reduce the stigma, accept it as the illness that it is, and expand mental health services.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the military members and their families during May, Mental Health Month.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES P. WEST ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure today of recognizing a very special Delawarean who recently celebrated his 90th birthday.

Charles P. West is one of a kind who served our State and Nation with distinction as a soldier, legislator, businessman, and advocate for the values that are important to his community of Gumboro. Charlie was first elected to the Delaware House of Representatives in 1956, serving one 2-year term. He returned to the statehouse in 1978 and served for 24 years before retiring in 2002.

Charlie took great pride in helping his constituents. As he used to tell me all the time, he fought for the little guy. He was a fierce advocate for those who were the backbone of his district: chicken and grain farmers, small business owners, and sportsmen.

Charlie and his wife of 63 years, Eleanor Lee, are good friends of mine, and they have helped me better understand what is important to our State. It is my pleasure today to wish Charles P. West a happy 90th birthday and wish him and his family many more years together.

GIVING MORE ACCESS TO AMERICAN OIL

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the pain at the pump is real. In this, the most difficult economy in the last 25 years, my constituents have gas prices on their mind, and with due cause: $4.18 a gallon average back in the Hoosier State, higher than the national average, gas prices have climbed more than $1 over the last year. And, frankly, with the summer travel season upon us and with the rising treacherous waters in the Mississippi threatening our refinery capability, we could see $5 a gallon gasoline in the near future.

It is time to give the American people more access to American oil. Starting last week and this week, this majority in Congress will continue to move legislation that opens up our own domestic energy reserves in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore to the American people. The answer to the pain at the pump is energy independence. Part of that answer is by giving the American people more access to our own domestic reserves.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting measures on the floor this week and last week and lead us toward that lodestar of energy independence and relieve the pain at the pump once and for all.

SUPPORT THE MAKE IT IN AMERICA AGENDA

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, families and small businesses have been hurting for too long. While the world is changing, Washington has made things worse by ignoring American manufacturing and stifling American ingenuity. But here is what hasn't changed. Americans are still the most creative and most productive people in the world. We're still great at making things. And that's why I support the Make It In America agenda, because American manufacturing can and should be the central driver of our economy.

The St. Louis region I represent has a strong base in manufacturing, and now we need to tap into that strength to bring high-quality, high-paying jobs back home. That's why my office is helping St. Louis-based heating and air conditioning manufacturer Unico after being unfairly targeted by regulators. With a level playing field, companies like Unico can compete anywhere in the world, and if we invest in education, innovation, infrastructure, and manufacturing, we can restore making things to a central place in our economy.

I ask my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to stand with me to make these job-creating investments so we can Make It In America again.

START GOVERNING AND STOP CAMPAIGNING

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I came down here to do a public service announcement. On behalf of all Americans, I want the Republican majority to know that the elections are over. You've won the majority for now, so now start governing and stop campaigning. If you can't handle the responsibility of governing, get out of the way and let's move towards progress.

This week we're considering two bills that Republicans claim would bring down the price of gas immediately. Let's just pretend that is a fact, that that is true, although we know it is not.

If it's true, then why would you bring a bill to the floor that expedites drilling permits, which I could agree with, but you add in a provision to strip the American people's right to challenge drilling permits that are not environmentally sound?

Let's look at the next bill, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. That isn't the name of a bill. That's the name of a campaign speech. That's the name of political rhetoric.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is now time to have the responsibility of governing and take it seriously so that the American people are not paying $5 a gallon for gas.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask that you remind the Republicans that the campaign is over and it is time to govern.

This public service announcement is brought to you by Americans For a Functional Congress.

CONGRATULATING THE TEXAS A&M WOMEN'S EQUESTRIAN TEAM'S WESTERN SQUAD ON WINNING THEIR THIRD STRAIGHT NATIONAL TITLE

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the second athletics team from Texas A&M University to win a national championship in the past month. The Texas A&M Women's Equestrian Western Squad recently took home their third straight national title with a 5–3 victory over Kansas State in the finals of the Varsity Equestrian National Championship in Waco, Texas. Including the overall national title in 2002, the A&M Equestrian Team has won nine national championships since it was formed in 1999.

These lady Aggies, who hail from various parts of Texas and numerous States around the country, glided through a near perfect season and had their eyes set on another national trophy to add to an already filled trophy case. This team is a shining example of how hard work and perseverance pays off.

I would also like to applaud Coach Tana McKay and her staff for an outstanding job in guiding the Aggie Women's Equestrian Team throughout their success. Congratulations, Aggies, on a job well done, and gig' em.

□ 1220

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we've been waiting for 17 weeks for the Republican majority to bring to the floor a jobs bill. I voted against the recess 2 weeks ago because I believe we ought to stay here until we get our job done, which is to create jobs for the American people. What's the majority doing? Last week, they tried restricting a woman's right to choose. Then they attacked health insurance protections. This week, they're

trying to repeal commonsense protections that prevent oil spills. Jobs? Nowhere to be found.

Last week, Democratic Whip STENY HOYER unveiled Make it in America. My Build America Bonds legislation is part of that agenda. In the last 2 years, every dollar invested in Build America Bonds leveraged $41 in private sector funds, or $181 billion to construct and repair schools and build bridges and roads in every State in America. These infrastructure improvements created hundreds of thousands of jobs. That's what we need to focus on—not an ideological agenda.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1540, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until 5 p.m. on Tuesday to file its report to accompany H.R. 1540.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1231, REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 257 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 257

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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, 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 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 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 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.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REED. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. House Resolution 257 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1231. The rule makes in order eight amendments, all of which comply with the rules of the House. Of the eight, seven are Democratic amendments.

Mr. Speaker, today we are debating H.R. 1231, the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. This legislation, which will have profound impacts on our domestic energy supply, our national security, and our economy, is ripe for consideration by this body. It is no secret that Americans are feeling the pain at the pump. In my congressional district in western New York, my constituents, my family, my wife and I are routinely forced to pay in excess of $4 per gallon for gasoline for automobiles. We need to develop policies that will lessen our dependence on foreign fossil fuels, create stability in the financial markets, and provide relief to our constituents. In addition, this piece of legislation will create American jobs.

We must get our financial and energy priorities in order. We can no longer be held victim to instability in the Middle East and across the world. The United States must develop our own energy solutions which will reduce our dependence on foreign fossil fuels.

Most importantly, this will create American jobs. H.R. 1231 is one more example of our conference's commitment to developing domestic natural oil and gas resources. It adopts a philosophy that we need to drill smart, drill where the resources are, and produce our own energy.

Drilling for oil and natural gas can be done safely and responsibly. There have been millions of wells drilled in the United States. There is a strong record of sound environmental practices. Total petroleum industry spillage has decreased consistently over the last 40 years.

H.R. 1231 does two things. First, the legislation requires that in developing a 5-year offshore leasing plan for drilling the Outer Continental Shelf, that each 5-year plan must include leases for sale in the areas containing the greatest known oil and natural gas reserves. For the 2012–2017 plan being written by the Obama administration, this would mean targeted lease sales only in those areas estimated to contain 2.5 billion barrels of oil or 7.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. At least 50 percent of those areas must be made available for leasing in the 2012–2017 plan.

Second, this legislation requires the implementation of production goals during the 5-year plan being written by the Obama administration. For this period, the goal would be 3 million barrels of oil per day and 10 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day from American domestic sources of energy. This increase in oil production equates to a tripling of current American offshore production and will reduce significantly foreign imports by nearly one-third. Most importantly, this will create American jobs and protect our national security interests.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and very strong opposition to the underlying legislation.

Here we go again. Another week. Another day. Another bill that helps record profit-making Big Oil but does absolutely nothing to help American families paying $4 at the pump for gasoline. Although Republicans continue to frame these efforts as a cure for rising gas prices and a way to decrease our dependence on foreign oil, the truth is that oil prices are set on a world market. It's simply not possible for us to drill our way out of these problems.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee I offered an amendment as a stand-alone bill, again, that would eliminate subsidies for Big Oil. While I do not agree with H.R. 1231, my amendment would have done nothing to prevent this bill from moving forward. Instead, my amendment would have allowed for a separate bill to come up under this rule that would end subsidies for big oil corporations that are making money hand over fist while gouging Americans at the pump.

Let me remind my Republican colleagues of the facts. Two weeks ago, ExxonMobil announced that in the first 3 months of this year it had made nearly $10.7 billion in profits. That's $10.7 billion. Billion with a B. There's nothing wrong with corporations making

profits. That's what they're in business to do. What is wrong is for American taxpayers to be subsidizing wildly profitable companies at a time when too many Americans are still unemployed and struggling to pay their bills. With their tax dollars funding corporate welfare for Big Oil and then still paying astronomical prices at the pump, it's a double whammy for American families. With all the talk of cutting spending and reducing subsidies here in Washington, I would have thought that the Rules Committee would have made my amendment in order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that energy companies are sitting on thousands of drilling leases in the Gulf of Mexico, and they're not producing anything. And despite the misleading title of this legislation, no drilling moratorium currently exists. Since October 2010, when the drilling moratorium was lifted, 39 shallow water and 10 deepwater permits have been granted, roughly the same average rate even before the BP oil spill.

Mr. Speaker, while H.R. 1231 may make for a good sound bite, this is not a serious solution to bringing down high gas prices. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose H.R. 1231.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my friend, the newest member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Corning, New York, for a superb job in the way he has comported himself in the management of this rule and for his great service on the Rules Committee. He has literally hit the ground running, and this is the third bill that he's managed, the second rule, on the House floor, and I congratulate him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the comments of my friend from Worcester, and I will say that this measure that's before us is about several things. Number one, job creation and economic growth is something that Democrats and Republicans alike say that they are concerned about; and that happens to be, continues to be, our priority.

Creating jobs for the American people who are hurting right now is what this bill is all about and, at the same time, the notion of trying to free ourselves or at least diminish the kind of dependence that we have on foreign oil. I don't personally believe that we ever in this global economy should be completely free of the flow of energy and other sources, but I do believe that we can take steps that will diminish the level of dependence that we have on sources of energy outside of our country. And that's what this measure is designed to do.

I also want to touch on the very important question that was raised by my friend about the issue of subsidization by the American taxpayer of the energy industry. And I know that my friend likes to say, well, the Rules Committee can just take care of this in one fell swoop and make this amendment in order. And it was very interesting that our colleague from Boulder said that if it were to be considered under an open rule, he'd like to allow for consideration of a measure that would reduce the top corporate rate as we look at the issue of ending this kind of subsidization.

Well, that is a global approach that I believe needs to be looked at by the House Ways and Means Committee, by the Energy and Commerce Committee; and I'm supportive, I'm very supportive, of our doing that. But the idea of saying that we would do what my friend has proposed, actually under the provision that my friend from Boulder said that he'd support up in the Rules Committee, it's a violation of House rules.

So the idea here is we need to do what we can to diminish the level of subsidization. I personally have opposed agriculture subsidization. I'm not a proponent of subsidization of private industry. I do think that in the context of having the highest corporate tax rate of any nation in the world now that Japan has actually reduced their corporate rate, we need to look at ways in which we can bring that rate down and deal with closing loopholes. And that's something that President Obama talked about here in his State of the Union message.

So I think that if my friend would recognize that we've had opportunities to do this when they were in the majority, and we've been in session for a matter of a few months, and the idea of saying that we haven't addressed it yet on the House floor, I think, doesn't really pass the laugh test because we are right now in the process of looking at overall reform, and it will include dealing with the issue of subsidies. So I agree wholeheartedly with the need for us to step up to the plate and take this issue on.

I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished chair of the Natural Resources Committee, our friend Mr. HASTINGS. Unfortunately, due to an illness, he's not able to be here this week, but I spoke with him yesterday and he's doing a lot better. And he has every degree of confidence, a high level of confidence, that we're going to be able to effectively address this issue of working to drive energy prices down; to diminish the kind of dependence we have on foreign sources of energy; and the very, very important issue of creating jobs here in the United States of America, which continues to be our priority.

So I thank my friend for yielding. I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation.

And I'm happy to say that we've been able to make almost all of the amendments in order that were submitted to us as long as they comply with the rules of the House. The CutGo provision is germane. We've tried to make most of those in order, and it's a new day. We've had more amendments considered here in the first few months of this Congress than we did in the entire last Congress. So I think that this work product that we're going to have before us today is further evidence of that.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of points that a New York Times editorial, entitled ''The Return of 'Drill Baby Drill' '' made, and that was that drilling alone cannot possibly ensure energy independence in a country that uses one-quarter of the world's oil while owning only 2 percent of its reserves.

The other point it makes is the Energy Information Agency recently projected what would happen if the Nation tripled production on the Outer Continental Shelf. There would be no price impact at all until 2020 and only 3 cents to 5 cents a gallon in 2030.

The bottom line is that we need an energy policy that does not rely solely on drilling for oil; and we've tried to pass a bill that would do that, only to have strong objection from my Republican colleagues.

I would also say I just want to make sure we're clear on one thing because the chairman of the Rules Committee seemed to intimate that bringing up my legislation that would allow for there to be a vote to cut taxpayer subsidies to oil companies would somehow be against the rules. It's not against the rules. It would be totally within the rules, and the Rules Committee could have made it in order.

One of the things that I hear, when I go back home, from my constituents is, Why are you cutting programs that help elderly people be able to heat their homes in the winter? Why are you cutting programs that would invest in alternative energy and at the same time you have Congress protecting taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies that are making record profits? People are outraged by that.

[From the New York Times, May 6, 2011]

THE RETURN OF ''DRILL, BABY, DRILL''

As President Obama observed in a March 30 address on energy issues, drilling alone cannot possibly ensure energy independence in a country that uses one-quarter of the world's oil while owning only 2 percent of its reserves. Nor can it lower prices, except at the margins. Only coordinated measures—greater auto efficiency, alternative fuels, improved mass transit—can address these issues.

Still the oil industry and its political allies persist in their fantasies. On Thursday, the House passed the first of three bills that will require the Interior Department to accelerate drilling permits without proper environmental or engineering reviews, reinstate lease sales off the Virginia coast that

were canceled after the BP blowout, and open up protected coastal waters—East, West and in Alaska—to drilling.

The bills would make regulation of offshore drilling even weaker than it was before the spill. They would also do almost nothing to solve the problems of $4-a-gallon gas.

Here's the hard truth: Prices are set on the world market by the major producers, OPEC in particular. Even countries that produce more oil than they need, like Canada, have little leverage. Canada's prices track ours.

The Energy Information Agency recently projected what would happen if the nation tripled production on the outer continental shelf. There would be no price impact at all until 2020 and only 3 cents to 5 cents a gallon in 2030.

By contrast, the agency found, raising the fuel efficiency of America's cars would do real good. Increasing the fleetwide average from roughly 30 m.p.g. today to 60 m.p.g. in the next 15 years, an ambitious but not implausible goal, could bring prices down by 20 percent.

Some politicians get it. Senator Max Baucus, a Montana Democrat, is drafting a bill that seeks to repeal $4 billion in annual taxpayer subsidies to the oil industry and use the proceeds to develop more efficient cars and alternative fuel sources. Mr. Obama has tried twice, without success, to get rid of those subsidies, and the House voted in March to preserve them in the current budget.

The tax breaks—fast write-offs for drilling expenses, generous depletion allowances, and the like—may have been useful years ago but are wholly unnecessary when oil prices and industry profits are reaching new highs.

Even John Boehner, the Republican leader, conceded in a recent ABC News interview that oil companies ''ought to be paying their fair share.'' When horrified aides reminded him that ending the subsidies would amount to a tax increase—anathema among Republicans—he backed off.

Repealing these breaks would reduce the deficit and yield revenues to be invested in cleaner fuels, while having no real impact on prices. Mr. Obama may not be able to persuade the House of these simple truths. But he can and must seize whatever opportunities are offered in the Senate, involving himself, not just rhetorically, in the hard but necessary struggle for a sane energy policy.

At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans act as if they're trying to help the consumer with this legislation. But all they're really doing is helping Big Oil—bigger profits, bigger tax breaks. I mean, the first quarter earnings for the oil companies were bigger than ever, billions of dollars in profits. Even BP, even after the disaster a year ago, was still making huge profits; and, of course, we've got about $4 billion in tax breaks that the Republicans continue to give to the oil companies.

No more oil is going to be brought to market because of this legislation. As my colleague from Massachusetts said, we're talking years before any oil could be brought to market. And at the same time, we have the huge environmental risks.

The fact of the matter is that the BP oil spill a year ago showed us the environment risks that are involved with deepwater drilling. And there was a bipartisan commission that was put forward; Democrat and Republican testified before the Natural Resources Committee that I serve on. But no Republican effort is being made to implement those recommendations and say, okay, we need to do certain things before we can do offshore drilling in these deepwater areas. Nothing at all. So when you open up these areas under this legislation to new drilling, you're just inviting another BP-type spill because nothing is being done by the Republicans to prevent it.

Now, I would point out there are all kinds of leases out there now, on land, offshore, that the oil companies can drill and they're not doing it. They're just stockpiling them. There's more oil production that's been put forward in the last year or so under President Obama than ever before. So we're producing oil. No one is saying that you can't drill in the areas that are already leased. And there's more production. All we're saying is, why in the world are you risking these areas that now we know, after the BP spill, shouldn't be put into production when you've got all kinds of other opportunities out there?

Now, I offered an amendment. The chairman of the Rules Committee said that we were going to allow a lot of amendments. Well, they didn't allow my amendment; and my amendment simply said that the Atlantic coast for the next 5 years under the President's plan is off-limits because of what happened with BP and that we should keep that in place. But my amendment was not allowed in order.

□ 1240

What the President has done and what all of us are saying here is, in the aftermath of the BP spill, there are certain areas that shouldn't be allowed offshore production and in which the leases shouldn't go out. We learned from the BP spill that these areas should be off-limits because we are concerned about the environmental risks.

In my case in the State of New Jersey, we're talking about billions and billions of dollars in tourism related to the shore that would be put at risk if we had another oil spill. That's where the jobs are. Tourism is the number one industry in the State of New Jersey. Up and down the Atlantic coast, tourism is a huge business. It creates all kinds of jobs. What minimal jobs will be created by allowing these areas to be put out to lease and by allowing the drilling compared to the risk of the jobs that would be destroyed?

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal by former Democratic Member Harold Ford.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 11, 2011]

WASHINGTON VS. ENERGY SECURITY

(By Harold Ford, Jr.)

Even former President Clinton calls the Obama administration's deep water drilling policy 'ridiculous.'

When President Obama introduced his energy plan in March, he pointed out that the U.S. keeps going ''from shock to trance on the issue of energy security, rushing to propose action when gas prices rise, then hitting the snooze button when they fall again.''

It's true that since the Nixon administration U.S. leaders have all made the same commitment to cutting our reliance on foreign oil, finding reliable sources of clean energy, and keeping energy prices low. Yet Americans keep hearing only short-term solutions and narrowly focused rules and regulations. The U.S. still imports more than half its oil, gasoline prices are at historic highs, and consumers are paying the price.

One bipartisan policy tradition is to deny Americans the use of our own resources. President George H.W. Bush took aggressive steps to keep off-limits vast supplies of oil and gas along the coasts of California and Florida. Since then, the build-up of restrictions, limitations and bans on drilling (onshore and off) have cost the U.S. economy billions of dollars while increasing our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

In the year since the Deepwater Horizon spill, the Obama administration has put in place what is effectively a permanent moratorium on deep water drilling. It stretched out the approval process for some Gulf-region drilling permits to more than nine months, lengths that former President Bill Clinton has called ''ridiculous.''

Then there's tax policy. Why, when gas prices are climbing, would any elected official call for new taxes on energy? And characterizing legitimate tax credits as ''subsidies'' or ''loopholes'' only distracts from substantive treatment of these issues. Lawmakers misrepresent the facts when they call the manufacturing deduction known as Section 199—passed by Congress in 2004 to spur domestic job growth—a ''subsidy'' for oil and gas firms. The truth is that all U.S. manufacturers, from software producers to filmmakers and coffee roasters, are eligible for this deduction.

We won't achieve energy security by restricting our own companies from drilling or singling them out for punitive taxes. We're talking about an industry that provides millions of jobs and, for the foreseeable future, the power for our economic growth.

So our focus right now has to be to find ways to encourage domestic energy supplies, even while we encourage new sources of energy. President Obama is right that this isn't a long-term solution. But we can't lose sight of what the country needs today.

Here are a few steps to take:

First, let's conduct a comprehensive review of existing policies, rules and restrictions and root out any that needlessly hamper energy production at home. Do the existing environmental rules, for example, accurately reflect the industry's technological advancements in the ability to safely recover oil and gas supplies?

Second, let's develop the skills we need to find new and better ways to recover domestic supplies of energy—and to develop next-generation fuels to secure the future. That means encouraging more students to study math, science and other disciplines this industry needs.

And third, let's stop demonizing Big Oil to score political points. It does nothing to encourage the new talent, new ideas, and new entrepreneurs who are most likely to make breakthroughs in new sources of energy.

The kickoff of the presidential campaign season and the spike in fuel prices offer an opportunity to constructively debate a comprehensive national energy strategy. Effective policies will ensure sufficient domestic production and the healthy operation of U.S. companies abroad, which together will provide the secure, affordable energy supply that Americans need.

At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and of H.R. 1231, the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act.

When gas prices hit $4 a gallon in the summer of 2008, Congress and President Bush lifted a decades-old ban on drilling, allowing for exploration off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. However, these plans were postponed or cancelled by the Obama administration, and we are now back in the same situation of high gas prices, of squeezing the budgets of American families and small businesses. The facts are clear: The current administration is blocking American energy production and is hurting middle class America. On the other hand, they are also using American tax dollars to help offshore drilling in Brazil.

Since President Obama took office, the national average price of gasoline has nearly doubled to $4 a gallon in most States, and the energy policies of the Obama administration have resulted in the loss of hundreds of thousands of barrels of domestic daily oil production. To make matters worse, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, offshore energy production is expected to drop 13 percent in 2011.

It is not too late to change our country's course of action and to begin to undo the damage done by these policies. The energy reserves off our coasts and under our public lands belong to the American taxpayers, and should be utilized in an efficient and environmentally safe manner to create jobs, to grow our economy, to lower energy prices, and to enhance our national security by reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

The Federal Government also has the ability to realize substantial revenues through the leasing of these areas, which will help pay down our $14 trillion national debt. According to the CBO, enacting H.R. 1231 would increase receipts to the Federal Treasury by about $800 million over the next 10 years. This important legislation will require the Obama administration to expand access to areas offshore that contain the most oil and natural gas reserves. When we do so, we will improve our energy security and grow American jobs.

I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for his efforts in bringing H.R. 1231, along with two other American Energy Initiative bills, to the floor. I also would like to offer my special appreciation to Chairman HASTINGS for his support in allowing me to offer an amendment to H.R. 1229, which includes language from a bill I recently introduced, which extends certain leases affected by the administration's moratorium for 1 year.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

I am amazed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to be apologists for Big Oil. The fact of the matter is that Big Oil in this country is about making profits for Big Oil. They don't seem to care very much about the consumer.

I hold this chart up, Mr. Speaker, just to kind of prove a point that, notwithstanding the fact that they're raising prices on consumers, in the first quarter of this year as compared to last year, all of these oil companies—Exxon, Oxy, Conoco, Chevron, BP—all made record profits. Exxon is up 69 percent. They made $10.7 billion in profits in the first quarter.

What is particularly outrageous is they're making all this money, and my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to protect the subsidies and the tax breaks that they get. It's outrageous. They cut money for poor families who are trying to heat their homes in the winter; and on the other hand, they go out of their way to protect Big Oil from any amendments that we could bring to the floor here to be able to go after these subsidies and tax breaks.

My colleague from California, the chairman of the Rules Committee, says, oh, he's sympathetic. Well, we don't want your sympathy. We want your vote. I brought this amendment to go after the subsidies that the oil companies currently enjoy, taxpayer-funded subsidies, three times in the Rules Committee. All three times, it was voted down. So enough is enough.

In terms of this rule, I want to point out something. There was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL). It was germane, and it complied with the Republicans' new cut-go rules. It simply required that anyone who gets a lease under this bill would have to give preference to hiring veterans—the men and women who we have sent over to Afghanistan and Iraq. When they come back, we ought to go out of our way to make sure they have jobs. This amendment was voted down in the Rules Committee, an amendment to help our veterans.

I mean, it is unbelievable to me that the Republicans voted this amendment down. Maybe there's a reason someone could give me on the other side of the aisle as to why this was ruled out of order. It was germane, and it complied with the cut-go rules; but the idea that we're not going out of our way to help our veterans, I think, is unconscionable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act, which will lift the President's ban on new offshore drilling by requiring the administration to do what my constituents in southeastern and eastern Ohio have been calling for Congress to do: open up for production the areas that contain the most oil and natural gas resources right here in America.

The hardworking people of my district have made it abundantly clear that their number one concern is the rising price of gas at the pumps. Over the past week, this side of the aisle has begun to show the American people that we are serious about addressing our energy crisis and that we will not succumb to bringing up bogus proposals that may poll well in the court of public opinion but that will only result in higher gas prices.

In 2008, our country was also experiencing record high prices at the pump, and in a logical and commonsense response to those record-high prices, that Congress and that President took action to end a decades-long drilling ban offshore by opening up new areas in the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans for exploration and production. Unfortunately, this administration has reversed the will of the people, and has taken steps to reinstate this moratorium from new lease sales in these offshore areas.

Not only has the administration abandoned the plan to go forward with opening up new areas for production, but they have also cancelled previously scheduled lease sales. We are now again faced with rising prices at the pump, and instead of being able to focus on new ways to make America's energy secure, we are forced to bring up legislation that will do again what Congress did 3 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, recently, the Secretary of the Interior testified before the Natural Resources Committee. Between his testimony and answers to questions, he made it painfully obvious that this administration does not have a real national energy strategy. Today, with this legislation, we're going to help the Secretary and the administration take a big step toward developing a real energy plan for America. This legislation requires the administration and the Secretary of the Interior to set specific goals on the amount of oil and natural gas production that is estimated from each of the 5-year lease plans contained in this legislation.

During my 26-plus-year career in the United States Air Force, we set goals and objectives, and then we set out about working hard to not only meet them but to exceed them. This legislation sets the production goals at a level that is triple the level of America's current production, and it therefore reduces foreign imports by one-third.

Once this legislation is adopted, we will send a signal to the world oil markets that America means business when it comes to our energy future. I am fully confident that if we set the bar high, as this legislation does, American drive and ingenuity will rise to the occasion and will exceed this goal.

□ 1250

If we're going to become energy secure, Mr. Speaker, we must increase our energy production, not limit it, and we need to commit ourselves to developing our own resources. That is why I strongly support the Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

It appears, based on what I'm hearing here, that what the Republicans are dedicated to is helping the oil companies make more profits but doing nothing to help the consumer.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member on the Resources Committee, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

So here's where we are. The Republicans—this is unbelievable—are blocking any legislation from passing that is going to have new safety rules for drilling off of the beaches of the United States 1 year after the BP spill. They're blocking any new safety legislation to make sure that the United States, which has four times the fatality rate of countries in Europe in drilling off our shores, has rules that are put on the books to make sure that those worst of all safety violators, these companies that drill off of our shores, have those new safety rules.

Number two, the Republicans are fighting any attempts to take away the $4 billion in tax breaks which the American consumer gives to the oil companies each year, even as the oil companies report ExxonMobil, $10 billion; Shell, $8 billion; BP, $7 billion; Chevron, $6 billion, et cetera, for the last 3 months. That's how much money they made. The Republicans think that's not enough money, even as people get tipped upside down and have money shaken out of their pockets at the gas pump. No, not enough money. They also need to give the oil companies tax breaks. That's the Republican perspective.

What else do they do? They also slash the renewable energy budget, the clean energy budget, by 70 percent. So you're a kid out there in America; you're in the sixth grade; you're looking to America for the 21st century.

Here's what the Republicans are doing:

They're slashing the solar and wind budget by 70 percent;

They are saying to the oil companies, you don't need any more safety off of the beaches to drill;

They're saying that your profits are not windfall profits, which, of course, they are in the oil industry.

But instead, here's what we're going to let you do:

We are going to let you drill off of the beaches of California for oil, off of the beaches of Florida for oil. We're going to let you drill off the beaches—3 miles off of the coast, by the way—off the beaches of Cape Cod, of Georges Bank. We're going to turn Georges Bank into ExxonMobil's Bank. We're going to turn, not shellfish into a product that we sell, but Shell Oil will be out there. That's the agenda for the Republican Party.

This is almost surreal that they want to take the tax breaks that the oil industry has, fight like the devil to protect them, even as they want to cut Medicare for Grandma and cut wind and solar as the energy sources for the future. It's almost like they think it's 1958 and gasoline is 28 cents a gallon and we're all cruising around pretending that we're not part of the rest of the world.

This debate today is kind of a microcosm of what's wrong with Republican policies. That before, I think; people want themselves to see oil rigs off of their beaches in California and North Carolina, in Massachusetts and Maine, the least I think that you owe these people is that you have new safety rules that reflect what happened. You have that BP commission report implemented. But you guys are just running ahead as though nothing has happened.

By the way, do you want to know what else is really wrong here? We know because of Goldman Sachs that this $20 to $30 a barrel of oil of increase in price over the last 11 weeks comes from speculators. What you're doing is you guys are trying to kneecap the speculator cops on the beat so that they're not even out there policing these speculators, and you're trying to reduce the budget for the speculator cops, the people who will be chasing down these speculators.

So it's all so ExxonMobil, it's all so Shell and BP and Chevron and ConocoPhillips—and, by the way, at least you're true to your colors. At least this is really what you believe in. You don't believe in wind and solar, so you're cutting that budget by 70 percent, and you want to open up the beaches as well for drilling in the States that don't want oil rigs off their beaches. I mean, my goodness, this is something that at least you should be able to respect.

You also disapprove the using of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve as a weapon to tell speculators, you could go bankrupt because we're going to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the 700 million barrels of oil that the U.S. has stored.

This is a very important debate to have. I'm glad we're having it today because this ''Drill, baby, drill'' just says, yeah, your policy is not all of the above; it's oil above all. Everything else gets defunded.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are demanding relief at the pump and for Congress to create an environment that creates jobs. Republicans are answering that demand with practical solutions that will have an immediate impact on the price of gasoline, energy security, and jobs.

Liberal Democrats are still adhering to the sort of demagoguery that may score political points with their base, but that doesn't create a single job nor does it reduce the cost of energy by 1 cent.

Republicans strongly believe that energy security depends on strong domestic energy production. The liberal Democrats and President Obama have actively blocked and delayed American energy production, destroying jobs, raising energy prices, and making the U.S. more reliant on unstable foreign countries for energy. This is hurting American families and small businesses who are vital to creating the new private sector jobs we desperately need during this time of high unemployment. The liberal proposals fail to create jobs in America but help create jobs overseas for the citizens of foreign nations.

President Obama's reckless moratorium on domestic energy production has cost the gulf coast region 12,000 jobs since it was enacted last year. His moratorium now threatens an additional loss of over 24,000 jobs in the gulf and 36,000 jobs nationwide if we do not reverse this dangerous liberal endeavor.

The Republicans believe that energy security will not only create jobs but will also help reduce the deficit. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 1231 will generate $800 million in revenue over 10 years while reducing foreign oil imports by nearly one-third.

The solution provided by the Democrat elites? More taxes, resulting in higher costs that will get passed on to American families. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service says Democrat tax increases ''would make oil and natural gas more expensive for U.S. customers,'' and even some liberals admit ''it would cost thousands of jobs.''

Renowned economist Dr. Joseph Mason has stated that Republican proposals for domestic energy production will create 1.2 million American jobs.

If the liberal Democrats care about our energy security, prices at the pump, job creation, and strengthening our domestic energy capability, they would join Republicans in supporting this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, American families cannot wait any longer for relief at the pump. American families cannot wait any longer for jobs. If you stand with American families, if you stand with American energy security, and if you stand for job creation in America, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague on the Rules Committee talked about all the people she stands with. I want to know

why she didn't stand with the veterans last night when we had a vote that would help make sure our veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan would have preference in terms of these so-called new jobs that were going to be created. I find it unconscionable that the Rules Committee did not make that amendment in order, the Boswell amendment.

At this time, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. Yes, indeed, the taxpayers are waiting for relief at the pump, but this bill is not it. I rise in opposition to this rule and to H.R. 1231.

□ 1300

Once again the House will vote on Republican legislation that takes a ''let's put all our eggs in one basket'' approach to our national energy policy. And what's their answer to high gas prices? Drill for more oil offshore, and preserve taxpayer subsidies for Big Oil. Big Oil gets $4 billion in subsidies from us taxpayers. This helped them rake in $35 billion in profits in the first quarter of 2011 alone. Meanwhile, my taxpayers in Hana, Maui, have to pay over $6 per gallon to fill up their cars to go to work. Do these taxpayers get a subsidy? No. People in Hawaii pay the highest gas prices in the country. When I was in Hawaii recently, my constituents were astonished to hear about the record profits and continuing subsidies that are provided to Big Oil.

At the same time that the Republican majority is defending subsidies for oil companies which don't lower the price at the pump, they're also working to cut Federal funding for clean, alternative energy, public transit, and energy efficient programs. They also, adding insult to injury, want to disarm the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which is the main cop on the beat when it comes to oil speculation. Republicans also want to pretend that there are no consequences to the near indiscriminate drilling authorized by these bills. Less than a year after the catastrophic BP oil spill, which was caused by lax regulation of a dangerous industry, they want us to undo the reforms that have been made. And for what?

The Energy Department's Energy Information Administration estimates that drilling authorized by these bills may lead to a measly 1.6 percent increase in domestic energy production from 2012 to 2030. That is not a prescription for relieving pain at the pump in the short term, and it's a poor strategy for long-term energy security. Instead, we need to invest in fuel-efficient technologies and expand our transportation options. We need to focus on harnessing clean alternative energy sources, and that way, we can leave our children a cleaner, healthier planet and wean ourselves from foreign oil. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and against this drill-only bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, can I respectfully ask how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 13 minutes. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 12½ minutes.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. The rule we have before us today allows for an open process and provides this body the opportunity to debate an issue of increasing importance to our constituents back home. The future of our energy policy in this country is at stake here today, which is why I'm proud to cosponsor this bill reversing the President's offshore drilling moratorium.

This past weekend, I visited with a number of constituents at gas stations throughout my district. Some are asking, Will we get to $5 gas prices? If you come to my district, we're already there. I visited Wawona, California, last week. Everybody likes to talk about tourism. In California, we've got a great deal of tourism. But everybody that I talked to at that pump said, We planned this trip quite a while ago. We can't afford to do it today. We wouldn't have done it had we known gas prices would have been this high. Well, gas prices are still going up. We're afraid that in Wawona, we'll see $6 gas prices. You want to affect tourism, try hitting America's pocketbook at $6 a gallon.

But it's not just tourism. If you go to one of the farms in my district, diesel gas has gone up. If you are frustrated about paying higher gas prices, wait until you pay higher grocery prices, because in California's great ag economy, the prices are going up. In fact, some crops are going to stay in the field this year just because we can't afford the gas to bring them to market.

Parents are feeling the same thing. You know, as I'm going to swim practice over the weekend, talking to parents, they are frustrated about just being able to get their kids to school every day. You think this bill won't do something for gas prices? It's common sense to know if we've got a greater supply here in our great Nation, gas prices are going to go down. We want American jobs. We want to be self-reliant.

We talk about veterans here on this floor. I am a veteran. I served my country. I don't want to be reliant on foreign oil anymore.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A lot is always talked about us utilizing 25 percent of the world's gas. And where we disagree is the number of 2 percent of the world's oil. It's not a disagreement. The fact is, we've got 65 percent of the world's reserves between our oil shale. You just have to be willing to go get it. Natural gas, we want to use natural gas. Let's utilize our own natural gas. We have some of the largest oil reserves in the world. We just have to be willing to have American jobs and reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does absolutely nothing to lower gas prices, and it does everything to increase profits for the big oil companies. Again, I repeat the question that I have been asking over and over again: why was the amendment that would help our veterans get jobs on their return from Iraq and Afghanistan defeated in the Rules Committee? I have no idea why.

At this point, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me time, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

The bills proposed by the Republican leadership today, H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1231, do nothing to lower the high gas prices burdening America's families today. That's why I will be offering legislation that will produce real fuel savings for consumers, reduce our dependence on imported oil, and stimulate American manufacturing.

The Advanced Vehicle Technology Act proposes real solutions to high gas prices by helping America develop the next generation of high-tech fuel-efficient vehicles. I hope my colleagues will see that this is a better alternative to the bills that are being voted on today.

First, this bill has broad support, unlike the Republican measures before us. My bill passed last Congress with a bipartisan majority. A majority of the Members in the House today have already voted in favor of this legislation. Unlike the Republican bills, this legislation is supported by both business groups, like the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, as well as the League of Conservation Voters and the Sierra Club, proving that you can support the economy while also protecting the environment.

Second, this bill will quickly result in real cost savings to consumers. Technologies have already been developed to achieve remarkable fuel savings, and putting more money into R&D increases the speed in which new technologies can be adapted and used. Unlike the Republican drilling plan, which will take nearly a decade to produce results, technologies being developed today can be commercialized and put into cars in the very near future. I have visited auto companies and suppliers in my district and have seen firsthand the level of technological advancement. For example, they have

technologies that are ready to be commercialized that can improve efficiency by 30 percent and sometimes more. That means you can drive your car 30 percent further on the same tank of gas. That represents real savings to consumers.

A large focus of this bill is on commercializing those technologies so that they can be brought to consumers and start reducing gas bills today, not 10 years from now. This bill also targets fuel savings in medium- and heavy-duty trucks. It's widely known that there are huge efficiency gains to be made in these vehicles. By placing a greater focus on research and development in this area, we can achieve the greatest bang for the buck. More efficient trucks also yield consumer savings because it will reduce transportation costs of food and other goods that we buy at the store. The fuel savings we receive from these technological advancements in cars and trucks will have a national security benefit as well. Simply put, the bill reduces the amount of oil we import from unfriendly nations. Sixty percent of our petroleum needs today are met by imported supplies. Reducing the demand for imported oil is one of the best ways to meet our energy independence goals and end the immense transfer of American dollars to undemocratic and unfriendly nations.

Finally, the legislation supports American manufacturing and high-paying jobs. Rising gas prices are going to drive up demand for advanced vehicles around the world, and it is in our national interest to ensure that the research, development, and manufacturing happens right here in the United States. That's why this bill was included in the Make It in America agenda, a plan to rebuild American manufacturing and create well-paying jobs, unveiled by House Democrats and Democratic Whip HOYER last week.

□ 1310

The Advanced Vehicle Technology Act epitomizes the goals of Make It in America by ensuring that our country remains a leader in producing the cars and trucks of the future and supporting high-tech research and engineering jobs right here at home.

Fuel-efficient vehicle research is a win/win for our economy. It creates jobs and makes transportation more affordable for American families.

There is no doubt in the years ahead that more Americans will be driving hybrids, plug-in hybrids, battery electric vehicles, and cars and trucks powered by hydrogen fuel or natural gas. The only question is whether these new technologies will be researched, developed and manufactured here in the United States or overseas.

At the same time, domestic automotive and commercial vehicle manufacturers and suppliers have increasingly limited resources for research and development of advanced technologies. That's why the Advanced Vehicle Technology Act will create partnerships between the Department of Energy and private companies, and ensure that the American automobile industry and manufacturing base will continue to be globally competitive and that, as a Nation, we will not trade our dependence for foreign oil for a dependence on foreign batteries and other emerging technologies.

This bill does what the American people expect from us. It bridges the partisan and ideological divide.

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

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

Mr. PETERS. It's legislation that has support from the business community, the environmental community and the labor movement. We must stop voting on bills like the ones the majority is offering that pit priorities against each other, and, instead, we need to move legislation like my bill that brings our priorities together.

This legislation will lower costs for consumers, reduce the amount of oil we import from countries that don't like us, and create and sustain manufacturing and R&D jobs here in the United States.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can support this legislation to Make It in America.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the American families, the farmers and the fishermen, especially those across north Florida and northwest Florida who are being crushed today by these incredibly high rising fuel costs.

I represent and I am privileged to represent the largest land mass district in Florida, and I'll tell you, those that make their living in farming, those that make their living in one of our eight coastal counties in the fishing industry, they are being hammered day in, day out, day in, day out by rising fuel costs, especially the cost of diesel fuel.

We have the responsibility to American people today to alleviate our energy crisis through tough economic times. We can do this and must achieve this important goal while protecting the sensitive coastal regions.

And, yes, I took my baby steps on the beaches of Panama City, so I understand how important our environmental concerns are. My family's been there since Florida became a State, so I understand how critically important our environment is.

But at the same time, we must also preserve our military mission capabilities. We are the home of Tyndall Air Force Base and the home of the F–22, and so I understand how critical they are to our communities and our environment and our economies down in Florida as well.

We must do all these things while at the same time making sure that what we do in this House protects the American family budget and, especially in regards to rising fuel costs. Most family budgets today are spending over 10 percent, right at, near and over 10 percent of their family budget on rising fuel costs.

Unfortunately, some of our colleagues today believe the best thing to do, rather than to get out of this hole, is to dig this hole even deeper. As my grandfather would have said, Son, that would violate walking around sense? Okay? Instead of getting out of the hole, you just drive and dig a deeper hole.

This chart that I'm looking at right here beside me that I want you to see talks about the declining crude production in the Gulf of Mexico. In mid 2009, the United States was producing 1.73 million barrels of oil per day in the Gulf of Mexico. According to the Energy Information Administration, that number will fall to 1.18 million barrels per day next year.

Earlier we heard one of my colleagues talk about the sixth graders around the country. Well, sixth graders, I will tell you, they understand and they will soon learn in economics that, in order to reduce the price, you have to have more of something. That's simple. They're going to learn that much in basic economics. You have to have more of it.

What does this drastic reduction in the gulf exploration mean for people in Florida's Second Congressional District? They mean that if they go to the marina to try to go catch their two fish this year per day out in the Gulf of Mexico, that they're going to spend almost $6 per gallon of gas to fill that boat up—$6 per gallon of gas. I'm telling you, that is unbearable.

The second chart that I have right here is the exodus of American jobs, rigs leaving the gulf for foreign waters under the Obama administration's de facto moratorium.

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

Mr. REED. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. You will see on here that jobs are leaving the Gulf of Mexico, and they're going to the Mediterranean Sea, Egypt, Australia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone and, as we know, our favorite pick of late is Brazil.

I'm saying that what we have to do in this body today is we have to make sure that we put our lives in the lives of the American family, and we have to make sure that it is time today to do what this body should have done many, many years ago, and we have to make sure that we take care of them and make sure that we tap into our natural resources that we have in this country.

I stand today and rise in support of this rule as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 5 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. This bill does nothing, nothing at all to lower

fuel costs, and everything to increase the profits by big oil companies. I think it shows where the priority of the Republican Party is at this moment.

At this time I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1367, the Advanced Vehicle and Technology Act and ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

This legislation rewards American workers and American innovation. It's a true investment in American ingenuity and will help us Make It in America. By reauthorizing the Department of Energy's vehicle technologies research program, the Freedom car and the 21st century truck partnerships, the next generation of advanced vehicles will be built in America.

The Advanced Vehicle Technology Act is one important part of the Democratic jobs plan, a jobs plan that focuses on making it in America because there is no way that we can maintain our position as a great economic power without making things in America.

Making things in America is a key part of rebuilding our Nation's economy. It's about reversing the manufacturing job loss trend, recommitting ourselves to the things that created America's middle class, good-paying jobs, world-class education, top-notch research and sound infrastructure.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1367, because when we invest in American ingenuity and innovation, when we Make It in America, our middle class will be strengthened and our Nation will be prosperous.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Hypocrisy. It's hypocrisy. Reuters', April 27, reported that the President urged other countries to lift crude oil output, to lift crude oil output. How come, if other countries increase their output, it affects the price; but yet, if we increase our output, it does not?

So if other countries promote their drill, baby, drill, it affects the price; but yet, when we in America try to drill, we don't affect the price, according to my colleagues on the other side.

Electric cars. So let's get this straight. They want Americans to charge their car up on a system, on a grid system that's already failing and broken. We've had rolling brownouts and blackouts in this country, and that's what we want to plug our cars into? I'm sorry. No.

□ 1320

Then they say there are the hybrid cars. I can't pull my boat with a Prius. I can't do it. I enjoy going fishing. I enjoy the time that I get to take my little boy out and teach him what my father and my grandfather taught me, and I have to do that pulling a boat with my Chevrolet pickup truck. I sure wish that, when I fill it up, that it was affordable.

And we can make it in America. Let's make American energy. That's what this bill, our bill, does. That's why I rise in support of this rule and this bill. If we want to make things in America, let's start with making our energy. When we can make our energy in America, we can make our products here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE).

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize that the gentleman from Louisiana had it partially right. You know, the way we create jobs, we do it the old-fashioned way. We import great cars from Detroit.

So I urge you to defeat the previous question, support the bill that we have been talking about that will create great fuel-efficient cars, that will create jobs, and also save our motorists a lot of money because they won't have to fill up their cars with this expensive gasoline. They will be able to power their vehicles through other alternative sources of energy.

It's good for our environment, it's great for our country, it will save the motorists money, but, most importantly, it will create jobs.

Let's import these good-paying jobs by importing fuel-efficient vehicles from the city of Detroit. That's how you make it in America.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the rising cost of gas is quickly becoming the hottest topic in any meeting, and especially in my hometown and in my neck of the woods in southwest Washington State.

I hosted a job creators forum about 1½ weeks ago, and one of the biggest issues I heard about was the rising cost of gas prices.

One gentleman owns a pizza delivery operation. They make pizzas and deliver them. You can all imagine what rising gas prices do to a small business like this. They've had to let people go in the past, and they're certain to hire people again. One of his requests was: make this affordable. One of the ways we can do that is by supporting this bill, because we open up the opportunity to get more domestic energy. And that's the reality.

I can't wait for the day when our country no longer is dependent on fossil fuels, when we don't need gasoline or we don't need to get it from countries that don't like us. I can't wait for that day. And I support those explorations of alternative energies. But the problem is we're not there yet. We are not there today. The reality is, every time gas goes up, we lose jobs, and in my neck of the woods, where we have double-digit unemployment, 13 percent, 14 percent going on 3 years, it is unacceptable that this Congress would sit on its hands and do nothing while the price of gas goes up.

If we explore for energy here domestically and we do it now, we're going to bring relief today to those small business owners in our region. They're going to be able to hire more people.

As we all go back to our districts next week, we know we're going to hear from moms and dads, we're going to hear from business owners about the high cost of gas. I invite my Democratic colleagues to join with us. Let's look our constituents in the eye and say: we supported legislation that will lower energy prices today to meet their needs.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to remind the gentlewoman that the Department of Energy says that if we go ahead with this plan, prices will go down by 3 cents to 5 cents in the year 2030.

If you're serious about alternative forms of energy, then my question is, Why have you defunded all the programs that would fund those new clean, green jobs?

While my Republican friends cut Medicare; while they cut fuel assistance for elderly people who can't afford the cost of fuel during the cold months; while they cut Pell Grants; while they go out of their way to protect the tax cuts of Donald Trump and millionaires while putting all the burden to reduce the deficit on middle class families; while they protect the subsidies for big oil companies, it is shameful. It is shameful that with the record profits that Big Oil is making, that taxpayers continue to subsidize them by billions of dollars. It is unconscionable.

Do you want to reduce the deficit? My friends on the other side go after programs that benefit the poor. They protect programs like corporate welfare that goes to big oil companies.

We should be investing in alternative forms of energy. We should be investing in cleaner and greener technologies. That's what we have been trying to do, but my friends on the other side have been obstructing everything that we have proposed.

They say they want to not be so reliant on fossil fuels in the future, and yet they cut the very programs that will allow us to become more energy independent. This bill here will do nothing, absolutely nothing, zero, to impact the price of gasoline. It does nothing.

Everybody knows how Big Oil operates, and they do whatever they want to do. At a time when they're raising their prices, they're going to make more money this year than they did last year. It's outrageous what they're doing to the American people, how they're gouging the American people.

This bill is not an answer to anything. It is just a sound bite for them to go home and say, hey, we did something, knowing it will never pass the Senate, but also knowing that even if it did pass the Senate and if the President signed it, it would mean nothing.

So rather than focusing on things to help create jobs, to help make it in America, to help create more products in this country, we are going through these ridiculous exercises every week on different subjects; and today it happens to be a bill that is a big wet kiss to Big Oil.

To me, this is the wrong thing we should be taking our time up doing. We should be talking about how should we create jobs in this country, how do we put people back to work. And, yes, we should be talking about ways that we could truly reduce the cost of energy for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging that we defeat the previous question. I will offer an amendment, if we defeat the previous question to the rule, to provide that, immediately after the House adopts the rule, it will bring up H.R. 1367, the Advanced Vehicle Technology Act of 2011, introduced by Representative PETERS.

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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. One final thing, Mr. Speaker. Again, we had an amendment in the Rules Committee offered by Mr. BOSWELL that would help give hiring preferences to our veterans who are risking their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it was defeated. That is an outrage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass a bill that American companies develop the next generation of high-tech fuel-efficient vehicles. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, on this rule and on this bill, I think this side of the aisle is demonstrating to all of America that we are listening.

Right now, with gas prices going through the roof, right now, with people suffering high unemployment across the Nation, we have before us a rule and a bill that will undoubtedly create jobs, 1.2 million jobs, according to economist Dr. Joseph Mason.

We have a bill and a plan that is going to bring us closer to less dependency on foreign energy supplies. It will reduce foreign oil imports by nearly one-third.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the aisle are going to deal with the American people in an honest fashion. We are not going to scare the American people. We are going to have an open and honest conversation with the American people. We will lead. And what we are doing here is answering a call that the American people have reached out to us to do, and that is to commit to our domestic supplies of energy so that we have energy supplies that will allow manufacturers in the private sector to create the new opportunities for generations of Americans that are yet to come.

This is not a bill that is about protecting Big Oil. This is not about tax subsidies. I take great disagreement with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they say we are fighting for tax subsidies for Big Oil. What they are talking about is intangible drilling costs. They are talking about basic tax policy where there are income and expenses that are being calculated and deducted off income taxes. It goes back to my life in the private sector when I read income and expense sheets. All we are talking about are expenses, not tax subsidies.

If we want to engage in rhetoric, that's fine. But we are focused on the substance of the issue, and that substance is getting Americans back to work, 1.2 million jobs under this proposal. We will generate $800 million in revenue over 10 years, and we are going to lead.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation by voting in favor of both.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 257 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 2. 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. 1367) to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy. 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 Science, Space, and Technology. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 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. REED. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUNYAN). 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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1229.

□ 1331

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 10, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 112–73 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 112–73 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. HANABUSA of Hawaii.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) 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 187, noes 235, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

AYES—187

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

NOES—235

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

NOT VOTING—9

Bilirakis
Braley (IA)
Costa
Davis (KY)
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Van Hollen
Westmoreland

□ 1358

Messrs. TERRY, SOUTHERLAND, and HUIZENGA of Michigan changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LOBIONDO, SMITH of New Jersey, CARSON of Indiana, and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 302, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 302, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 302, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 247, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—179

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—247

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
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)

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Huizenga (MI)
Johnson, Sam
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1404

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 254, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

AYES—174

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

NOES—254

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

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
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)

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) (during the vote). There is less than 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 1408

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 258, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

AYES—169

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—258

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

NOT VOTING—4

Bilbray
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1412

Mr. KINGSTON changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 222, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

AYES—205

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
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
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—222

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

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Schock

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 1 minute remaining on the vote.

□ 1417

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama and GINGREY of Georgia changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 239, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

AYES—185

Ackerman
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
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
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
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Nunes
Schock
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama) (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1422

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I am recorded as voting "nay" on rollcall vote No. 307; this was inadvertent. I intended to vote "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, 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. 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 245, reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, 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. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I am in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Connolly of Virginia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1229 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 4, after line 6, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate accordingly):

"(3) COASTAL RESTORATION.—The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph (1) to any applicant that has been required to pay a civil penalty, a criminal fine, or monetary damages resulting from the applicant's activities on the outer Continental Shelf, until such penalties, fines, or damages have been paid in full, or the applicant has entered a formal agreement to pay such penalties, fines, or damages, in order to redress economic and environmental harm caused to the Gulf of Mexico Region.

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, this simple motion to recommit ensures that oil companies clean up their mess from their oil spills prior to receiving a new permit under the guidelines of this bill.

This is the final amendment to the bill, and if it is adopted, we will immediately vote on final passage.

Although we may disagree on the underlying bill, we surely can agree that it is necessary to protect taxpayers who would otherwise have to foot the bill for cleaning up oil companies' oil spills. It's also necessary to protect the individuals whose lives have been directly affected by those spills.

To illustrate how important this final amendment is look no further than last year's Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. The gulf's fisheries were worth $5.5 billion annually prior to the spill. Shouldn't we require BP to pay those economic damages before it receives another permit to drill again?

The gulf coast fisheries supported 200,000 fishing jobs prior to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Shouldn't BP have the responsibility to pay economic damages to those fishermen who may have lost their livelihoods as a result of their oil spill?

More than 407,000 residents and 102,000 businesses on the gulf have submitted claims for damages due to the spill, and fewer than half have been paid. Shouldn't BP have to resolve all of those claims before it takes more of our publicly owned oil from America's Outer Continental Shelf?

In many cases, payment of claims is the difference, Madam Speaker, between survival and bankruptcy for small businesses. Of the 102,000 of them that claim damages as a result of the gulf oil spill, more than 55,000 submitted claims in excess of $10,000. Losses ranging from $10,000 to more than $500,000 are not trivial, and we should not allow companies like BP to force businesses into bankruptcy even while they seek permission to take more oil from America's Outer Continental Shelf.

We still don't know the full extent of cleanup costs resulting from Deepwater Horizon, but the costs continue to grow. Consider how labor intensive restoration is. To help prevent some sea turtles from being wiped out, restoration teams rehabilitated more than 1,000 of them and relocated 14,000 turtle hatchlings to Florida's east coast which was not damaged by oil.

More than 4,200 people are still working to clean up more than 544 miles of gulf coastline, and this work is essential to restore the gulf's fisheries and tourist economy. For example, the Coast Guard is still cleaning up tar balls and tar mats from Gulf Shores, Alabama.

While we can all appreciate the resources that BP has put into the cleanup to date, it is important that we set a clear standard for the Gulf of Mexico: Oil companies that cause oil spills have to clean up their mess first. We should never allow companies like BP to get away with giving the gulf coast cleanup a lick and a promise or let other oil companies continue extracting America's oil until they have finished cleaning up their mess.

If the oil companies responsible for spills do not pay for their oil spill cleanups and private damages, then America's taxpayers will end up paying for it. So we need to send a simple message to oil companies that cause spills: It's your mess; you clean it up. We cannot afford to be subsidizing them at a time when we're wrestling with record deficits and they're experiencing record profits.

By passing this simple final amendment to the bill, we'll be honoring the lesson that most of us probably learned from our mothers: If you are responsible for it, you've got to clean it up.

□ 1430

And if some oil companies aren't willing to clean up their mess, then they shouldn't get to extract more of our oil, because there are plenty of responsible businesses that would conduct business in a manner that doesn't

endanger the livelihoods and lives of nearby residents.

Remember, this final amendment doesn't stop a single oil well from being drilled. All it does is ensure that an oil company that caused the spill clean up its mess before drilling new wells on oil on our property; it has to take responsibility for the cleanup.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this simple amendment.

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

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve my point of order while rising in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, my Democrat colleagues are trying to distract us from the central issue, which is jobs. We're trying to put people back to work, but instead of putting people back to work, we're having to deal with procedural gamesmanship. The American people are tired of games. They want results.

Last night, on the phone while I checked on my constituents who are preparing for floodwaters not seen in some 50 years, constituents who may lose their homes, one gentleman asked me, he said, Congressman, when are we going to get back to work? I will need my offshore job to pay for the damages that this flood brings us.

Shockingly, I said, do you understand that these floodwaters may not recede for months? He looked at me and he replied, like any good old Cajun, sha, them floodwaters were sent here by God, and it will recede; the same God who gave me my two hands and my two feet, so that I can get back to work.

My job is gone because of a man and my government, not God. Please tell them that we are not only ready to get back to work, we need to get back to work.

Now, my friends, how do you say no to him?

How do you say no to a people who have endured over two calamities per year since 2005. Katrina, Rita, Ike, Gustav, the *Deepwater Horizon* incident, the Mississippi River floods that are coming upon us?

These people simply want to get back to work. They understand that putting them back to work will ease the price at the pump they too pay.

Let's put our differences aside. Let's put America back to work. Let's crank up those steel mills in Pennsylvania. Let's tell the boys in Illinois that we need those Caterpillar engines. Let's tell the Texans, the Louisianans, the Mississippians, the ones in Florida, Alabama, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, that jobs are coming back to the gulf.

Let's fuel our plants with American energy and American oil. No more shall we beg those who hate us for their oil. America is on her way back, and it starts in the Gulf of Mexico. Let's put the gulf back to work so we can put America back to work.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

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. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 1229, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 257; and adoption of House Resolution 257, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 239, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—186

Ackerman
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)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
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
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
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)

NOT VOTING—6

Clarke (NY)
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Polis

□ 1453

Mr. ROHRABACHER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on roll-call No. 308 I was tied up in an elevator. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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. MARKEY. Madam 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 263, noes 163, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

AYES—263

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
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)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—163

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Fortenberry
Giffords
Goodlatte
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam

□ 1459

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. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, on roll-call No. 309 I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONGRESSIONAL SPORTSMEN'S CAUCUS

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

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus is the largest bipartisan caucus in the Congress. Every year, we go out and have a little bit of fun shooting sporting clays, skeet, and trap. It's kind of like the baseball game and the football game and all the other stuff that goes on around here where we try to get out and get to know one another better.

This year, just yesterday, out at PG County, the Annual Congressional Sportsman's Caucus Trap, Skeet, and Sporting Clay Competition was held, and I'm pleased to report, Madam Speaker, that for the third consecutive year the Democrats won the trophy. Did I say for the third consecutive year?

Top Gun Member of Congress went to MIKE THOMPSON.

Top Gun Democrat went to COLLIN PETERSON.

Top Gun Republican went to JOHN KLINE.

Top Skeet Member was JEFF DUNCAN.

Top Trap Member was AUSTIN SCOTT.

Top Sporting Clays Member was BENNIE THOMPSON.

Top Beginner Member was RENEE ELLMERS.

Top Laser Shot went to HEATH SHULER.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would yield to my cochair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I'll make this very brief.

Congratulations.

It was a great day to be out there. I promise to those on our side of the aisle we will not be handicapped next year by only shooting .410 slugs. We will use shotguns with open chokes.

It was a great day. It went to a good cause for those that enjoy the outdoors, conservation, and the environment. I appreciate the opportunity to chair the Republican side of the Sportsman's Caucus.

Congratulations to our friends. I was in the team right behind BENNIE THOMPSON. Bennie, we're going to get you on our side.

Congratulations.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1231, REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 257) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to

amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
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)

NAYS—179

Ackerman
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
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
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Ellison
Fattah
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Hirono
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Kind
McDermott
Petri
Royce

□ 1510

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 310, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 310, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 179, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
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
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
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
Shuler
Simpson
Smith (NE)
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—179

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

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (TX)
Ellison
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
McDermott
Rogers (MI)
Shuster

□ 1529

Mr. LANDRY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, on May 11, 2011, I inadvertently missed rollcall Nos. 310 and 311. Had I been present I would voted ''yes.''

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: As the Steering Committee has formally selected me to sit on the House Committee on Financial Services, I formally seek to resign my seat on the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I am very pleased with the opportunity to serve on the Financial Services Committee, and I look forward to being an active and effective Member.

Again, thank you for your assistance. Please contact me if I can answer any questions.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN L. FINCHER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 263

Resolved, That the following named members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES—Mr. Fincher.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE—Mr. Ribble.

Mr. MILLER of Florida (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 1800, EXTENDING COUNTER-TERRORISM AUTHORITIES

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 2011, to file its reports on H.R. 1800.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS ON SUNDRY LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until 5 p.m. on Friday, May 20, 2011, to file its reports to accompany the following bills: H.R. 1407, H.R. 1484, H.R. 1627, H.R. 1383, H.R. 1657, and H.R. 802.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 427

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 427, a bill originally introduced by Representative HELLER of Nevada, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 673

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 673, a bill originally introduced by Representative HELLER of Nevada, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 16 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 16

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR SOAP BOX DERBY RACES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races (in this resolution referred to as the ''event''), on the Capitol Grounds.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on June 18, 2011, or on such other date

as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 46 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 46

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 30th Annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (in this resolution referred to as the ''event''), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2010.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on May 15, 2011, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam 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. 1231.

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

There was no objection.

REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROUN of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 257 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. 1231.

□ 1534

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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER of Michigan 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 Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, the Americans suffering from $4 a gallon gas today, $5 a gallon gas next month must feel like they're experiencing a sense of deja vu. It was just three short years ago, in 2008, when gasoline prices reached a record high of $4.11 per gallon. Those high prices cut deep into the pockets of Americans that summer and generated enough public outcry to force Congress to act.

That fall, the Democrat-controlled Congress and the Republican President took bipartisan action to lift the offshore drilling ban that had been in place for decades. This monumental step opened up all of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts to new offshore energy production. Three years later, most Americans would likely be shocked to learn that no energy development has happened in these new areas and that they have actually once again been placed off-limits.

The progress that was made in 2008 by lifting the drilling moratorium has been completely reversed by the Obama administration. The President says he wants to ''win the future,'' but his policies are taking us back to the past.

Now American families and businesses are once again facing $4 gasoline, as I said, $5 the first of June; and we're no further ahead in expanding American energy production than we were 3 years ago. That's outrageous and unacceptable.

The House has already passed two bills to increase offshore energy production, create jobs, and lower prices. Today, we will vote on a third offshore drilling bill, H.R. 1231, in order to reverse the moratorium that President Obama has single-handedly placed on new offshore drilling.

This bill requires the administration to move forward with offshore lease sales in areas containing the most oil and natural gas. For the 2012–2017 lease plan being written by the Obama administration, this would include areas containing at least 2.5 billion barrels of oil or 7.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Based on the government's own estimates of our oil and natural resources, this would open up areas in the north and central Atlantic coasts, the southern California coast, and offshore Alaska.

Even in the face of rising gasoline prices, the President wants to drill nowhere new. This bill says let's move forward with leasing and drilling in those areas where we know America has real and significant resources. In contrast to the President's drill nowhere new plan, this is a drill smart plan.

This bill requires the Secretary to set specific production goals for 5-year plans. For 2012–2017 it sets a goal of 3 million barrels of oil per day and 10 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day by the year 2027. By comparison to today's levels, this increase of oil equates

to a tripling of current American offshore production and would reduce foreign imports by nearly one-third.

This bill will not only significantly increase American energy production; it would also create good-paying American jobs. Economist Dr. Joseph Mason testified that this bill would create 250,000 jobs short term and 1.2 million jobs long term.

This bill will also generate hundreds of millions in new revenue to help strengthen our economy and pay down the national debt. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill will generate $800 million in revenue over the next 10 years.

Recent polls show that the majority of Americans—Republicans, Democrats, and independents—all support increased offshore drilling. They recognize that our national economic security should not be left in the hands of Iranian-led OPEC and that expanding American energy production will translate into more jobs, more revenue and lower gasoline prices.

Madam Chairman, the Obama administration is trying to lead us into a supposedly new era of time without understanding the importance of fossil fuels. It is the largest tax on every family. Approximately $1,100, Mr. and Mrs. America, you're paying to the Obama administration in taxes because of the high cost of oil, high cost of gas to you.

It's time America steps up and becomes independent from those that have been selling this oil for the past 25 years. It's not just this President. This has been going on for a while. But next year we're going to send $400 billion overseas to the countries that do not like us, that do not create one American job, not anything for America—send the money over and buy foreign oil.

□ 1540

I watched the President say this down in Brazil, We want to be your partner. You are developing new oil fields, and we want to buy your gasoline. So Mr. And Mrs. America, keep in mind, we have the fossil fuels, we have the opportunity, and it's time that we open the offshore for development of the good State of America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are at a historic juncture in our country's history, as northern Africa and the Middle East explode. And what we have, of course, is a real instability in the oil marketplace, and we have to do something that fundamentally responds to that challenge.

In the first 3 months of this year, Exxon-Mobil made $10 billion off of the American consumer—in January, February, and March of this year. Shell reported that they had made $8 billion. BP reported that they had made $7 billion. So what are these companies asking for? These companies are now asking that we open up the beaches of California to drill for oil, we open up the beaches of Florida to drill for oil, we open up the beaches of New Jersey and New England to drill for oil.

I will tell you right now, in most of those places—actually, in all of those places, the only oil the people who live near those beaches want is the suntan oil that they use when they're out on those beaches. They don't want oil coming in the way it did in the Gulf of Mexico. And why are they concerned? They're concerned because the oil companies, exercising their power—and right now, those oil companies are centered down in the Gulf of Mexico—those companies have exercised their power to block any new safety reforms from being put in place that would protect against another catastrophic spill.

So the temerity of these oil companies is that they are coming out here today, and they're saying: No safety; no lessons learned from what happened in the Gulf of Mexico, devastating the beaches of the gulf. Now we want permission to drill off of the California coast, the Florida coast, the New England coast, the New Jersey coast without any new safety. And by the way, although we've made a fortune just in the last 3 months, with the skyrocketing prices that people who travel here to Washington—they've been coming down all of the highways towards our Capitol, watching the price of gasoline go up even as they are traveling, heading up to $4 and, in some places, $5 a gallon—they're saying that the Congress shouldn't take away their tax breaks. Don't even touch those tax breaks, the oil companies are saying. Cut Medicare for grandma. Exxon-Mobil and Shell, they are advocating cutting Medicare for grandma, to take that money and to give it to the oil companies as tax breaks to put on top—kind of like a cherry on top of the sundae—to put it on top of all of these profits that they are making off of the American consumer. That's what they're trying to do, and that's what this debate is all about.

So what we're saying as Democrats is, let's implement the safety recommendations to make sure that the drilling doesn't endanger the beaches of the east coast and the west coast the way they did in the Gulf of Mexico. The oil companies are coming in here, with the Republicans as their advocates, saying, Don't worry about it. Yes, we're going to block any safety measures from being put on the books, but that's our prerogative because we have the votes here. The Republicans are going to make sure that the votes are there to block any safety—we want to keep the tax breaks; the Republicans say fine. We don't want any new safety regulations; the Republicans say fine.

By the way, we don't even like the idea of this competition from wind and solar, so we would like to ask you, as the Republican majority, to cut the solar and wind budget by 70 percent—and they did it, believe it or not. It's 2011. We're watching the Middle East explode, and the Republicans cut wind and solar in the United States by 70 percent. Keep the tax breaks for the biggest oil companies, and ask grandma to take a lower Medicare benefit to pay for it all for the oil companies. This is 2011, ladies and gentlemen. This is a message. It is so dangerous for our country.

We have to oppose this bill because, first of all, they already have 60 million acres of American land—the size of Minnesota they already have to drill on, that they haven't drilled on yet, which has about 11 billion barrels of oil underneath it and an equivalent amount of natural gas. So vote ''no'' on this Republican bill. It's just a giveaway to Exxon-Mobil and Shell, and they're the last people in the world right now that need a handout.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, as record high gas prices are causing American families to suffer in their daily routines, like buying groceries at the grocery store and driving to work each morning, it is inexcusable that this liberal administration continues to turn its back on the problem. Just last month, Americans spent around $368 on average just to fill their tanks, about the same amount a family would spend on groceries for 2 weeks. Yet the Democrats' only solution to the pain at the pump is to raise taxes on domestic oil producers, and they've already admitted that it will not lower gas prices.

I fully support H.R. 1231, a real proposal which would lift the President's ban on offshore drilling and get the ball rolling on domestic energy production. I urge my Democrat colleagues to pass this bill because both our cars and our economy should be running on American resources, not on their empty promises. Pass this bill to create American jobs and a strong American economy.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. Look, we have preserved millions of acres in Alaska. We want to preserve the shores of New Jersey. Now if you don't understand that, there are even more major problems.

Since last night, my friends on the other side have voted down no fewer than four amendments dealing with the safety of drilling. You could be for drilling. But I think it's common sense that we preserve and not take the chances that large companies are taking, and we saw what happened in the South. The Gulf of Mexico is still recovering from billions of dollars in economic and environmental damages caused by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

It's almost unbelievable. When you watch it, one blamed the other, and

those folks still don't have relief. It's almost unbelievable; in the wake of such a tragedy, this bill is before us today. There are 60 million acres of public land already under lease to drill, and I wouldn't give 1 more acre up until those companies drill on the land that they already have. You blame everything on the President. You're going to blame the plague on the President. That dog doesn't hunt anymore. Forget about it.

If we can't come together on issues like this, the one that the American people are disgusted with when they do pay their gasoline bill—you want to expand offshore drilling to vast new areas of our oceans, including the Atlantic coast, without taking any of the commonsense steps that the President's bipartisan oil spill commission recommended.

□ 1550

An oil spill on the Atlantic coast, which the Federal Government would be required to lease under this bill, would devastate the economy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLT. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. Tourism at the Jersey Shore supports jobs for over 500,000 people, generates over $50 billion in economic activity every year. These people depend on the responsible stewardship of our waters and coasts for their livelihoods.

Let's set the record straight. This legislation does nothing to address the current spike in gas prices. What we need to do is:

Stop wildly fluctuating oil prices. And that's up to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which is writing the regulations as we speak right now.

Cap America's oil reserves. For a short period of time, we can afford to do that.

Crack down on gas gouging, which is happening and the U.S. Attorney General is correct in investigating this.

And, finally, evolve to a clean energy economy. It's not just that we need to depend less on foreign oil, we need to depend less on domestic oil. We know it's going to take time. We need to be reasonable about this and be safe about it as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I appreciate the gentleman's comments on why he represents the area he represents. But he did vote against ANWR, has supported no production, very, very important to me.

I can say one thing. The Obama administration, I got a big kick out of someone saying we can blame the President. I can remember Bush was in office for 8 years and we blamed him for the earthquakes and the tsunami and I don't know what else.

What bothers me the most is that this country moves its economy with fossil fuels. Our trucks, our ships, our planes, our automobiles and our trains are all using fossil fuels and must do so. That's what moves our commerce. That's also what will raise the price for everybody and every household in this Nation. It is being taxed by these high costs of fossil fuel.

We can stabilize that cost if we're allowed to produce off our shores and on our shores. But to not say we're going to produce any more oil—which is exactly what this administration is saying, because they want to transfer into a new era of time. We want to transfigure the country into a new era of time. We don't care about jobs. We don't care what happens to the economy. We're going to do it because we're right. I'm saying you're dead wrong.

Can we use the fossil fuel in America to use it as a bridge to new fuels? Yes. But you cannot stop using fossil fuels. We're buying $400 billion a year overseas from foreign countries, bleeding this country every day. It's time we get on with the job.

At this time, Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, this truly is a tale of two parties.

The Democrats have been very clear in their approach on this issue. Heap additional taxes on producers, which will be immediately passed on to consumers, and continue to delay and obstruct the development of America's vast petroleum resources. Higher prices at the pump, increasing dependence on foreign oil, and thousands more families thrown out of work, that is the Democratic plan.

The Republicans have also been very clear on our approach. Open America's vast petroleum resources, triple the current production by 2027, cut foreign imports by one-third. Even more importantly, this bill means hundreds of thousands of new jobs and hundreds of billions of dollars of direct revenues into the national and State treasuries, not through higher prices for consumers but through growing prosperity for our country.

That's the choice between the two parties, plain and simple, and it's the choice I believe the American people are ready and eager to make.

Mr. HOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), who knows this subject very well.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1231, the last and most egregious bill in the Republicans' oil addiction agenda.

It's unconscionable that we're voting today to expand offshore drilling even before stronger safeguards can be put in place, to mandate new leasing off the economically important coastlines of southern California, Alaska, and the entire eastern seaboard, each time these waters are open to drilling.

And it's cynical to claim that more drilling will relieve high gas prices. More drilling only means more profits for the oil industry, not lower costs at the pump.

We all know oil companies hardly need a boost right now. They're receiving billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies and reaping record profits.

On top of that, the oil industry is already drilling more than ever before. For example, offshore production has increased by more than a third in the last 2 years, and the gulf produced 1.6 million barrels of oil per day last year, an all-time record. Yet, despite all that drilling, gas prices continue to soar, and the reason is clear: More drilling here in the U.S. has little effect on the global oil market.

Nearly three-quarters of the world's proven oil resources are owned by OPEC nations. And even if we expanded offshore drilling significantly, we wouldn't see an impact on gas prices until 2030; and even then, it would be a matter of just 5 cents a gallon. This is according to the Energy Information Administration.

If, instead, we further raised fuel efficiency standards, we could lower driver bills at the pump. Building cars that go further on a gallon of gas is the best way to protect American families. It also creates jobs. It slashes our oil imports, and it reduces dangerous air pollution. This is the kind of solution we need right now.

We shouldn't be promoting reckless drilling that will fail to lower gas prices and endanger our coastlines. Vote ''no'' on H.R. 1231.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the bill under consideration.

I heard one of my friends on the other side of the aisle suggest that the only thing people in California or other places that live near beaches, the only oil they're concerned about is suntan oil. I have to take exception to that.

Even though I represent an inland district now, I was born a block from the beach. I was a resident of a beachside community for 42 years. I grew up with kids whose parents worked in refineries, worked on oil rigs, were wildcatters, worked in offshore drilling in the Port of Long Beach, worked offshore, Huntington Beach.

I just have to tell you, I find it insulting to suggest that those people are not concerned about the good of the United States. We're talking about the loss of middle class jobs in America. There's nothing more middle class than those men and women who have worked for years in the oil industry.

Where do you think it comes from, from the sky? You've got to drill for it. You've got to produce it. You've got to refine it. And everything I hear on the other side of the aisle is we're not going to allow you to drill; we're not going to allow you to produce; we're not going to allow you to refine because somehow it's just going to show up.

We watched the President of the United States, supported by the Members on the other side of the aisle, journey to Brazil and laud their efforts to use American technology to explore and drill and maximize their recovery of their resources. He lauded them for it. He thanked them for it. He applauded them for it. Then he turned around and said, And we want to be your biggest customer. In other words, he promised that we would pay a foreign entity for a resource that we need.

I'm absolutely convinced that my friends on the other side of the aisle will oppose any notion that we can have any offshore drilling unless we make Brazil the 51st State. That's how absurd it is.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chair, as someone who grew up with family members, with people whose families worked in this industry and did not consider it a dirty industry, considered it an all-American industry, how far have we come that now we denigrate it from top to bottom?

We also hear from the other side, well, it won't have any impact because it takes 5 to 10 years to develop it. I heard that on this floor 32 years ago. I heard that on this floor 27 years ago. I heard that on this floor 22 years ago. I heard that on this floor 5 years ago, and it is correct. My friends on the other side are correct. It will make no difference so long as they make sure we don't drill now, we don't drill 35 years from now, we don't drill 10 years from now.

We are harming ourselves. It's time to stop the harm.

□ 1600

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

Madam Chair, here we go again, considering legislation that is written as if the largest oil spill in U.S. waters did not occur. This is the third of the amnesia acts that we have seen offered in the last week.

I say to my friend from California, no one is saying that we oppose this bill because we shouldn't drill, ever. But let's be smart. H.R. 1231 would force the Interior Department to open up vast swaths of the American coastline to drilling, including California and all of the Mid and North Atlantic. It is incomprehensible that the majority would take such a reckless radical step before we even know the full cost of the gulf spill. Let's be smart.

This bill in particular represents something worse than the pre-spill mentality; it represents an alternative reality: facts evidently don't matter. Never mind the fact that, 1 year ago, 11 workers died in a Deepwater Horizon oil rig explosion. Never mind that about 60 died over the last decade. Never mind the fact that, prior to the gulf spill, offshore drilling in U.S. waters was four times more deadly than drilling of the same operations, the same kinds of operations by the same companies elsewhere in the world, even in the inhospitable territory of the North Sea.

Never mind the fact that the Gulf of Mexico workforce suffered 1,550 injuries, 948 fires over the last decade. Never mind that Congress has not enacted a single piece of legislation to improve the safety of offshore drilling. Never mind the fact that there were 79 reported losses of well control in the gulf between 1996 and 2009.

Never mind the fact that a single blowout caused more than 4 billion barrels of oil to spew from the Macondo well for 87 days, coating 1,000 miles of coastline, closing over 88 square miles of some of the Nation's most productive fisheries.

Never mind the fact that the independent Energy Information Administration has concluded that unlimited access to U.S. offshore resources would have zero effect on gas prices over the next decade and might have an effect of pennies after that.

Never mind that U.S. oil production will remain above the 2009 pre-gulf spill levels through 2035, as calculated by the Department of the Interior, without the proposed acceleration in leasing and drilling. Never mind that the United States cannot drill our way to lower pump prices when we possess about 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. About 2 percent of the oils reserves.

We are not dominant in this field. Oh, yes, we have some of the best companies and certainly the most profitable, but we consume 25 percent of the world's oil while we have about 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. Prices are determined by OPEC, with fluctuations above that basic price determined by speculation on the commodities market.

Never mind the fact that 79 percent of all of the potential oil reserves on the entire Continental Shelf are already available under the current leasing; 79 percent, I repeat to my friends, are already available under the existing leasing program. Never mind that 60 million acres are already under lease but not producing oil. That is onshore and offshore. And offshore, the existing leases contain more than 11 billion, billion with a B, barrels of oil.

Never mind the fact that the entire Atlantic contains less than 5 percent of the potential U.S. offshore oil reserves and less than 9 percent of the natural gas reserves. Never mind the fact that the entire Pacific contains only about 12 percent of the potential U.S. offshore oil reserves and less than 5 percent of the potential natural gas reserves.

Never mind the fact that, in the Gulf of Mexico, the oil companies already hold the drilling rights to 34 million acres, but are producing oil on only 6 million acres. Never mind the fact that the 28 million nonproducing acres in the gulf have more natural gas and about as much oil as you would ever get total from drilling up and down the east and west coasts.

Never mind, my friends, the fact that, from 2005 to 2009, Big Oil used less than 10 percent of their profits to explore for oil while they used between 60 and 90 percent of their profits to pay dividends and buy back stock. These are behaving like financial industries, not energy industries.

Never mind the fact that the majority refuses to end the $4 billion, actually more like $8 billion, in tax breaks for oil companies at the very time that the top five oil companies took home over $32 billion in profits in just the last 3 months.

Never mind the fact that when the top four oil companies took home $485 billion in profits during the 5 years from 2005 to 2009, they still reduced their combined American workforce by 10,200 employees. And my friends here are talking about jobs, when these companies make profits of nearly $500 billion, they lay off more than 10,000 workers? What kind of reality are they living in?

Never mind the fact that the Gulf of Mexico tourism and fishing industries employ five times as many people as the oil industry. Five times as many. Never mind the fact that the annual value of coastal tourism and fishing in the U.S. exceeds that of oil and gas extraction by tens of billions of dollars.

Never mind the fact that this bill before us is one more unjustified giveaway to Big Oil. Never mind all of those facts. Ignore the spill. Drill, baby, drill.

No, thank you. I prefer to live in the real world where facts matter, and where this bill could have devastating real-world consequences. I urge my colleagues, Remember the spill. Vote down this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, may I say there were no facts presented in that last presentation. There were opinions; there were no facts. When everybody says never mind the facts, there were no facts there. That's all opinion.

One thing that bothers me most, they talk about what the oil companies made. They made it overseas; they made it overseas selling us oil. These are international companies. International companies. That is something that really disturbs me, when you understand we're burning oil produced overseas, yes, by the same companies that work in the United States.

And, yes, they did lay off 10,000 people, because of this moratorium this President laid in place in Louisiana in the gulf. There's where the jobs are lost.

The biggest economic impact of the Horizon spill was the loss of employment of the people in Louisiana, Alabama, and the Gulf of Texas, the loss of jobs, loss of oil to this country.

That's the thing that concerns me, because there are no facts about the profits made and the people laid off, other than the fact it was done by the Obama administration.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE).

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because I support this bill.

And I do have a fact. The fact of the matter is that we have a gas crisis going on right now, and the fact of the matter is, when I go home and I fill up my tank, I cringe at how expensive it is. Our friends on the other side of the aisle, their so-called solution is to increase our taxes and to demagogue oil corporations, because that's the classic bogeyman approach that they go to.

But that is not a solution to get our people back to work, to get our economy moving again, because right now we are having some anemic growth in our economy. And if we start to increase taxes and have an energy increase in costs that is happening at the pump, that is going to have a negative effect on economic growth.

Instead of actually having solutions where we can get the people in the gulf back to work, where we can get our economy moving again, where we can actually tap the energy sources that we have in the United States, we have an administration that only pursues moratoriums on gulf drilling, moratoriums on actually having energy supplies.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman.

If we actually started to look and invest in those sorts of thing and get our energy independence going, we could have charts down on this floor that show job growth.

According to CBO, if we pass today's legislation, we will generate $800 million in revenue over 10 years. Combined with the energy initiatives that the House passed last week, these three votes will create an estimated 250,000 jobs in the short term and 1.2 million jobs over the long term.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill and get our economy and our American people back to work.

□ 1610

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL, 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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 754, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–75) on the resolution (H. Res. 264) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REVERSING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S OFFSHORE MORATORIUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 257 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1231.

□ 1616

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes with Mr. CAMPBELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) had 16½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) had 12½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If enacted, this bill will open up areas of the Outer Continental Shelf where there are the greatest known oil and gas reserves that contain billions of barrels of oil. With resources like these, it is a wonder that we continue to rely on other countries for most of our energy. While the administration is encouraging other countries to produce oil, Americans are unable to access large areas of our own energy supply here.

H.R. 1231 will hold the administration accountable by setting production goals to make sure that we provide enough energy for our country while reducing the dependence on foreign oil. Gas prices have increased by 12.9 cents per gallon in my hometown of Chattanooga, Tennessee, during the last month alone.

Plain and simply, we know that increased oil and natural gas production will drive down gas prices. We should have the ability to access our vast resources at home. Mr. Chairman, we have the means to provide relief for our growing energy deficit, and passage of this bill will be a step towards providing these means for our country.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG).

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chairman, my home State of North Dakota is rich in natural resources, and we have seen tremendous economic opportunity from the Bakken field. Through EMPOWER North Dakota, we were able to adopt a long-term energy plan in our State. It encouraged new energy development; and it created high-paying, high-quality jobs in the energy industry. In fact, today our unemployment rate is the lowest in the Nation.

We can have the same success on the national level, but to do so we need a long-term commonsense plan that is a national energy policy that must work to increase America's energy production, lower gas prices, and ultimately break our dependence on foreign oil.

□ 1620

America's families and small businesses are hurting. Gas prices are over $4 a gallon. Energy bills are hindering business growth. National unemployment remains a very high 9 percent. There is enormous potential in the gulf for energy development that can help turn our country's problems around. Our addiction to foreign energy is not sustainable. It threatens our national security. It's time to invest our resources that we have here in the United States. We need to lower energy costs and get Americans back to work.

As a member of the House Energy Action Team and a proud North Dakotan, I'm committed to working hard towards a national long-term energy policy. Let's pass this bill, get the gulf back to work and break our dependence on foreign oil.

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

The majority, the sponsors of this bill, say that we need it because supply is dwindling and gasoline prices are climbing and employment is terrible. Well, I'll grant they have got a point on a couple of items here. But it has nothing to do with this legislation. They bring forward a bill to help the oil supply when it is a fact, I say to my colleague, that 79 percent of all of the potential oil reserves as calculated by

the nonpartisan prospectors on the whole Continental Shelf are already under the current leasing program. Sixty million acres. This is indisputable. Sixty million acres offshore are under existing lease and contain 11.5 billion barrels. So this ''hurry up and drill'' legislation is certainly not necessary for that.

As for employment, I said it before and I'll say it again. It is a fact. During the 5 years previously when the four oil companies took home $485 billion in profits, their combined American workforce dropped by 10,200 employees. They made money. They laid people off. So we can check that one off, too. It's not about employment.

How about prices? This year's leases have nothing to do with this year's price at the gas pump—or next year's. In fact, not for 20 years. Might it have an effect? Oh, yes, there's a supply problem. The supply problem is that U.S. oil reserves amount to about 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. About 2 percent. My colleagues say, Oh, no, those calculations are wrong. Okay, I'll give you a break. Let's say we're off by a factor of two. How about a factor of three? How about a factor of four? We would still be one of the smallest oil supplies of the oil-producing countries. So this is not about that.

The prices are determined right now at the pump largely by speculation. According to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, speculators increased their energy future contracts—their positions—by 64 percent over the last couple of years, totaling more than a million contracts. They are trading in each day far more paper barrels than barrels of oil are ever delivered. It's speculation, pure and simple. Speculators have moved from holding 30 percent of the open interest in the commodity markets to 70 percent. And you wonder why the prices at the pump are so high. Even Goldman Sachs says that speculation is responsible for many tens of dollars of the hundred dollars a barrel that is now the world price for oil.

Going back a decade, the majority voted to exempt all energy derivatives from CFTC regulations. And then when the Dodd-Frank financial reform bill came along, they opposed the enactment to give the CFTC the power to regulate energy derivatives. They voted to slash the CFTC budget as part of H.R. 1. Right now in the Agriculture Committee and the Financial Services Committee, they are working to block any possibility that the CFTC would put in regulations to limit or reduce speculation.

So if my colleagues want to do something to deal with the high gas prices, I will give them a list of things to do. It is not this bill. We do not need to cut corners. We do not need to deem that inadequate applications for leasing are adequate. We do not need to deem that environmental impact statements that are clearly inadequate are adequate. We do not need to open up the east coast and west coast to willy-nilly rapid drill prospecting. We certainly do not.

Now, one thing I'll hand my colleagues. They yesterday said we really need to get away from these environmental regulations that are stymying the oil companies, that are making it hard for them to earn their profits, these burdensome environmental regulations. I'll give them one thing. These regulations, the environmental impact statement that was prepared for the drilling in the Gulf of Mexico this year that they want to expand on into the future that has in it a plan for dealing with walruses, because they think that's a really good environmental impact statement that's based on the real world facts—you're right. In the Macondo well in the blowout of the Deepwater Horizon, we didn't lose a single walrus's life.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. In closing, I just repeat, let's live in the real world. Let's deal with the facts. Facts matter. And this bill can have devastating consequences for workers, for those who have to travel by car and buy gasoline, and for those who earn their living fishing and dealing with tourism in the gulf and in New Mexico and in California. Let's not pass another ''Amnesia Act.'' Let's not ignore the spill and drill, baby, drill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. May I ask how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this legislation. I would like Americans to understand that the issue of whether we should drill or not is long overdue because I have heard this argument for 36 years because I was here when we drilled and opened the Trans-Alaska pipeline to provide 17 billion barrels of oil to America—17 billion barrels of oil.

I've heard people say that there's only 2 percent. That is a figure that was arrived at in 1955. We have new estimates with new technology. We think we have about 20 percent of the world's reserves in fossil fuels. And we're not producing them. I've heard the argument this wouldn't change the price of gasoline. It's not quick enough. I heard that 25 years ago.

We need to produce so we have a stable supply of domestic fossil fuels so other countries and speculators don't take advantage. They have us right now in a position they can take advantage of because we are not producing any oil of any consequence in the United States right now. We're down to 600,000 barrels a day in Alaska. If we drop much more, we won't even have that 600,000 barrels a day. Yet we have in Alaska in the Chukchi Sea, there's been $5 billion spent to find oil. We have not had the permit to drill because of this administration. They think there's 27 billion barrels of oil in one offshore development. The other one has approximately 14 billion barrels of oil in one offshore development. Of course, we have ANWR, which that side does not support, to a great degree, that has probably 39 billion barrels of oil.

□ 1630

You add up that amount of oil and you have oil that will last this country for a hundred years.

Now, yes, we ought to have other forms of energy. But the Obama administration is trying to force this country into a green energy future. This is a policy. I heard the former Speaker say it. Of course it makes sense to reduce our dependency on oil, as I said before, but no one takes into consideration the impact upon the economy of this Nation.

New Jersey is building an LNG plant to receive gas from overseas. That's well and good, buying foreign gas, when we have trillions of feet of gas in the United States of America.

We are costing not only jobs but the dependency—and everybody talks about the high price of gasoline. It's caused primarily because of spiking. Some little incident in the Middle East—the OPEC countries supposedly have 70 percent of our oil—raises the price of that gasoline. You can't have a model economy and a business and have those spikes. If the price was $5 across the board and you knew it was going to be $5 across the board for the next 40 years, you could build your economy on that. But we have gas at $5 a gallon now, the first of June, and it may go up to $6 in August. It may be down a little bit. We need to stabilize it. Only we can do this.

But this administration is trying to convert America into their green technology. Technology of wind. Technology of, let's say, solar. Wind power is 17 cents a kilowatt compared to 5 cents for coal. Mr. and Mrs. America, you're paying for that. And again, as I said in one of my statements, this, in fact, is a tax on the American people. This is an Obama tax because of the lack of the cheaper fuel that's necessary to keep our economy running.

The impediments of oil and gas production is another reason, the slowdown of Federal leases. We talk about everything that's leased and permitting offshore and onshore. Only six permits have been issued since the Gulf of Mexico, the time the BP spill happened—six permits. Leasing in the Gulf of Mexico coast has been delayed for several years. Offshore permitting for oil and gas has been slowed down to a real slow crawl.

America, I keep telling you, you are being taxed by an administration that does not understand the necessity for fossil fuels for our economy. The movement of product, the receiving of product and the shipping of product, the deliverance of people, the deliverance of

supplies by air, ship, plane, train, automobile, and truck. That's what makes this country great.

And here we sit with a group that says, oh, we're going to save the environment. I'm all for that. But you don't have an energy policy and you can't have it off fossil fuels. Anybody who says we're going to have one off fossil fuels is not even thinking about fuels, not even thinking about energy. You can't do it with wind power. We might get a little wind power if we put a propeller on the top of this Capitol to collect all the hot air that comes out of here most of the time. That might work. But we're not going to do it with solar power. You need all the forms of energy. And this administration so far has not promoted anything but the two most expensive: wind and solar.

We need our fossil fuels. We need to make sure the agencies under this administration make sure that we develop our energies, or we cannot go anywhere. And if they can't do it, then it's up to this Congress. This Congress, this bill, this legislation, and the two previous bills are a step forward, a necessary step for this Nation. We need to keep going. So employ Americans and quit buying foreign oil. You talk about being hooked on dope, that's what we are. We're hooked on foreign oil. Yet we have people that say we can't develop our own oil, we can't develop our own resources, that it will hurt somebody, somebody will be harmed and we can't do it.

That's not true. We can do it. In the gulf there were 41,000 wells drilled without a spill. Add one spill and everybody thinks the world came to an end. It was bad, yes. Do we learn from it? Yes, as we did with Exxon Valdez. We learned from that and we will improve upon that. But not to let them drill, not to let them produce that oil, not to let them help America out, not employ Americans, that is dead wrong.

So I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and reject the amendments that are going to be offered. They are not the amendments they should be.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1231. I had offered amendments because I believe in responsible increase in offshore drilling. I offered amendments to improve upon this bill that would have provided for revenue sharing with coastal states and a study and report back to Congress to ensure that the Department of Interior has proper funding for staffing and training and technical engineers and such other personnel as is necessary to responsibly increase offshore drilling.

As a Representative from 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 significant jobs and income.

My state supplies 20 percent of the nation's oil production, one-third of the nation's natural gas production; a quarter of the nation's refining capacity and nearly 60 percent of the nation's chemical manufacturing.

The Texas energy and petrochemical clusters employ 600,000 people, which represent 70 percent and 15 percent, respectively, of the total U.S. workforce in those industries.

Houston is home to some of the world's largest oil, gas, and petrochemical facilities.

As the fourth most populous city in the United States, and the greater Houston area remains a diversified regional economy, with the energy industry contributing 50 percent of our economic base for employment. Even so there is no denying the importance of the energy industry for creating jobs in Houston and across our Nation.

We have consistently led the nation in petroleum production since the early 10th century and we have one-fourth of total U.S. oil reserves.

As a coastal state we provide the resources and the mechanisms to support the offshore drilling industry and we also bare the highest risk to our natural resources. Its stands to reason that we should also have access to revenue generated from Offshore leases.

Federal Revenues from offshore leases were estimated at $18.0 billion in FY 2008 by the Department of the Interior. During the previous 10 years (1998–2007), revenues from federal OCS leases reached as high as $7.6 billion in FY 2006. Higher prices for oil and gas are the most significant factors in the revenue swings. Of the $18.0 billion offshore revenue in FY 2008, $8.3 billion was from royalties and $9.5 billion came from bonus bids. Coastal states can use that money to further support the industry that utilizes our highways and waterways.

A significant portion of oil and gas produced from Gulf Outer Continental Shelf leases is transported to those refineries for processing via offshore pipeline through state waters.

Providing coastal states with additional access to revenue will enable these states to protect their natural resources and advance the transport of oil, gas, and petrochemicals across the United States.

Coastal States like Texas with energy development off their shores in federal waters have been seeking additional federal revenues generated off our shores.

We particularly want more assistance for coastal areas that may be most affected by onshore and near-shore activities that support offshore energy development.

Currently, the affected states receive revenue indirectly from offshore oil and gas leases in federal waters. This is in contrast to the direct revenues to states that have onshore federal leases within their boundaries.

Coastal states bear the greatest risks if there is a disaster. Because of the current and wind patterns in the Gulf of Mexico, Texas' coastal natural resources are most at risk for environmental damage in the event of an oil spill from an offshore production platform or pipeline. In addition, a substantial portion of federal Outer Continental Shelf production is refined in Texas and then transported via state highways or pipeline located in the state.

A significant amount of the infrastructure that will be used to explore and develop the resources in these new lease sales will be constructed in Texas and transported through state waters. The same might be said for other coastal states whose shores and resources are dedicated to offshore drilling.

Annual rental rates are $5–$9.50 per acre, with lease sizes generally ranging from 2,500–5,760 acres. However, annual rental rates for the March 2009 sale in the Central Gulf of Mexico begins at $11.00 per acre for lease in water depths over 200 meters. Initial lease terms of 5–10 years are standard, and leases continue as long as commercial quantities of hydrocarbons are being produced.

Demand for petroleum products in the U.S. remains strong. In 2005, each of the estimated 296 million people in the U.S. used an average of almost three gallons of petroleum every day. In 1978, the average American used 3.5 gallons per day.

In 2006, crude oil imports totaled 10.1 million barrels per day (MBD), two-thirds of the total U.S. supply of 15.2 MBD, according to the Energy Information Administration (EIA) of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). After several additions of other petroleum products by refiners and fuel blenders, total petroleum consumption came to 20.6 MBD for 2006.

The oil and gas industry supports job growth in my state of Texas and across our nation.

In Texas, the oil and gas industry supports 1.7 million jobs and approximately 25 percent of the state's economy, whereas nationwide the industry supports 9.2 million jobs and 7.5 percent of our nation's economy.

We should focus our attention on providing the Department of Interior with funding and resources it needs to provide for training and staffing of technical engineers and other such necessary personnel to review drilling permit applications and determine future offshore lease sale areas.

The Department of 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

For these reasons, I urge the Members as they vote on this important measure which certainly relates to job creation and national energy independence, that they consider a fair and balance approach as we aim to protect the environment and determine the most responsible measures to provide for the energy our nation requires.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1231. This bill will ensure that our federal offshore oil and natural gas resources are accessible to us. This is essential for America's energy security.

For years, I have supported bills that would increase funding to research and development projects dealing with new and cleaner energy sources as well as provide financial incentives to produce energy from wind, solar, biomass, and geothermal, for consumers to purchase fuel efficient vehicles, increase energy efficiency standards for buildings and appliances, and promote public transit efforts. I will continue to support programs and projects seeking to create cleaner energy technologies because we all benefit from a cleaner environment.

Finally, coming from Texas, which is the nation's leader in renewable energy production and a pioneer in developing its own state portfolio standard, I support efforts to promote renewable energy production that meets the unique circumstances and resources of each state.

But even with these increases in renewable energy, the Energy Information Administration found that oil, natural gas, and coal will continue to make up the large majority of U.S. energy use in 2030 and beyond. As our nation's energy demand continues to increase, reasonable access and exploration of our offshore resources is a key component of our nation's energy security.

It is our job to provide affordable and reliable supplies of energy to American consumers, and this bill will help in our effort.

For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in the bill is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1231

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 ''Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act''.

SEC. 2. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM.

Section 18(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including—

''(i) at least 50 percent of the available unleased acreage within each outer Continental Shelf planning area considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources (on a total btu basis) based upon the most recent national geologic assessment of the outer Continental Shelf, with an emphasis on offering the most geologically prospective parts of the planning area; and

''(ii) any State subdivision of an outer Continental Shelf planning area that the Governor of the State that represents that subdivision requests be made available for leasing.

''(B) In this paragraph the term 'available unleased acreage' means that portion of the outer Continental Shelf that is not under lease at the time of a proposed lease sale, and that has not otherwise been made unavailable for leasing by law.

''(5)(A) In the 2012–2017 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall make available for leasing any outer Continental Shelf planning areas that—

''(i) are estimated to contain more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil; or

''(ii) are estimated to contain more than 7,500,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

''(B) To determine the planning areas described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the document entitled 'Minerals Management Service Assessment of Undiscovered Technically Recoverable Oil and Gas Resources of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, 2006'.''.

SEC. 3. DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION GOAL.

Section 18(b) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION GOAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing a 5-year oil and gas leasing program, and subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall determine a domestic strategic production goal for the development of oil and natural gas as a result of that program. Such goal shall be—

''(A) the best estimate of the possible increase in domestic production of oil and natural gas from the outer Continental Shelf;

''(B) focused on meeting domestic demand for oil and natural gas and reducing the dependence of the United States on foreign energy; and

''(C) focused on the production increases achieved by the leasing program at the end of the 15-year period beginning on the effective date of the program.

''(2) 2012–2017 PROGRAM GOAL.—For purposes of the 2012–2017 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the production goal referred to in paragraph (1) shall be an increase by 2027 of—

''(A) no less than 3,000,000 barrels in the amount of oil produced per day; and

''(B) no less than 10,000,000,000 cubic feet in the amount of natural gas produced per day.

''(3) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall report annually, beginning at the end of the 5-year period for which the program applies, to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate on the progress of the program in meeting the production goal. The Secretary shall identify in the report projections for production and any problems with leasing, permitting, or production that will prevent meeting the goal.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112–74. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, as a designee of Chairman DOC HASTINGS, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 10, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(5)''.

Page 4, line 6, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(6)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment that corrects a drafting error in the bill that was discovered by the legislative counsel after H.R. 1231 was reported from the committee with bipartisan support.

The amendment changes the paragraph numbers in section 2 so they correctly reflect the sequence of appearance in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection and we urge swift passage.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112–74.

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 3, line 12, insert '', except in locations that would interfere, conflict with, or impede operations of the Armed Forces,'' after ''conduct lease sales''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, 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 clarifies that any expanded oil production will not interfere with ongoing operations by the Armed Forces of the United States.

I appreciate Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and Congressman JIM MORAN for their cosponsorship of this amendment. There are no stronger advocates for the military in my State than those two gentlemen.

□ 1640

As you know, the United States has more than two dozen coastal naval bases, including those located in Virginia, Washington, California, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Maryland, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maine, and Hawaii.

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness published a report, noting that many of these potential locations for oil exploration could and might conflict with DOD operations in these locations. For example, DOD has surface/subsurface operating areas and DOD special use airspace/warning areas off every coastal State in the continental United States.

You can see from this map that there are the red dots where they actually have bases and that the spiderwebs are where they have operations offshore.

These areas are important because the military uses some of these areas for surface and subsurface training as well as practice with live ordnance. Oil wells and live ordnance don't mix so well. For example, the Norfolk Naval Base in my home State of Virginia uses 78 percent of the proposed Lease Sale 220 area right now for training and live ordnance practice. The Navy wants to

ensure that oil drilling in that area does not interfere with live ordnance release and impact, including air to surface bombing; sensitive undersea and surface operations; combined shipboard systems qualification trials; and equipment testing and evaluation.

Norfolk is America's largest naval base and is a major driver of our State's annual $10 billion government contracting economy. It would be difficult to quantify how many billions of dollars taxpayers have spent building and maintaining these military installations all around the continental United States, but relocation costs would be substantial, and we don't have that money.

My friend from Alaska talks about putting people out of work or putting people into work. Believe me, if we had to close or relocate these bases, there would be a lot of weeping and mashing of teeth in the unemployment line all across America. The costs wouldn't just be borne by the taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, but also by the servicemen and -women who would have to relocate, and by the tens of thousands of contractor employees who rely on the DOD.

Perhaps it's possible to co-locate oil drilling infrastructure in areas now used by the Navy or other components of the Armed Forces. In that case, this amendment would not get in the way of the oil exploration. This amendment simply ensures that any additional oil drilling which takes place in accordance with this bill will not conflict with the national security operations of the Armed Forces.

I am sure that energy development and national security can be mutually reinforcing and compatible, and I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would support this commonsense amendment to protect our national defense and national security. I know we can all agree that preserving those should be paramount as we consider changes to our Nation's energy policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Both the Outer Continental Lands Shelf Act and the 2003 National Defense Act already fully protect the Defense Department's responsibilities in the Outer Continental Shelf and the State coastal areas of the OCS. H.R. 1231 continues these protections.

As Chairman HASTINGS stated last week during debate on a very similar amendment to H.R. 1230, preserving the working relationship between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior is of great importance to the Natural Resources Committee. Because of this, H.R. 1231 meets the mutual goals of balancing national security and energy independence, but this amendment would upset the balance.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense never notified, never talked to us about any opposition to this legislation.

H.R. 1231 fully supports the Department of the Interior's work with the Department of Defense in addressing the necessary stipulations that will protect the military mission on the OCS during the development of lease sales.

I also want to point out that gaining access to domestically available and affordable energy resources is also of paramount importance to our national security because it lessens our dependence on foreign sources of energy. Let me say that again. It must be very clear: Energy security and energy independence are a national security priority.

Additionally, developing our own energy resources benefits the Department of Defense. According to the Brookings Institution, every $10 increase in the price of a barrel of oil increases the cost of Defense operations by $1.3 billion. Lowering energy prices should be a priority for American consumers and for the Department of Defense.

This amendment isn't truly aimed at protecting DOD activities. It's aimed at trying to block lease sales and stopping offshore energy and development. That's what this is about. So I congratulate the people who are offering this amendment. It's exactly what you'd like to do.

Again, Defense activities are not hindered by energy development. The Departments of Defense and the Interior work well together to balance the needs of our Nation. H.R. 1231 allows both offshore energy leasing and military activities to go forward and exist in a safe, responsible way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I would just say to my friend from Alaska that I won't have anybody questioning my sincerity about trying to protect the national security interests of the United States of America. I come from a State with a long military tradition. I am proud of that tradition, and I am here sincerely to protect national security. If we want to disagree with that, that's fine, but questioning the motivations of whether there is another agenda is a different matter.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the balance of my time to my distinguished colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. May I ask the Chair how much time is remaining?

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

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Chair, and I thank my good friend from Virginia.

I would remind my good friend from Alaska that 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. Filling this area with drilling rigs is a bad idea.

Now, we have been told verbally and in writing that there should be no lease sales in 72 percent of this lease area because it's in direct conflict with the operations of the Navy. Five percent, in addition, would interfere with aerial operations and should not host permanent surface structures like drilling rigs. There is another 1 percent that would have site-specific stipulations. Then you're left with 22 percent, and much of that 22 percent is dedicated to the shipping lanes for the country's two busiest commercial ports: Hampton Roads and Baltimore.

There are other areas offshore, I'm sure, that are also important to the Armed Forces, but we are responsible for Virginia. We know the situation there. We are not going to jeopardize those jobs. I would say that national security interests ought to trump oil and gas development.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. May I inquire of the time remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alaska has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia's time has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment. It's unnecessary and boy if we can't get the government to work together there is something wrong, something deadly wrong. This is about defense. This is about the department of enter, this is about the American people. We ought to be able to work together and I'm sure they can. I'm confident of it and the idea that this is going to hurt the mission is again a way to stop drilling. That's all it is. Maybe if we had that 23 percent open and we knew exactly where it was we might be able to drill there but I don't think they would support that either.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY.

This amendment would prohibit offshore lease sales from going forward if those leases would interfere or impede the operations of the United States Armed Forces.

I represent the Hampton Roads region of Virginia, which is home to the world's largest Naval Base at Norfolk. Our Navy trains extensively off the coast of my state in the Virginia Capes Operations Area. A significant section of a proposed lease sale for drilling off Virginia's coast is within this important military training zone.

There are nearly 30 coastal naval installations in the United States and the Defense Department has expressed concerns that offshore oil and gas development could hinder the military's ability to train in many of these offshore areas.

I have long had reservations about drilling off the coast of Virginia. I believe the environmental, economic and national security risks for drilling off the coast of Virginia far outweigh any benefits. This amendment would simply ensure that offshore oil and gas development will not disrupt these vital functions to our national defense.

I urge my colleagues to support the Connolly Amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. MARKEY. 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, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) ELIGIBILITY FOR NEW LEASES AND THE TRANSFER OF LEASES.—

''(A) ISSUANCE OF NEW LEASES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, beginning with the 2012–2017 5-year program, the Secretary of the Interior shall specify that the Secretary will not accept bids on any new leases offered pursuant to this Act from a person described in paragraph (2) unless the person has renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the person to require the payment of royalties if the price of oil and natural gas is greater than or equal to the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

''(ii) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person referred to in clause (i) is a person that—

''(I) is a lessee that—

''(aa) holds a covered lease on the date on which the Secretary considers the issuance of the new lease; or

''(bb) was issued a covered lease before the date of enactment of this Act, but transferred the covered lease to another person or entity (including a subsidiary or affiliate of the lessee) after the date of enactment of this Act; or

''(II) any other person that has any direct or indirect interest in, or that derives any benefit from, a covered lease.

''(iii) MULTIPLE LESSEES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of clause (1), if there are multiple lessees that own a share of a covered lease, the Secretary may implement separate agreements with any lessee with a share of the covered lease that modifies the payment responsibilities with respect to the share of the lessee to include price thresholds that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

''(II) TREATMENT OF SHARE AS COVERED LEASE.—Beginning on the effective date of an agreement under subclaseu (I), any share subject to the agreement shall not constitute a covered lease with respect to any lessees that entered into the agreement.

''(B) TRANSFERS.—A lessee or any other person who has any direct or indirect interest in, or who derives a benefit from, a covered lease shall not be eligible to obtain by sale or other transfer (including through a swap, spinoff, servicing, or other agreement) any new lease made available in an oil and gas leasing program under this section, or the economic benefit of such a new lease, unless the lessee or other person has—

''(i) renegotiated each covered lease with respect to which the lessee or person is a lessee, to modify the payment responsibilities of the lessee or person to include price thresholds that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)); or

''(ii) entered into an agreement with the Secretary to modify the terms of all covered leases of the lessee or other person to include limitations on royalty relief based on market prices that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) COVERED LEASE.—The term 'covered lease' means a lease for oil or gas production in the Gulf of Mexico that is—

''(I) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

''(II) issued by the Department of the Interior under section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note; Public Law 104–58); and

''(III) not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

''(ii) LESSEE.—The term 'lessee' includes any person or other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is in or under common control with, a lessee.

''(iii) NEW LEASE.—The term 'new lease' means a lease issued in a lease sale under this Act.

''(iv) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the first quarter of this year, the oil companies were actually able to make $35 billion in profits; but in my amendment, we are able to say to them, because of a flaw in leases in the 1990s which required them to pay no royalties on public lands—taxpayers' lands—for oil they're drilling for right now and charging $100 a barrel, $4 a gallon at the pump, that we think there is something wrong when the taxpayers don't get anything back.

□ 1650

And so what my amendment says is that they can't apply for any more leases on taxpayers' land unless they're willing to renegotiate the mistaken leases that were given to them that, by the way, will allow them to escape having to pay $53 billion in taxes, in royalties. That's another word for taxes, ''royalties.'' When you're talking about oil, ''royalties'' is the word we use to describe taxes.

This blank check to the oil industry is absolutely undeserved. The Republican approach to offshore oil royalty policy is to treat the Big Oil companies like royalty and to treat the consumers and taxpayers like peasants. They're just going to give away all these breaks to the oil industry.

You know, Prince William and Kate Middleton just left on their honeymoon. Their royalty honeymoon is just beginning. But for the oil companies who are drilling for free on public land, they have a royalty honeymoon that has been going on for way too long, and today, we're going to give the Members of the House a chance to end the honeymoon on the royalties that the oil industry has to pay.

Now, what are the Republicans going to do? They're going to oppose it. They're going to say, no, we need more tax breaks, $4 billion worth of tax breaks, for the oil industry. And so where are they going to find the money for those additional tax breaks that they want to give to the oil industry? Well, they looked around and they decided that the best place to find it was in Medicare, that is, in the health care that we give to Grandma and Grandpa. And so what they have done is they've set up a drilling rig for the oil industry on top of the Medicare program so they can drill into the pockets of Grandma and Grandpa to find the $4 billion in tax breaks, and then on top of that, protect them against having to pay the royalties, the taxes on where they're already drilling for free on taxpayers' land in our country.

Now, that's an unbelievable combination, and they do it while cutting the renewables budget by 70 percent. Can you believe this? It's 2011. The Republicans have already passed a bill cutting the renewables budget—wind and solar, biomass, geothermal—by 70 percent, and they're setting up an oil rig on top of the Medicare program of Grandma and Grandpa to drill for even more tax breaks for the oil industry. This is just an unbelievable debate that we're having.

And they say over here, ''Well, you know, we're the all of the above party; we want to do it all.'' But the truth is that they're really the oil above all party, and that's what this debate is all about, how can we get even more for the oil industry.

So what my amendment will do is to just give people an opportunity to reclaim that $53 billion from the oil industry and give it to Grandma. Of all the people who don't need a break, a subsidy this year, it's the oil industry. You know who needs a break? You know who needs a subsidy? It's Grandma. Let's not cut Medicare. Let's not cut her health care in order to help the oil industry. Vote ''aye'' for the Markey amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. With all due respect to Grandma and Grandpa, there's no Grandma and Grandpa that has Medicare taken away from them or anywhere else. That's pure demagoguery on this floor, and we know that, tied into the oil companies.

It's ironic to me, this House has debated and voted on this amendment over the years. They've defeated it by a bipartisan vote. Just like a bad penny, it keeps showing up and the Big Oil is all bad. All I know, the American public is being taxed every year, $1,100 every year by this administration's high gas prices.

Let's review the facts. The Deepwater Royalty Relief Act leases were issued by, oh, boy, Bill Clinton and Bruce Babbitt in 1996 and 2000. Oh, my good Lord, it was the Republicans that did all this. They're the ones that issued these leases, and those who hold these leases have repeatedly been successful in challenging the Interior Department's authority to include price thresholds in lease agreements. The Department of the Interior has lost at the Federal district court, the appellate court, the United States Supreme Court, and now we're going to interfere with a court decision?

If this amendment passes, those holding such leases will be required to renegotiate the lease terms with DOI to include price thresholds before getting new leases. Bill Clinton would turn over—no, he's not in his grave, so I can't say that. The Secretary does not—and I repeat does not—have the authority to include price thresholds on these leases. In addition, forcing companies to renegotiate the leases would be a violation of contract law and would be challenged in court.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that just comes out of where, I don't know. It's a time to demagogue on the floor about Medicare. It has nothing to do with oil leases. It has nothing to do with the so-called tax breaks that Bill Clinton and Bruce Babbitt put in place. George Bush wasn't there. Mr. Obama wasn't there. Bill Clinton did this.

Lo and behold, somebody has to renegotiate something. Let's start renegotiating contracts all over the countryside. Maybe we ought to start doing that. Some of the contracts made, and I think we did this the last election, their contracts were terminated.

I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Could the Chair tell me how much time we have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Alaska has 2½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Alaska has the right to close.

Mr. MARKEY. We have a big choice here. We can reclaim $53 billion from the oil and gas industry that they owe to the American taxpayer and put it into wind and solar and all-electric vehicles and the revolution that we need to transform our country's relationship with OPEC. We should be able to tell OPEC, We don't need your oil any more than we need your sand.

This is a chance here to reclaim the $53 billion in windfall profits by escaping royalties that the oil industry owes, and put it into a new technology innovation agenda that talks about the future of wind and solar and electric vehicles that will transform our relationship with the rest of the planet.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments, but wind power is subsidized energy. That's all it is. Wind power is subsidized by the taxpayer. Solar power is subsidized by the taxpayer. To try to transform this country into using wind and solar by raising the cost of gasoline to the American consumer is dead wrong. That's not the way to solve this problem.

I will support wind power when it's not subsidized. I will support solar power when it's not subsidized, and I will support nuclear power when we can, which the gentleman's opposed every time, and I will support hydropower. In fact, I will support all forms of power so we can become more independent, and I go back to the concept of fossil fuels. It moves objects. It moves objects. Wind power doesn't move objects, no. Solar power doesn't move objects, no. It takes fossil fuels to run our ships, our planes, our automobiles, our trucks, and our trains. That's the commerce of this Nation, and that's what's hurting this Nation today in the recovery.

We have to start producing our own fossil fuels so we can have the commerce that's necessary to employ people and create the jobs in this country. In this country, it should be done. Yes, we can have the other forms of power, but we have to have the fossil fuels to continue hopefully the recovery of this country economically.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. KEATING. 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, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) DATA REGARDING BONUSES PROVIDED TO EXECUTIVES.—In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall include requirements under which the Secretary shall make available to the public data provided by each lessee under the program with respect to the bonuses provided to the executives of the lessee from the most recent quarter.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 1231. As our constituents see soaring gas prices, oil companies have revealed record profits. The top five multinational oil companies earned over $1 trillion in the past decade. These firms are eating up more and more of our constituents' paychecks.

And where is it going? Only a small portion of the profits are reinvested back into the company to pave the way for efficiencies and research into alternatives to oil. Rather, oil companies are providing bumps to stockholders and high bonuses to their company executives, a pat on the back for high prices at the pump.

My amendment would provide transparency to the U.S. taxpayer. The amendment requires the Secretary to disclose the executive bonuses for any company that is given a drilling lease.

The time is now to hold the largest oil companies accountable, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in order to provide transparency back to the American taxpayer.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, when I first saw this amendment, I was wondering if we were debating financial services legislation here on the floor. Clearly, this amendment attempts to raise issues outside the realm of today's debate on increasing American-made energy and creating jobs.

The Department of the Interior should spend its time focusing on reviewing permits, conducting environmental safety reviews, protecting our resources and leasing offshore areas that are most prospective for oil and natural gas production. The Department shouldn't have dozens of employees sitting around reading companies' Securities and Exchange Commission filings and assembling a list of which executives got what bonus.

The information that this amendment would burden the Interior Department with gathering and publishing is already publicly disclosed. It should be made public, and that's why it already is. This amendment is not about openness and transparency of disclosing information. That's already the law.

The real effect of this amendment is duplicative requirements and government waste. Let's get away from the political games and gotcha amendments. Let's allow the Department of the Interior to focus on OCS safety, environmental protection and leasing, and leave the bonuses to the Securities and Exchange Commission officials studying that. I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the relevancy to this debate, I would take this time, in the spirit of bipartisanship, to thank the Rules Committee for allowing this amendment and, thus, I agree with them that this is relevant to this debate.

I would like to comment on one more thing. My friend from Alaska brought up the point of a burden. The burden that exists right now is the burden that's being borne right on the gas pumps of the people in my district, in his district, and the people in the United States of America. That is the burden that working families are undergoing, the suffering that they are undertaking as they pay over $4 a gallon for gasoline in my district. Transparency and accountability are necessary, though the people who are beholden to the price spikes know where their money is going.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The question I ask is, How much would this cost the Department of the Interior? Would this take away from safety inspections? And to my good friend from Massachusetts, the burden is going to get worse. You are going to be paying about $5 a gallon by the first of June; if not, maybe a little bit later, but not later than the Fourth of July. And the burden is something that bothers me a great deal.

But in Massachusetts alone, not one time has any one of your Members in the Congress ever voted to produce energy, other than wind power and solar power. And that doesn't drive your constituents' automobiles. That doesn't drive your trucks that deliver your products to the restaurants or the hospitals. That doesn't drive that train that people ride to try to get automobiles off the road. It doesn't drive the ships to bring the products to your shores. Fossil fuel is the key to our commerce; and we should recognize that in this Congress. And we should develop an energy plan that includes everything. You can't do it with just wind power. You can't do it with solar power. But you can do it with all powers.

That's what's wrong with this Congress and this administration and, yes, previous administrations: they don't grasp the necessity of having more power available to increase the economy of this country. And we're on the cusp right now. I believe this bill will help us. If it does not help us, then shoot me another solution. I have not seen one on that side of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112–74.

Ms. TSONGAS. 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, strike the closing quotation marks and second period at line 19, and after line 19 insert the following:

''(7) WORST-CASE CONTAINMENT AND CLEAN-UP PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall include, in each 5-year oil and gas leasing program, a requirement that each applicant for a permit to drill under a lease issued in a lease sale under the program must include a plan for containment and clean-up of a worst-case oil and gas discharge scenario in activities conducted under the permit, if issued.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last summer, we all saw the painfully disorganized and ineffective response to the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. The frustration was palpable across our country. During that tragedy, it was clear that BP and the Federal Government had no plan to contain the oil spill and that BP lacked the capacity to respond to a spill of that magnitude.

The amendment that I am offering today is very straightforward and simple, one that seeks to implement the lessons learned from the events of last summer. My amendment would require that all applicants for a drilling permit under a lease sold under H.R. 1231 submit a plan for containment and clean-up of a worst-case scenario oil or gas spill.

This amendment does not limit drilling. It says simply and sensibly that when we drill, we should have a plan in place before an accident occurs. We shouldn't wait until a disaster like last year's 3-month-long spill has already begun. There wasn't a person I spoke to who wasn't horrified by the devastating oil spill in the gulf. I believe that the American people want us to learn from that environmental and economic tragedy, and this amendment helps us accomplish that. When we drill, we should have a plan for dealing with possible disaster.

Some have argued that we don't need a law because initial steps are being taken at the agency level or by oil and gas companies. Some have said that requiring a worst-case-scenario plan is anti-drilling or anti-jobs. We shouldn't get distracted from the simple truth of this amendment: when we drill, we should have a plan. We have seen the consequences of not having a plan, and it was lost jobs.

□ 1710

This amendment is pro-jobs. Requiring oil and gas companies to have a plan in place will not prevent the creation of a single oil and gas job, but it will protect fishing jobs and tourism jobs instead of asking us to put those jobs at risk should a spill occur.

Our constituents deserve to know that we have required oil and gas companies to plan for the worst. Opposing this amendment irresponsibly denies the tragic events of last summer.

For the sake of our economy, our environment, and our coastal jobs, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, simple amendment requiring oil and gas companies to have a plan. Join me in demonstrating to our constituents that we have learned from the events of last summer, and we are taking steps to prevent such a disaster in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, here again is another amendment that is redundant, but let's call it what it is: It's an obstruction.

The Department of the Interior already requires that applicants must calculate worst case discharge before approving a permit. On June 18, 2010, the Department of the Interior issued a notice to lessees outlining the information requirements and standards to be met before a permit would be approved. In the notice it is required that a lessee ''describe the assumptions and calculations that you used to determine the volume of your worst case scenario.''

It's already required on permit applications today, and is further reiterated by the language in H.R. 1229, which passed the House earlier today.

The minority continues to try to divert attention away from the real issue of increasing energy production, creating jobs, lowering energy costs, and

improving national security by lessening our dependence on foreign oil.

In fact, it seems that the Democrats simply do not want to face the fact that this bill says we can move forward with an aggressive program of responsible oil and gas development while, at the same time, ensuring that increased safety measures are undertaken. These are not mutually exclusive goals.

Republicans want to make U.S. offshore drilling the safest in the world, and it is the safest in the world, so we can produce more American energy, create American jobs and strengthen our national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. I thank my colleague for bringing this issue up. The June 18 notice to lessees is a great first step toward having worst case scenario containment and cleanup plans. But a notice to lessees is not the same as legislation. It is not intended to set policy, and it is not intended to have the force of law, which is why I am offering this amendment today.

We need Federal laws, not notices, that require companies to submit worst case scenario oil spill containment and cleanup plans to ensure that another spill like the BP spill never happens again. Our constituents deserve to know that we have required oil and gas companies to plan for the worst, or give them an honest reason why we think no such plan is necessary, given the events last summer.

If the majority agrees that we should have a plan, they should support this amendment. It simply requires that oil and gas companies have a plan, nothing more. It is about drilling safely, it protects jobs, oil and gas jobs, tourism and fishing jobs. And again, as I said, if the majority agrees that we should have a plan, they should support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I can only say that, to my knowledge, there's little chance of any oil drilling off the coast of Massachusetts. But there is a great possibility off the coasts of Florida, Virginia, Alaska, California, and this bill really sets out which areas should be drilled, not in large massive areas, but specifically.

I personally will tell you, if I could drill in Alaska, offshore, which we should be able to do, but this administration has delayed a permit for 5 years—5 years. Five billion dollars put into investment to develop that field. It can't be done because of this administration.

This bill tries to expedite that process for the good of this Nation and for the good of the people, not the good of the oil companies, because we need that oil.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112–74.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) MAKING MORATORIUM IN THE EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO PERMANENT.—The Secretary shall not make available for leasing in any oil and gas leasing program under this section any area referred to in section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (title I of division C of Public Law 109–432; 43 U.S.C. 1331 note).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer to H.R. 1231 an amendment that would make the current ban on drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico permanent. This amendment would not have any effect on the budget as scored by the Congressional Budget Office. However, it would have a significant impact on the economy of Florida, given that the State's tourist industry will be protected from future oil spills which could destroy our beautiful beaches and coastal areas. Certainly, Florida's coastline is a treasure, not just for Floridians but for all Americans and people throughout the world. For years, the Florida delegation has worked together to protect our coastline and natural resources, and as long as those rigs are in this area, the potential for devastation to Florida beaches persists.

If an accident was to occur causing oil to wash ashore and to Florida beaches, both the environmental and the economic damage would be devastating to the State. And following the disaster off of Louisiana's gulf coast last year, we saw a quick glimpse of what could happen to Florida's economy in the event of an oil spill.

I toured the region by helicopter last year and witnessed the devastation firsthand. That said, before any new areas are opened and Florida's pristine beaches are put at risk, I would very much like to see drilling in the areas that are already open and increased funding for research for new technology.

I strongly believe that any drilling off of Florida's gulf coast would be extremely deterrent to the State economy and ecosystem. As we saw in the BP oil spill last year in the Gulf of Mexico, wherein 11 workers died and an estimated 5 million barrels of crude oil poured into the Gulf of Mexico, the risks of drilling oil off of Florida's shores bring about extreme risk to our State in an already depressed economy, and with unemployment in the State of Florida still hovering at 11 percent, the last thing we need is to endanger nearly 1 million tourist-related jobs and the $60 billion tourist industry in the Sunshine State.

Drilling off the coast of Florida is a misguided miscalculation. The risk of danger to the environment and the economy greatly outweighs any potential benefits. I would very much like to see increased drilling in areas already open and increased funding for research for new technology.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. The underlying bill is focused on opening the Outer Continental Shelf to safe and responsible energy production. This bill aims to fulfill the promise that both Democrats and Republicans made to the American people when we voted in a bipartisan basis in 2008 to lift the moratoria on offshore energy production.

Since taking office, President Obama and his administration has effectively reimposed the moratorium. This bill would reverse his actions.

In December 2006, a majority of the House and the Florida delegation voted in favor of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, a bipartisan compromise that opened a portion of the western and central gulf but maintained the eastern planning area moratoria until 2022.

□ 1720

This amendment seeks to go backwards and single-handedly undo that agreement to close off forever the possible energy production in a portion of the Gulf of Mexico. This is exactly the wrong direction for America to be heading.

Congress should not foreclose the possibility of future energy production. This is especially true in the eastern planning area of the gulf, which the Department of the Interior believes contains technically recoverable resources in the amount of 4 billion barrels of oil and over 21 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Let's be clear, the area in the eastern gulf covered by this amendment is currently under moratorium until 2022. That is over a decade from now. This bill does not propose to change the 2022 date.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. More than 20 years after the Exxon Valdez oil spill,

we have yet to clean up Prince William Sound in Alaska. Oil is still being found buried in sand from the BP oil spill.

The frequent occurrence of extreme weather that the eastern gulf coast experiences, including hurricanes and severe storms, could easily produce an oil spill, even with the technological improvements in oil and natural gas operations. Storms along the gulf coast in 2005 caused 124 oil spills in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico, Hurricane Katrina caused a 233,000 gallon oil spill, and Hurricane Rita worsened the damage with 508,000 gallons of oil spilled. If these rigs were in the gulf coast, our beaches would face complete destruction. As we have seen recently, cleanup methods for these spills are incapable of removing more than a small fraction of the oil.

In addition, from the BP oil spill alone, Florida has over 284,000 claims with only 117,000 paid. That is less than half, for a total of over $1.45 billion. For the total gulf region, there have been 10,000 fishing claims, 122,000 food and lodging claims, 74,000 retail and sales claims, and a total of $1.6 billion paid on even more lost earnings and wages. We cannot afford another disaster of this magnitude. With more drilling, we still are living on borrowed time. Support the Corrine Brown amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. 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, line 19, strike the final closed quotation mark and the following period.

Page 4, after line 19, insert the following new subparagraph:

''(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary may not include in any oil and gas leasing program under this paragraph any lease sale in the Northern California Planning Area.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, according to this bill's drafters, the legislation would not require leasing permits in the northern California planning area, which is the coastline of my district. My amendment merely makes that clear.

Drilling on the north coast of California is a disastrous idea, and the legislation must be clear that it is not acceptable to drill off California's north coast. Because this amendment is a clarification of the legislation's intent, there is no cost associated with it.

Just about 3 weeks ago, we marked the 1-year anniversary of the Nation's worst oil spill. I will not let what happened to the Gulf of Mexico happen to the north coast of California. I have introduced separate stand-alone legislation which would permanently ban drilling off the coast of my district.

It is important to me and to my constituents that H.R. 1231 clearly notates that drilling will not occur in the northern California planning area along the coasts of Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte Counties. The coastal area of my district is one of only four major upwellings in our world's oceans.

An upwelling is where cold, nutrient-rich waters are brought from the ocean depths to the surface. Upwelling regions promote seaweed and growth, which, in turn, supply energy for some of the most productive ecosystems in our world, including many of our world's fisheries.

North coast ecosystems also sustain some of the largest salmon populations in the lower 49 States and provide essential habitat for Dungeness crab, rockfish, sole, and urchin.

In 2006 and 2008, commercial fishery disasters that virtually eliminated salmon fishing in California were economically disastrous to my district, to our States, and our Nation. If an oil spill were to occur off the coast of my district, the environmental and economic costs would be staggering. Drilling for oil or gas off California's north coast could cause serious harm to the unique and productive ecosystem and abundant marine life found in this area.

My district is economically dependent upon the rich natural resources we are blessed to have, but it is also subject to significant earthquakes which exacerbate the issues, the threats, and the problems related to oil spills.

One of my counties just wrote to me, and I quote, ''The modest amount of oil available in terms of our Nation's daily demand does not justify jeopardizing our fisheries, our environment, and our economic livelihoods.''

This amendment will merely protect the north coast of California and will simply clarify what the drafters of this bill say that the bill does, and that is that they claim that it does not require drilling off the coasts of Mendocino, Humboldt, or Del Norte Counties.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this is the second amendment of three today designed to close off portions of the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and natural gas exploration production, the opposite of what the bill under consideration today is about. The underlying bill is focused on opening the Outer Continental Shelf to safe and responsible energy production.

H.R. 1231 aims to fulfill the promise that both Democrats and Republicans made to the American people when we voted on a bipartisan basis in 2008 to lift the moratoria on offshore energy production. Since taking office, President Obama and his administration have effectively reimposed the moratorium, and this bill would reverse his actions.

This amendment proposes to take America in exactly the wrong direction in which we should be heading. Congress should not foreclose the possibility of future energy production. With the price of gasoline going to $4 and $5 a gallon, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and keep our focus on those offshore areas that contain substantial oil and natural resources, where increased American energy production will create new jobs, lower energy prices, and increase our economic and national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

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

Again, I want to point out that the majority party has told me and told my staff that the bill that they have offered today, the bill that we are going to be voting on, does not affect the north coast of California. Now, my effort with this amendment is merely to trust but verify.

□ 1730

To oppose this amendment really calls into question, what is the underlying motivation of this bill? Does it do what they claim and not affect this region of our ocean, again, one of only four major upwellings in the world's oceans. This is an area that feeds and promotes the fisheries and the marine life not only in my area, but in all the ocean. And the idea we would put it at any kind of risk. Those of you who know the area know how rough the water is, know how rocky the shores are. If there was an oil spill there, it would never be cleaned up. The area is seismically active. To drill in that area with the threat of earthquakes, you are

looking at a situation that would make the Gulf of Mexico disaster pale in comparison.

It is not too much to ask that we merely verify what it is the majority party says that they are not doing with this bill. And the idea that this amendment would be opposed is quite startling to me. I believe that this is something that everyone can get behind. To say that the bill doesn't do this and then refuse to take the amendment calls into question the motive of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from California brings out some legitimate points. But right now, today, under existing law, the northern California planning area is available for leasing. This bill does not change that current situation. It has been available since 2008 when gasoline prices hit $4 a gallon and the President and Congress lifted the offshore drilling moratoria.

I will remind the House that in 2008 the coast of California was opened for potential leasing and drilling, that Democrats were in the majority in the House and NANCY PELOSI of San Francisco was Speaker of the House. For months, they resisted Republican efforts to end the offshore ban, but eventually the American people won out and the bans were lifted.

I would also like to point out that this bill provides direction that when the Federal Government is writing 5-year leasing plans, that the focus be on areas with the greatest estimated oil and natural gas resources. This particular planning area does not have and has not registered high in this regard and this bill does not direct that leasing occur in this planning area. With gasoline back to the 2008 highs of over $4 per gallon, let's keep the focus on where it should be, increasing American offshore energy production. That's what we're trying to do.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I don't know that there is a great deal more to add to what he has just said about permits and about the issue that has been discussed just recently.

The thing that really bothers me is just a few years ago, 25 years ago, we were importing about 28 percent of our oil. Today we are importing 62 percent of our oil, more than double what we were doing just a few years ago, and the American people are paying the price. Instead of $1.50 or $2 a gallon for gas, they are spending $4 a gallon for gasoline.

Nationwide, there are 86 billion barrels of oil. Fifty-one percent of that is in the Gulf of Mexico, which means there are 44 billion barrels of oil in the Gulf of Mexico, and there are 240 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. For us to continue to be dependent on foreign energy sources is crazy. We ought to start drilling and doing what needs to be done here in America. And we can do in an environmentally safe way. We can do it in Alaska, offshore, we can do it in a number of places. But to sit by and continue to send our money to Saudi Arabia and other countries around the world that aren't our friends just doesn't make any sense, and the American people understand it.

I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle ought to go back and talk to their constituents, who are paying the price at the gas pump.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112–74.

Mr. INSLEE. 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, line 19, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period, and after line 19 insert the following new paragraph:

''(7) WASHINGTON STATE APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Under this section, the Secretary shall not make available for leasing for exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas any area of the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Washington unless such leasing is approved by the Governor and legislature of the State of Washington.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 257, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to protect the beaches and shoreline and economy of the State of Washington. This amendment is quite simple. It would simply say that we will not allow the Federal Government to run over the State of Washington on issues of drilling off of our coastline, that we won't be shackled to this antiquated policy of drilling without first providing reasonable protection, without first addressing the issue of rampant speculation that is what is exposing my consumers to $4 a gallon gas in the State of Washington, and without freeing us to do what we should be doing, which is developing new, clean energy sources. I want to address each one of those.

Basically our position is we don't think in the State of Washington, or any State, and particularly the State of Washington, which is the Evergreen State, we ought to have this policy foisted upon us that is not an evergreen energy policy for this century for three reasons.

Reason number one: Despite the fact that we have had this enormous passage of time since this horrendous spill in the gulf, this Chamber has not passed into law one single safety provision to bring additional safety to anywhere on our coastline. My amendment would simply say that the people of the State of Washington and their elected officials ought to be able to make a decision that we have got adequate, reasonable safeguards for drilling before it happens off of the State of Washington. That has not happened, and it is inexcusable.

Second, before this happens, the people of the State of Washington ought to have reasonable protection against the rampant speculation that is going on that is driving up these prices. Even Goldman Sachs has recognized we have had four times the speculative positions taken and probably a $20 amount that has driven up these prices associated with this unchecked speculation. Yet this Chamber and my friends across the aisle have not done a single thing to address this speculation. Until we do that, we shouldn't have my neighbors and my constituents have foisted down their throats this policy of mandatory drilling without them first making a decision.

Third, the people of the State of Washington want to help in our energy crisis and they are capable of helping in this energy crisis if this Chamber will just free them to do it.

Here is how they want to help. They want to produce lithium ion batteries that can run electric cars so we don't have to start being shackled and just addicted to oil. But this Chamber hasn't done a single thing, a single thing this year, to help clean energy sources that Washington State business people want to produce.

I look at the EnerG2 company that is making ultracapacitors. This Chamber isn't helping them make electric batteries for electric cars.

I look at the REC company in Moses Lake, Washington, that is making the polysilicate cells for photovoltaic cells to produce the electricity for electric cars. This Chamber hasn't done a single thing to help that company advance.

I look at the Targeted Growth company and the Boeing company that are developing biofuels so that we can have a competitor to gasoline so we can drive those prices down. This Chamber hasn't done a single thing to help those companies develop Washington State jobs for a new energy future.

Now, we have got a lot of energy off of our coastline. It might be in assorted ways. But I know it is in offshore wind. But we aren't doing a single thing to help the offshore wind energy. All we are doing is trying to shackle an antiquated energy policy on the people of the State of Washington.

I would have liked this amendment to have helped all of my colleagues on the Pacific Coast, but because of some of the financial rules that we have, we have only been able to bring this involving the Evergreen State. But I would hope that all of my colleagues would join me in saying that before this gets forced on the citizens of Washington State, we adopt some reasonable measures.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1740

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, acting for Natural Resources Committee Chairman DOC HASTINGS of Washington State, I oppose this amendment.

As explained in the debate on the prior two amendments, this bill is focused on increasing American-made energy, creating new jobs, and decreasing our dependence on energy from foreign nations. Congress needs to focus on increasing energy production, and this amendment goes in the opposite direction. In fact, this amendment attempts to impose unprecedented and impossible obstacles to fostering more American energy in Federal waters.

It is stated that the purpose of the amendment is to give the State of Washington a say on leasing in Federal waters off the State's coast. However, multiple Federal laws already provide Washington State, and every State, the opportunity to participate in any such decisions. What this amendment would do is grant double veto power for Washington State to prohibit Federal activities in Federal waters outside the State's borders. The Interior Department provides repeated opportunities for public comment and participation throughout the planning and leasing process.

Furthermore, the Coastal Zone Management Act requires State consistency review with its State coastal zone management plan before the Federal Government takes action in Federal waters off of any particular State. On top of that, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act provides clear requirements for consultation and cooperation with affected State and local governments. Considerable care and protection is provided to each and every State, with extra consideration guaranteed to coastal States. This is as it should be.

What is particularly revealing about this amendment is that it only gives Washington State double veto power over certain types of offshore energy leasing. It singles out only oil and natural gas, but provides no such veto power over other forms of energy leasing. This includes wave energy, wind, solar, and other renewable forms.

This double standard exposes the real intent of this amendment. It's not truly aimed at ensuring a voice for Washington State; it's intended to score political points. But the political points the amendment attempts to score are entirely hollow. Why? Because there isn't estimated to be any recoverable oil or natural gas in Federal waters off of Washington State.

Again, this bill only goes into areas that have really large potential. Again, multiple Federal laws already guarantee all Americans have an opportunity to participate in an offshore planning process, especially the Governors, State and local officials, and citizens living in coastal States that will be impacted by leasing, should it take place.

For those reasons, I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Thank you.

First, I wish my friend DOC HASTINGS from Washington was with us today. He's not feeling well. But Mr. YOUNG is doing an admirable job with a weak argument, and I'll report that they're getting represented.

I just want to point out we haven't seen horrendous damage to any ecosystem from a wind spill yet. If you spill a little wind, you don't end up covering large gulf areas with hydrocarbons or destroying oyster and shrimping grounds like have been in the gulf. There are differences from multiple sources.

We are simply saying that before we move forward with additional offshore drilling, we ought to have reasonable safety protocols, we ought to address speculation, and we ought to have an energy policy that looks at all of the above.

My friends across the aisle told us you were going to give us an all-of-the-above energy policy. All you have given us is an all-of-the-below energy policy. We need a little better than this.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alaska has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My good friend from Washington, they may not have a wind spill, but there's opposition to wind power. And wind is extremely expensive and only can be successful as long as it's subsidized by the taxpayer. As long as this administration keeps insisting on wind and solar power, they're doubly taxing our taxpayers of this Nation and hurting our economy. That's reality.

So they're doubly taxed because now they're paying taxes because of the high cost of oil, the high cost of gasoline. And $1,100 a year they have additionally been taxed this year versus last year. And yet we talk about wind power. They're taxed because that comes out of the general fund. We're borrowing money from the Chinese. That's reality.

Wind and solar are fine as long as they're subsidized. As long as you pay for them, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, they're fine. But that's an additional tax on you. If it was so economical, so well to be done, then we would have done it a long time ago. And I say it will work. It's like ethanol. It works. It's still not economical.

So we have to go back to what commerce is run by—and it's fossil fuels. We can have all those other forms of energy. I do not want them subsidized. We can have all those other forms of energy, but we have to have the ability to move product. I look at the Port of Seattle, the Port of Tacoma. Every one of those ships is burning a fossil fuel that deliver those goods. Every truck that leaves that port that goes out to deliver those to the people around this Nation is burning fossil fuels. Every train that leaves is burning fossil fuels. Every airplane that lands, built by Boeing, is driven by fossil fuels.

This is a chance for us to speak up in Congress and say we are going to develop our natural fuels in this country so we can compete legitimately. You cannot compete by borrowing money to buy foreign oil, and that's what that side wants to do. I'm saying that's wrong. And I will join hands with you if you vote for ANWR and you vote for other forms of energy, too. Let's get it all together, guys. Let's have an energy plan. All we're trying to do here is undo what the Obama administration did, and that's put a moratorium in.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. INSLEE. 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 Washington will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112–74 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts.

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

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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 228, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—193

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

NOES—228

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
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
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
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 (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
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 (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Fortenberry
Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Hirono
Johnson, Sam
Marchant
Reed
Schwartz
Sullivan
Waters

□ 1814

Messrs. YOUNG of Indiana, RIGELL, and WEBSTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. POSEY, ROONEY, JACKSON of Illinois, CRENSHAW, DIAZ-BALART, and FORBES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 312, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 238, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—189

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

NOES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus

Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
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
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
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 (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 (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1822

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—186

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—240

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Stearns
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 (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Smith (NE)
Southerland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1830

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL, 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. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMERICAN ANGELS ABROAD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, they are America's angels abroad. They are ambassadors for America, and they are good folks that represent everything that is right about our country. They are the Peace Corps volunteers. And this is the 50th year of the Peace Corps. These are the most wonderful people I think I've ever met.

But there's a problem in the Peace Corps because many times these volunteers go overseas, they help out other countries, but they become victims of crime and victims of sexual assault. In fact, in 2009 there were 122 of them that were victims of sexual assault by predators in foreign countries.

And the problem is there's not much compassion, not much concern, and not much care with the Peace Corps about the plight of these victims according to the victims who testified today.

But those things are changing. Director Williams is committed to making the Peace Corps a safe place for our volunteers overseas. We're going to work with him and these victims to promote legislation so that we will have a protocol that is the law so that they are treated better.

We are the greatest human rights Nation in the world. We promote human rights, but human rights need to also apply to victims in the Peace Corps who are sexually assaulted overseas.

And that's just the way it is.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our Nation's law enforcement officers, the brave men and women who dedicate their lives to protecting our communities.

This week is National Police Week, and thousands of officers from across the country will gather here in Washington to pay tribute to those who have fallen in the line of duty. Sadly, in the past year, 162 officers have died in the line of duty, including two from Minnesota, Sergeant Joseph Bergeron of Maplewood and Mahnomen County Sheriff's Deputy Chris Dewey.

As we remember these officers, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to legislation that I have introduced that would help protect those who protect us. H.R. 1789, the State and Local Law Enforcement Discipline, Accountability, and Due Process Act, would guarantee law enforcement officers have basic rights during disciplinary actions.

I ask and urge my colleagues to sign on to this legislation so we can also help protect our law enforcement officers.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO GET OUR HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine in your household, if, for every $1 you spent, 40 cents was borrowed?

That's the situation we're in with every dollar that we spend in the U.S. Congress today. And yet there are those who do not want to reform or change.

But if I brought in my family and said, listen, guys, for every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed, we would say, okay, what can we cut out? Can we do with less travel? Can we do with fewer clothes? Can we cut back on the kitchen table a little bit? We would come up with some ideas. They might be tough choices, but it's the right thing to do.

It is time for Congress to get our house in order and to think about the next generation, not just the next election.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can tell you, each and every day, people come to see me to ask for more money to be spent. We've got to change our culture of spending here and get the House under control.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize our men and women in uniform and join our community in celebrating National Military Appreciation Month. The month of May encompasses a number of celebratory days linked to our Armed Forces, their families, and our Nation's proud history. From Military Spouse Appreciation Day to Victory in Europe Day, and from Loyalty Day to Armed Forces Day and Memorial Day, the month of May is a time for our Nation to come together and give praise to our most heroic citizens.

Our Nation traditionally recognizes our troops' sacrifice in a somber manner on Memorial Day, but National Military Appreciation Month allows us to not only appreciate those who have given their lives for our freedom, but also to celebrate the resolve of our Nation through its most difficult times.

I welcome our Nation to join in recognizing the contribution of our servicemen and -women, past and present, for all that they have done to preserve our freedom and our way of life.

DIFFERING VIEWS ON IMMIGRATION

(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, I noted with interest that the President announced this week he was going to give a major address on immigration. As one who's been involved in this issue for three decades, I was very interested to find out the approach the President was going to take.

So let me register my disappointment at the demonization of those who might have a disagreement with the President that was expressed by him in his speech yesterday. Talking about moats and talking about alligators and talking about intransigence on the other side of the aisle is not the way to attract bipartisan support to deal with one of the most difficult and important questions of our Nation. I wouldn't say I'm outraged. I would say I'm disappointed at the tone of those remarks of the President yesterday.

If, in fact, we're going to work together on issues as important as that, it would seem to me to be important for us to, in some way, at least accept the fact that there may be legitimate reasons for differences and try and bridge those differences, rather than expand them.

THE WESTERN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the Western Caucus has several members here tonight. We would like to talk about what is going on right now in the country. The administration seems to be waging a war on the western jobs, and that is carried out through a whole range of activities.

A couple of weeks ago, the administration and the President said that the administration is not doing enough to address the high gas prices. The President said in a speech at Georgetown that he would like to cut foreign oil by one-third by drilling at home. Well, we have been in the process of offering him the solution to what he said he would like to do.

Now, keep in mind that while the President is saying one thing, he's doing another.

□ 1840

While he says that we would like to drill for more oil here, understand that

he has increased the moratorium on the offshore drilling. They have made it more difficult to drill in on-land areas through the Rocky Mountains. Know that they rejected Shell Oil Company's $4 billion NEPA study because a paragraph was omitted.

So while we are hearing bold language from this administration about increasing the amount of oil that we are drilling here at home—and that would create American jobs but it would also create lower energy prices—understand that it appears that the President is not following through on what he said.

So in the past couple of days, this Congress, this House, has passed out H.R. 1229, which says that we are going to put the people back to work in the Gulf of Mexico.

I think everyone understands that BP is accountable and should be accountable for the problems that they caused, but we should not have killed 100,000 jobs offshore.

Our Nation is stuck at 9 percent unemployment. We are stuck with a deficit that is having to be financed by our own Federal Reserve. We are putting the Nation's economy at risk because of the way that we are treating jobs and because of our deficit.

So we are saying: Put the American workers back to work in the Gulf, produce American oil, produce American jobs, and bring lower prices of gasoline to the consumer.

The same bill improves the safety by reforming current law. It sets timelines for the Secretary to act on permits to drill. Right now, one of the things that the Secretary is doing is holding off approvals for those applications for permits to drill, the APDs. Know that the administration has within its power to improve the situation with jobs immediately, but instead they are doing the things that harm our work.

H.R. 1229 also establishes expedited judicial review processes.

We also have passed in this House H.R. 1230, which says we are going to restart the American Offshore Leasing Now Act. It passed last week. It requires that the four lease sales in the gulf and Virginia take place. Those lease sales were previously scheduled, but instead of going ahead with them, the administration has put them on hold. Let's simply produce the energy which has been verified to be there, which would create American jobs and which would aid American consumers by lower prices of gasoline.

H.R. 1231 has also been passed, which reverses President Obama's offshore moratorium. The President made a big deal just after he was sworn in 2 years ago about reversing the moratorium. But after one analyzed the moratorium that he reversed, we actually saw that he increased the moratorium, that more areas were put off limits to drilling rather than the message that he gave the American people.

So H.R. 1231 says to the President: We would like for you to join us in creating American jobs, jobs that the West would be proud of, jobs that would produce energy, jobs that would produce high-paying careers and not just jobs. We believe that these are the things that the American people are looking for. This is the leadership that they are asking for out of Washington.

H.R. 1231 requires each 5-year offshore leasing plan to include lease sales in areas containing the greatest known oil and natural gas reserves. Our offshore areas are tremendous reserves of energy. All we have to do is tap into them and use them. It requires that the Secretary establish a production goal when writing a 5-year plan.

I am joined tonight by several members of the Western Caucus. Each one has got their own particular interest area where the administration appears to be conducting a war on western jobs. So tonight, to lead off, I would like to yield time to my good friend CYNTHIA LUMMIS from Wyoming such time as she would consume.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding. I appreciate his leadership of the Western Caucus and look forward to this robust discussion tonight.

The West is rich in natural resources. And natural resources, their good stewardship and using them for the benefit of our country is what the West does best.

This administration is turning its back on the stewardship that is available in the West as we produce our natural resources and, instead, is taking away the jobs, the environmental progress, and replacing it with further dependence on foreign energy from places like Saudi Arabia and Venezuela.

We can produce our own energy in this country. Between the resources of Canada and the United States, we can produce enough energy for us to meet our foreseeable needs. But that requires us to use the technologies and the jobs associated with those technologies that will create tens of thousands of jobs, in fact, hundreds of thousands of jobs. Instead, we are actually going in exactly the opposite direction. Let me give you an example.

Fracking technology is advancing dramatically the ability of America to recover its rich natural gas resources, and it allows us to do so by casing a well with perforations. There is an explosion that cracks the tight sands or the rock. Then fluids are forced into these gaps in the rock, keeping the seams open, allowing this gas or oil to percolate back up the well casing and be produced, allowing Americans to use American-grown energy. But the attack on fracking technology is based not on science but on the idea that fracking could damage drinking water.

None of us want to see our precious drinking water polluted by contaminants that some people believe are being used in fracking fluids.

The States know their own geology better than anyone in Washington could and the very diverse geology that is different from State to State. You are going to be hearing later this evening from G.T. THOMPSON, a Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, where the Marcellus shale formation is being produced. I am going to talk about the use of fracking technology in my State, where the geology is very different from the Marcellus shale, but where it can be used in a responsible manner to produce American oil and gas with American jobs.

The Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, recognizing the concern that our drinking water could be imperiled, set about and created a set of rules and regulations to disclose the contents of fracking fluids and the processes that are being used by companies that are fracking wells in the State of Wyoming. Those rules are being used to provide people with the information that is needed to assure them that fracking fluids are not contaminating our water.

Furthermore, there have been repeated stories, using an example from Wyoming, in Pavillion, Wyoming, of an area that some argue was fracked to the detriment of local water wells. Well, we are learning more and more about those water wells. And what we are finding is, out of over 100 water wells in the area, only about one-fifth of them are permitted, and some of them are not even cased. Well, this allows for the natural percolation of gas into water that has nothing to do with fracking.

If we look at the science and apply it correctly, using good stewardship principles, we can produce oil and gas and have good drinking water.

□ 1850

I even have a photograph from someone in my home State, Mr. Speaker, that has a flame coming out of a pond. The flame is a consequence of a natural methane seep coming out of the water that has been on fire as long as this gentleman can remember. These are natural phenomena.

We need to make sure that we are assuring people in this country that drinking water will be safe at the same time we recover these resources. Those very assurances require scientists, they require environmental companies, they require fracking experts; more jobs, more oil and gas, more diverse energy for the American economy.

Of course, clean burning natural gas provides us also an extension of the air quality that we value so well. These are American jobs that can be saved, nurtured and grown, and used successfully all over the United States, on and off shore.

Mr. Speaker, you just acknowledged a project in the Beaufort Sea, which is off of the coast of Barrow, Alaska, 87 miles. Shell has put $4 billion, as you pointed out, into preparing to produce that resource, and still does not have a permit to produce it. At some point, those investments begin to devalue

their sunken costs in a way that may make companies like Shell look elsewhere. That takes jobs away from America and into countries where we are competing for jobs, and in places that sometimes are not our best friends when it comes to foreign policy and human rights.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's produce oil and gas with American jobs, with good pay, with good benefits, and with the residual goal of having an all-of-the-above energy policy that benefits the West and the country as a whole.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentlelady for her comments.

We are joined tonight by my good friend Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania. Before I yield time to him, I would like to walk through just a brief list of some of the other ways that the government conducts war on Western jobs.

Consider the listing of endangered species. No one of us wants to see a species be extinct or go extinct, but what we have seen is an extreme interpretation of the rules which kill jobs at the same time. I think there are ways that we could keep jobs and preserve species, yet we are not doing that right now.

The Coho salmon was listed as endangered. As a result, the farmers in the Klamath Basin in Oregon have been forced into bankruptcy due to prohibitions on water use by the listing of the salmon.

The Methow salmon, water rights holders in the Methow Valley of Washington lost the use of their water, and property owners and timber owners face restrictions on their properties because of the imposition of egregious stream buffers to protect the listed salmon.

The listing of the salmon in general, the court case over whether hydroelectric dam operators have done enough to prevent the death of salmon in Washington and Oregon, billions of dollars have been spent to accommodate, according to Bloomberg Business Week, but the environmental groups continue to sue.

The northern spotted owl, the listing has killed the entire timber industry in much of the West, especially in northern California and Oregon. The Mexican spotted owl, that listing also killed the timber industry in New Mexico and Arizona. Hundreds of thousands of jobs have been lost.

The Delta smelt, the listing of that species, a small 2-inch fish that lives in the San Joaquin Valley, killed 27,000 jobs there. The San Joaquin Valley was the source of 80 percent of our Nation's vegetables. Now those vegetable farms are gone. Bankruptcy. We are now importing food from countries that can spray pesticides that are outlawed in this country, so our food supply is less safe. Fewer jobs, bigger government deficit, greater cost of vegetables and unsafe food supply.

The gray wolf was listed by the Fish and Wildlife Service as endangered and has killed agriculture and mining jobs throughout the West. Still the list goes on and on. So it is not that these are just hypothetical ideas that the war on Western jobs is occurring by a government. These are ongoing processes.

One group, the Center for Biological Diversity, has declared they are going to list over 1,000 species this year, that they are going to petition for the listing of over 1,000 species this year. Understand that their lawyers get reimbursed at the rate of $350 to $500 per hour. For every lawsuit that they bring against the government, every lawsuit that kills jobs provides employment for lawyers in those groups, so know that the taxpayer is footing the bill but yet losing jobs in the meantime.

I would like to recognize Mr. THOMPSON now, and thank him very much for being here tonight.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Hobbs, New Mexico, for yielding. Representing part of Pennsylvania, it is an honor to be part of the Western Caucus. I represent western Pennsylvania and central Pennsylvania and a little bit of eastern Pennsylvania. My district is so large, so rural.

It has many of the same issues, Mr. Speaker, that fit very well within the Western Caucus. We have public lands. All of these issues you are hearing about tonight in terms of what government does as a huge barrier and to kill the jobs, they are the same things that we certainly experience in western Pennsylvania.

Now, I am proud. I chair the largest subcommittee of Agriculture, Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, so I want to go down another road in which how government kills jobs, western jobs, whether it is the West or western Pennsylvania or, frankly, throughout the United States.

We recently had a hearing reviewing the proposed United States Forest Service plan. Our National Forests, it is very clear they are not National Parks. Our National Forests were created to provide sustainable resources, predominantly timber, but timber is not the only thing. Our forests were created to provide us energy, access to oil, to natural gas, to coal, to minerals. So that is why they were put in existence.

As we look around the Nation, certainly in my congressional district, my National Forest is relatively small compared to I think some in the West, 513,000 acres, but it is profitable and home to the world's best hardwood cherry. It has a management plan that says in a sustainable way, to keep the forest healthy they are supposed to harvest over 90 million board feet a year. But yet for over a decade they have been doing 20 million. One of the members of my subcommittee, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, talked about his National Forest, they harvest zero board feet out of his National Forest.

Now, there are a lot of problems with that. First of all, if you don't harvest timber, if you don't manage that forest in a healthy way, you subject yourself to wildfires, to invasive species. It creates an unhealthy forest. But it also kills jobs, and that is what we have seen. We have seen that all across the Nation, in the West, frankly, all parts of the country with our National Forests where the Forest Service has failed to do its job in terms of managing the forests I think in a productive way. That point came out very clearly in the first of what will be I think a number of hearings that we are going to do on this issue.

Frankly, timber production is down. I am proud to say that it is up to 40 million board feet in the Allegheny National Forest, but that is only with the persistence of kind of being with the Forest Service almost on a constant basis. But it is still a long ways from 90.

The production of timber is down. That means timber jobs, first of all. Our sawmills, our timber industry, those jobs, in many parts of the country those jobs have gone away. They are extinct today. And the forest products jobs that come as a result of having that timber supply are going away.

□ 1900

And the economies. Our rural communities were taken in order to create these national forests by the Federal Government. And the economies of our rural communities that make up those forests depended on the promise that was made when the forests were formed that the timber industry, minerals, oil, gas, coal, all those sustainable resources would be provided, would be produced, and that would maintain the economies of those rural communities. Well, that's been a lie by the Federal Government. They haven't done that. They haven't met their responsibilities. And that has killed jobs and killed our economies in rural communities.

In terms of energy, in my district I was sworn in for the first time in Congress in January 2009. Within a week of when I was sworn in, the Forest Service chose to place a moratorium on any new drilling permits in my national forest.

Now, you have to understand, 93 of the subsurface rights are privately owned. So these are owned by private individuals. And they came in and imposed this moratorium because of some lawsuit, as my good friend talked about, and the taxpayers paid their lawyers and paid the organizations to file, basically, and we went over a year with people losing their jobs, families suffering for just that reason.

Thankfully, a Federal judge overturned that decision. Of course, the Forest Service appealed and the Federal judge threw it out again. And now the Forest Service has appealed again. They've taken it down to a different court, down to the Philadelphia court, and we'll see what turns out there. But that's just another example of just bad government.

My good friend Mrs. LUMMIS from Wyoming talked about the Marcellus natural gas. Let me just say that's all private sector. The government is not involved in it. Natural gas is mostly private lands. And it works. It has created over 88,000 jobs in Pennsylvania. I have counties that, for the first time in history, their unemployment rates are below both State and national averages.

Prosperity is a good thing, and everybody benefits—not just the people that are getting the royalties or the leases, but, frankly, the churches, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the little leagues, the fire departments, the hospitals, because rural folks are generous and they support good causes.

And so the communities are growing. The annual average earnings are going up. Frankly, government is benefiting because local, State, and even the Federal Government is getting a little more tax revenue by all that economic activity. And unemployment is down and energy security is there, and it's lower energy costs for everyone, and it's private sector.

If the government owned that land, we'd never be experiencing those benefits. Though, despite that fact, despite these are private lands—and I'll end my comments with these, because I know we've got other Members that want to speak tonight—this administration is going after that natural gas production. They are. There are some in this body that are proposing Federal Government overreach.

We're accessing that energy as a good steward. We've got regulations. The Department of Environmental Protection in Pennsylvania is a tough agency, but they do a fair job. They're always looking at their regulations. But we've got this administration who wants the Federal Government to employ the EPA and to send them into Pennsylvania and other parts of our country where we're producing domestic energy, which will essentially shut down our energy production and will shut down this prosperity, will shut down these jobs that are being created, will shut down the movement that we're making towards energy security.

I want to thank my good friend from New Mexico for hosting this hour tonight. I'm proud to be a part of the Western Caucus and proud to be with you this evening.

Thank you.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments. So far, the quote of the night is ''prosperity is a good thing.'' Yet our government seems to have a war on prosperity. Why is our government trying to undermine the economy when we're struggling with high deficits and unemployment? It defies imagination that that's going on.

I would like to recognize now my good friend from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) for such time as he may consume. I appreciate your being here. Georgia and Pennsylvania in the Western Caucus, that's the way it should be. We're west of somewhere. Thank you for being here tonight.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. PEARCE. I appreciate your yielding me some time. Let me go forward with what Mr. THOMPSON was just saying and what you were just commenting on about prosperity.

Just today, I had a businessman in my office relaying to me a conversation he had with one of the liberal Democrat Senators, and he was talking about the issues that concerned him and his business. She was arguing over and over again about how government needs to do all the regulatory constraints on business and how businesses need to be taxed higher, and it's not fair for businesses to be making money at the levels that they are. In fact, just today, we saw some of our Democratic colleagues talk about the oil companies and the kind of money that they have been making with increased prices of gasoline. Finally, in frustration, this Democrat Senator said to this businessman: All you're concerned about is profit. You just want to make a profit.

Well, that's what business does. It makes a profit for its shareholders. If it's a corporation, it makes a profit for small businesses.

The policies of this administration, the policies that we've seen from our Democratic colleagues when NANCY PELOSI was running the House, now with HARRY REID running the Senate, and certainly the Obama administration, they're trying to destroy profits. They're trying to destroy our economy, in my opinion.

In fact, the President, himself, has said that he doesn't mind seeing gasoline prices go up as long as they go up incrementally. He doesn't want to see the massive increases, but as long as they keep going up. His own Energy Secretary, Dr. Chu, fairly recently said somehow we have to find a way to make gasoline in the United States at the same price that it is in Europe, which is roughly $8 a gallon today. The policies of this administration are doing just exactly that.

Today, in the Science, Space and Technology Committee, we were talking about fracking. The EPA scientist that is studying fracking admitted that there has not been one single incident—not one—where fracking has been implicated in contaminating drinking water. Not one.

But I believe this administration is doing everything it can to try to destroy energy production in this country and to try to destroy the free enterprise system. In fact, the President, himself, said that if his policies go into effect, to use his own words, energy prices will ''necessarily skyrocket.''

Well, who's going to be hurt? Who's going to be hurt when fuel prices go up and food prices go up, not only gasoline and diesel fuel?

I was talking to a manager in a restaurant just last week in Athens, Georgia, and was asking him about his food prices in his restaurant and what is going on because of the high cost of gasoline. He said his suppliers are adding a fuel surcharge onto the cost of the foods that he's buying and selling in his restaurant. And it's the policies of this administration that are doing that.

Just yesterday, I had a constituent of mine who's an egg producer in Georgia come in and talk about some of the issues that he faces. I am from Georgia. I'm a good southerner, and I love my grits and cornbread. For folks who are not southerners, grits are made from corn. Cornbread, obviously, that's self-explanatory where that comes from. I think even Yankees will know that cornbread comes from corn, too. The thing is that I, as a good southerner, cannot see driving down the road, burning up my grits and cornbread in the fuel tank of my GMC Yukon that I used as my office, actually, when I was making house calls as a medical doctor.

I hear our Democratic colleagues talk about we need to remove the subsidies for the oil companies. Well, the American people need to know that those subsidies are actually tax credits. They're not true subsidies as such. In fact, HARRY REID was recently wanting a subsidy for gold mining in his own State of Nevada. He also wanted us to continue funding the cowboy poetry festival in his home State.

We've got to stop spending these outrageous funds that the Federal Government has been spending, and we need to start creating jobs in a strong economy. The best way to do that is to get rid of the policies of this administration that are destroying jobs, destroying our economy, increasing the cost of gas and diesel fuel for farmers and everybody in this country.

But back to my egg producer friend. I've got a chart here that we made up in our office, a dozen eggs in Georgia. We have the subsidies—which are really not subsidies for the oil companies; they're just tax credits. But we have subsidies for ethanol production, which are true subsidies. Our administration has tried to pick winners and losers. One of the winners that they picked is the ethanol production.

□ 1910

That's been a total failure, and what that has done is increase the cost of gasoline. It's increased the cost of food across this country too. In fact, the major ingredient in feed for chickens is corn. Corn, when I when I was farming back a number of years ago, was $2.50 a bushel. Now it's approaching $8 a bushel. In 2005, before this ethanol subsidy, the total feed cost per dozen eggs—so when a consumer goes out and buys a dozen eggs—the food cost in that dozen eggs was 21 cents per dozen of eggs. Now, 2011, it's approximately 52 cents per dozen.

So who pays for that? Does the egg producer? No, it's the consumer. When

you go to the grocery store and buy a dozen eggs, you're paying more money for the failed policies of this administration, particularly when it has to do with energy.

If we start drilling for oil, tapping into our natural gas supplies, start producing coal, particularly doing the clean coal technology that we have, having an all-of-the-above energy policy, what's going to be the long-term outcome for the American consumer? For every single American, it's going to lower the cost of eggs and milk and bread because it's going to lower the cost of the production of all the foodstuffs. Every single good and service in this country is affected by these high costs of gasoline and fuel oil, diesel fuel, et cetera. The people who are going to be hurt the most are the poor people, those on limited incomes, our senior citizens.

I hear over and over again our Democrat colleagues say that Republicans are in the back pockets of Big Oil. Wrong. I would like to see us end all subsidies, all of them, but particularly the ethanol subsidy, which has not made any sense whatsoever. And let's start developing our own energy resources, which will create jobs here in America.

Just yesterday and today, we've been debating three bills that came out of our Natural Resources Committee. Those three bills will enable us to start tapping into the God-given energy resources that we have in this country, help us to be less dependent upon foreign sources for energy. If the President will ever sign those three bills into law, the short-term effect, I think it's been estimated, is that 200,000 new jobs are going to be created. So 200,000 new jobs will be created just with those three bills, just to be able to open up developing our own energy resources here in America that the President is blocking. Long term those three bills, it's estimated, will create 1.2 million new jobs here in the United States, American jobs, and help create a stronger economy.

The failed energy policies of this administration are hurting job creation. They are hurting our economy. They're raising the cost of gasoline. They're raising the cost of diesel fuel. They're raising the cost of fuel oil. They're going to hurt egg producers and thus egg consumers, consumers of all goods and services. Your food costs are going to go up. The cost of every good and service in this country is going to go up all because of the failed policies of this administration because we cannot develop our own energy resources, our God-given resources, that we have in this country. I submit if a nation is not energy independent, it's not a secure nation. And that's where we are today. We've got to become energy independent. And how is that going to happen?

Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen one time said when he feels the heat, he sees the light. The most powerful political force in America is embodied in the first three words of the U.S. Constitution: We the people. When we the people start contacting Members of Congress, particularly the Democrat Members of the House, and the Members of the U.S. Senate, and demand that we develop our own energy resources here in America, that we have an all-of-the-above energy policy that looks at everything—nuclear energy, alternative sources, clean coal, oil, gas—everything, which we must do, and that's what Republicans are fighting for, if enough people all over this country will contact their Senators and their Members of Congress and say, let's develop our own energy resources, let's develop American jobs, let's develop a strong economy here in America, then we can do so. But it's up to we the people to be able to demand that from your elected Representatives.

Thank you, Mr. PEARCE, for yielding to me. I appreciate the great job you're doing as chairman of the Western Caucus, and I'm honored to be a part of that caucus.

Before I close, I encourage people to go on my Web site, broun.house.gov, and they can actually look at all the things on this chart. They can look at it in fine detail and understand how high energy costs are creating high prices for eggs in the grocery store.

Thank you, Mr. PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his comments and his perceptions.

As he mentioned, it seems that Washington has a war on profits. I think that maybe our friends on the other side of the aisle don't understand that profits pay high salaries. If you work in an industry with no profits, you work at low salaries.

Profits pay to reinvest in new buildings, creating construction dollars in neighborhoods. Profits are put into youth training, baseball leagues, soccer leagues. Profits are reinvested into new equipment, causing manufacturing firms to thrive. Profits are invested in dividends, and they cause increased values of stocks, helping retirees.

And, finally, profits are the only thing that corporations pay tax on. They do not pay taxes on losses. So when we begin to talk about taking away the profits of companies, understand that we're talking about undermining the American way of life. This attack on profits is an attack on the American way of life.

I am pleased to be joined tonight by a good friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank Chairman PEARCE from New Mexico for using the Western Caucus to illustrate some of these ideas and situations that are here.

I'm also grateful that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) was just here and tried to show how whenever you have a policy that prohibits or discriminates or lessens the amount of energy that we have in this country, it has a direct impact on individuals and people. As he was showing, it has a direct impact on the cost of food. For every dime that diesel fuel increases, that's $400 million the agricultural industry has to put onto the cost of food. Not just in transporting the food but for the fertilizer to grow it, for the boxing, the shipping, the manufacturing of it—all of those things are added to it. For every penny that the cost of gasoline increases at the pump, that is $1 billion that's taken out of the household income of Americans.

And whom is that going to impact the worst? Obviously the people at the lower end of the economic scale, who have the most difficult time making their budget stretch to pay for higher transportation costs through fuel, for higher food costs because fuel goes up, for higher heating costs because fuel goes up. They're the ones who are hurt.

Now, I also appreciate Mr. PEARCE for illustrating that actually we have a situation in which the West, without trying to be specific to a region, but the West has been treated with the heaviest hand over the past few years and has suffered the greatest consequences of that heavy hand.

Last year, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they simply said that the region that had the highest unemployment for last year and the year before happened to be the West. Six of the top 12 States that had the largest decline in employment-to-population ratio since the recession that began in 2007 are found in the West.

□ 1920

Three of the top five States showing the most stress last year in the summer were found in the West, and unfortunately, Washington's misguided policies over the last several years are simply making these situations worse.

Let me, if I could, talk about a couple of specific situations that I have found in my State that have added to this problem of what we call the ''war on the West,'' because they have had the dual whammy of not only increasing the price of energy, which is the price of living and the price of doing business, but at the same time of decreasing jobs in our particular area. Part of that is because the West simply has, as a region, over half of its land owned by the Federal Government. This government—it was not planned this way; it just kind of happened—owns 1 out of every 3 acres in the United States. Yet, west of Denver, it owns 1 out of every 2 acres in the United States, and we get to have the fun of working with the heavy hand of the Federal Government on all sorts of efforts, especially when the Department of the Interior has unlimited, arbitrary and capricious powers given to them.

For example, the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Utah went through what they call ''regional management plans.'' I have 16 areas. Half of them went through a regional management plan. The people on the ground,

who are working there, who live there and who know that area, spent 7 years in developing a regional management plan, which means simply: How will the land owned by the Federal Government—and remember, it's still half of it—be used for development purposes?

For 7 years, they held the public hearings, and they went through all the processes. They came up with their plan. The Secretary of the Interior came into office, and in the first few days, he simply said, Those plans don't fit the needs of this country because they authorize 77 oil and gas leases, places where the professionals on the ground determined that the best use of government land was used to develop oil and gas in the State of Utah. The Secretary simply said no. He believed the last administration had made a rush to judgment, and therefore it was his best decision to suspend not only those oil leases but also the land management plans at the same time. He did it simply by the stroke of his signature. There was no work with it. There was no counterbalance. There was no checks and balance system. He simply said, I think it was wrong. It was a rush to judgment. I'm going to stop it.

Now, like everything else, this situation went to court, and the judge ruled that, actually, the Secretary was wrong. There was not a rush to judgment by anyone other than the Secretary when he suspended those leases. However, because there was a timing element—one of those technicalities—and because those who were suing waited too long to file the lawsuit, the decision of the Secretary would stand. Now, what the Secretary said is, I'll be magnanimous, and of the 77, I'll let 17 go forward. The other 60, they stay off the table. I don't care what the regional management plan did.

The end result of that was simply that you don't have a whole lot of leases that will be put out for development. Unfortunately, it has a ripple effect through the community because not all leases are found on Federal land. There is also State land and very few pieces of private land; but oftentimes they abut one another, and if you block the leasing opportunity on this piece of land, it sterilizes the leasing development opportunity on its neighbor land at the same time. Plus, if all of a sudden the Department of the Interior is sending a message that they're going to be tough on this kind of development, industry gets the message, and they're not going to fight that kind of issue, and they will leave at the same time.

The net result of this one action by the Department of the Interior was that unemployment in one rural county in Utah was a loss of 3,000 jobs in a county that only has 30,000 residents. The unemployment tripled over a course of months and only and solely because of this one decision: that not only did we not have the ability of drilling on those Federal lands, but you also lost the opportunity for the private sector to go onto State lands and onto certain private lands. Then there was the ripple effect as they realized what simply happened, which is that the private sector said, I'm not going to put up with this. They took the investment capital that they were willing to put into the region of rural Utah and took it somewhere else where they didn't have to deal with the Department of the Interior.

We have the same situation in the West in another particular area, specifically with oil shale. The U.S. Geological Survey, which oddly enough is part of the Department of the Interior, has estimated that, in a 16,000-square mile area of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, there are, roughly, 2 trillion barrels of oil that can be extracted from oil shale. That is more energy than we get from Canada. This is not a new and unusual process. Estonia, in the Baltic states, has been using this same process of extraction from oil shale for 80 years, and they have done it successfully and in an environmentally friendly manner.

We could copy that same proposal—but no. Once again, this administration has decided to slow-walk any development, slow-walk any allowance of projects to go forward to demonstrate what we can and cannot do. The net result of losing this opportunity for oil shale is at least $1.9 trillion added to the economy of this country, and there is projected to be up to 100,000 new jobs that would be lost simply by this one decision as well.

Now, this is a small area, but if you compound that fact of what is happening not just in my State of Utah but what is happening in Colorado and Wyoming and New Mexico and Nevada and the rest of the West and if you see the compounded problem we have, you truly can understand why in the recession the West was the hardest hit—because we were dealing with the Federal Government in a way that was certainly unfair.

I'd like to say one last thing before I yield back to the gentleman from New Mexico.

In the last days, as the gentleman said, we have been talking about the ability of trying to jump-start our energy portfolio, our energy self-dependence, our energy ability in three bills specifically dealing with offshore development. We have that same potential for energy development onshore as well that we need to talk about at the same time; but sometimes we also need to talk here simply about understanding how words have meaning. We have been throwing around words in the debate over the last couple of weeks in a way that, I think, has been somewhat unfair and somewhat dilatory, and it has clouded the actual issue of what is going on.

For example, there are those who are saying we don't need to actually develop any new oil or gas resources. There are plenty of leases out there that aren't being produced. I want you to know, when you deal with words, that ''lease'' is not the same thing as a permit to drill, and a ''permit to drill'' doesn't mean you're going to find anything for production. Just because there is a lease does not mean there is production. I had a company that was in my office today which has a lease in one of the Western States. They received the lease 6 years ago. Only this year did they finally check off all the boxes, run through all the bureaucratic hoops and do the environmental impact statements to get the permit 6 years later to finally start preparing to drill to see if it is actually productive. Those 6 years cost a lot of money to that company, money which could have gone to providing work, providing jobs, as well as resources to help grow the economy of this country. That's a real cost, and that is real and legitimate.

We've heard comments before about how this country doesn't have enough oil because we don't have enough reserves to make it worthwhile. According to the CRS, Congressional Research Study, we have $1.2 trillion worth of gas that is available for production here in the United States. That puts us in the top five countries in the world for oil. We are not an oil-poor country. However, when we talk about reserves, reserves are not the same thing as the amount of money that's available. Our reserves are a definition that is established by the SEC, and by the definition we use, we will always have fewer reserves than other countries, by definition.

In addition to that, a reserve can't count as a reserve until you can actually get to it. When we put parts of this country off, when we have a moratorium, by definition, that takes us out of the reserve. So, when someone says we don't have as many reserves as other countries, it's probably true. That doesn't mean we don't have enough oil that can be used and produced. It simply means it doesn't fit the definition. ''Reserve'' is not the same thing as ''amount of producible oil.''

Just like as the gentleman from Georgia said, a subsidy—and we talked about all the subsidies the industries are getting—is when the government actually pays cash to somebody. The oil companies are not getting cash from the government.

□ 1930

A subsidy should not be confused with a tax credit or a tax deduction. If it were, when I fill out my long form and I write down my charitable contributions and get to write them off, that means the Federal Government is subsidizing me or subsidizing the charity to which I'm giving. That doesn't make any sense.

What we need to do is talk about the words as the words really are meant to be and make sure that the words are used the proper way and not for some rhetorical effort to inflame the situation and reach some other result.

The last word we need to talk about is simply ''jobs.'' Right now, there are twice as many government jobs as in all of manufacturing combined. In 1960, those ratios were reversed. We have gone to a lot of effort over the last 2 years to pass jobs bills, all of which produced government jobs. What we need to do is look at jobs in the private sector, and the private sector which creates a reliable, long-term job, a job that also equates wealth that goes back into the system and helps to grow our economy and grow our country.

Those are the jobs we should be after, and those are the jobs we need to do. Unfortunately, we will never develop those jobs until we have a governmental energy policy that is reliable, that is not dependent on the whims of some foreign country, and that helps us develop the resources that we have in this country. We can do it and we need to do it, and I appreciate Mr. PEARCE from New Mexico for bringing up this issue because that's exactly what we need to do as a policy.

With that, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his comments. He pointed out that this Nation is rich in shale oil. We do, in fact, have 2 trillion barrels in reserve in shale. That all was outlawed from use by the American consumers back in 2007 in a bill passed by NANCY PELOSI off the floor of the House.

To put that in perspective, what does 2 trillion barrels of shale oil mean? We have only used 1 trillion barrels of oil completely in our history in just shale oil. That's not natural gas. That's not normal petroleum. We have double in shale oil what we've consumed up to this point.

Another comment that was made earlier is that we subsidize and that consumers end up paying for things that they don't know they're paying. I just talked to a constituent last week. He said that he was given a tax credit for 40 percent of a solar facility that he put on his own home. That was from the Federal Government; from the State government, another 10 percent. So about 50 percent of the cost of the program was completely reimbursed by the government. But the big deal is they're paying him 22 cents per kilowatt hour of energy that he is able to sell back into the system. Now, that 22 cents needs to be compared to the 7 cents that electricity normally costs. So the consumer is tagged with three times the cost of electricity that is provided by solar power that is bought from individual producers. The consumer will pay more for the power. It is not an easy process to understand, but consumers will ultimately pay all of the higher energy costs.

We hear much today in Washington about the subsidies for Big Oil. Be aware that there are no subsidies for Big Oil. There are simply write-offs that every company is allowed to take legally; write-offs to encourage them to invest in machinery; write-offs that sound like depreciation, amortization; write-offs that are allowed by accounting techniques across the board in this country. Understand that when we begin to penalize these oil companies, we're going to cost America jobs.

So let's talk just a bit about the different supposed subsidies that are, in fact, legitimate write-offs that companies are given.

The suggestion was made that we repeal the expensing of the intangible drilling costs. The intangible drilling costs usually represent 60 to 80 percent of the cost of a well. Historic U.S. policy allows a deduction for development. That's since 1913 in this government's Tax Code; and yet, today, we're talking about reversing it at a time when we're starving for jobs, 9 percent unemployment, and we're going to talk about making it harder to employ people in this country.

Other businesses are able to expense their research and development projects. Pharmaceutical companies, IEC specifically targets U.S. oil and gas companies. It will discourage innovation in the energy sector at a time when we need more innovation, not less. Disallowing the expensing of intangible drilling costs will put the American consumer in a worse position and endanger American jobs.

The second idea that's talked about in raising taxes for oil companies is to do away with the write-off, the dual capacity rule. The dual capacity rule was to ensure that income that is taxed by another nation is not also taxed by the U.S. It's something that the U.S. has been alone on in taxing double. We tax not only the amount that is made here but the amount that is made in other countries, the profits made in other countries. That's a tax inversion that has cost us many jobs.

Now then, we have the allowance of dual capacity rule in place to stop that, and yet our friends on the other side of the aisle are saying that we must stop this practice. All it's going to do is make the U.S. more inhospitable for investment in energy resources. At a time when we're seeing $4 gasoline, at a time when our economy is struggling, when we need jobs, we're talking about making American businesses less competitive and making American jobs more scarce.

The final section is maybe the most egregious of all, that is, the repeal of section 199 manufacturing exemptions for oil and gas companies. In 2004, the Congress enacted section 199 for manufacturing companies to encourage them to bring jobs back to this country. From 2004 to 2007, the oil and gas industry was responsible for 2 million new jobs that were created. The oil and gas companies currently support 9.2 million jobs. Almost all manufacturers receive a 9 percent credit. That's, again, in order to encourage them to come back to this country.

The oil and gas companies have only been receiving a 6 percent credit because they've already been picked on by the people in this town. But now they're suggesting that we would want to completely do away with the manufacturing credit. Keep in mind, that's the refining of gasoline. That's the definition of manufacturing in oil and gas.

So at a time when we're starving for jobs, we're going to make U.S. manufacturers, the U.S. refineries, less competitive. We're going to encourage Venezuela and Hugo Chavez to send more jobs there, to take more jobs and to send more gasoline here. It just doesn't make sense.

Tonight, I'd like to wrap up with this one picture about the status that our country is in. Our country right now has a tremendous problem with its economy. The problem is this: in Washington, we spend $3.5 trillion. Our revenues to the government are $2.2 trillion. That's a $1.3 trillion deficit. The accumulated deficits over the lifetime of this country are almost $15 trillion.

I show those deficits running out the end of the pipeline into our debt barrel to show the accumulated debt to the Nation. I also show a green sludge pouring over the edge of the barrel because we've got $202 trillion of accumulated costs of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. These are the things that are wrecking our economy.

This chart given by OMB and CBO, the Congress, and the White House both show that our economy is going to fail in 2038 because of these practices. At a time when we're starving for jobs, this administration has a war on western jobs. It has a war on our energy. It has a war on the jobs in the timber industry. It has a war on our way of life.

This is not the time to be conducting partisan politics in this town. It's a time for us to create jobs. With each job created, the 2.2 is greater because each person pays in increment more taxes, but they also are no longer receiving welfare, unemployment, and food stamps. So the 3.5 decreases.

The path forward is simple. We simply ask that the President get on board.

□ 1940

LOST JOBS AND THE TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, jobs need to be America's number one priority. When people go back to work, it seems fairly obvious that we'll not only balance family budgets, but we'll be able to balance America's budget. They're tied together. But for some reason, too many officials here in Washington, both elected officials and those who lobby, simply haven't gotten that message. At the end of last month, The Washington Post ran an excellent piece, asking, ''What is it about the word 'jobs' that our Nation's leaders

fail to understand?'' ''How has the most painful economic crisis in decades somehow escaped their notice?'' and ''Why do they ignore the issues that Americans care most desperately about?'' Very good questions. I tried to answer them myself, as I have fought the resistance to try to help reemploy those who seek work across our country.

I would have to say that, in some ways, some here in this city are privileged. They've really led very privileged lives. They've been insulated, insulated from living in a family that gets a pink slip, insulated from being in a family that knows what it's like to live on an unemployment check and wonder if you will ever be able to get regular checks again, insulated from families that desperately worry when their unemployment checks expire and there is no job.

A lot of people here inherited their wealth, and they truly are insulated, but for the rare few. Others had their educations paid for. They didn't work for them. It's unbelievable. There are a lot of people here just like that. Some of them always had enough to eat. They really never had to scrimp and choose whether they'd have milk, whether they'd have water, whether they'd split a cabbage in order to get their family through the weekend. So there really is a lot of distinction between what people have had to endure in their own lives. And frankly, there are a lot of people in this capital city that make a whole lot of money. I'm going to talk about some of them in a second.

But recent polls tell us what the majority of Americans are thinking about. And according to two recent polls, four out of 10 Americans believe our country is heading in the wrong direction. I agree with them. And as gas prices rise and have climbed to record levels, 71 percent of our citizens are experiencing financial hardship. More cars are along the roads in Ohio where people just simply run out of gas. Or you see them at the pump, and they only put in $20, and they hope that maybe a week from now, the price won't be as bad.

I want to dedicate my time this evening to talking about jobs, about America being held hostage to what the gentleman ahead of me was talking about, Big Oil, and policy changes we need to make to get our economy running strongly here at home. And I want to just point out a couple of measures of our predicament so that people are thinking about different aspects of what we face so that we can really fix it.

Now, this first chart up here shows that for the last quarter century or more, America has not had balanced trade accounts. What does that have to do with the budget deficit? When you are in the red and you are importing more than you are exporting, you are having to actually borrow money to pay the difference. Somebody else is making the money off of us. We have not had balanced trade accounts since the 1970s. Every single year, more and more of America's wealth has been outsourced to someplace else. Every American knows that. You see the jobs that have disappeared from your own community.

I use the Maytag Washer Company in Newton, Iowa. I'm not from Iowa. I'm from Ohio, but I still have my old Maytags, great product. Those jobs ended up in Mexico after they were actually outsourced because of a big buyout that happened in that company. And that's happened in company after company after company. That's what's happened to all of our manufacturing jobs. But this chart here shows the U.S. trade deficit, every single year. In 2010, last year, we had $500 billion more in imports into our country than exports going out. This is a serious part of the problem.

Now, those trade deficits result from agreements America has signed that were supposed to result in exactly the opposite, job creation in our country. Probably the best known is NAFTA. In 1993, this Congress passed an agreement called NAFTA, and the people who voted for it said, Oh, it's going to create all these jobs in the United States, and we won't have to worry. Relations with Mexico will be terrific. Well, guess what? Ever since NAFTA passed, there hasn't been a single year when we have had even a trade balance with Mexico. No. Every year, our deficit with Mexico—more imports coming in here from Mexico than exports going out—has gotten worse.

And what about in Mexico? In Mexico, over 35,000 citizens of that country were shot last year related to the illegal drug trade. We are receiving the reciprocal of that across our border as people flee just to try to have a better way of life. Because you see, the farmers in that country, the small holders, were thrown off their land as a result of NAFTA. Two million people desperate to earn a living. We said that would happen. People didn't care. They simply didn't care. And so we lost that vote on the margin of about 12 votes. But what we said would happen in '93 has happened, and we've had over $1 trillion of trade deficit with Mexico.

The balance of trade with South Korea. Knowing the terrible trade record that this country has had with every country we've signed one of these free trade agreements with, what is the administration proposing and the majority here proposing? They want to bring up more, more NAFTA-like agreements. They want to bring us Korea. They want to bring us Colombia. I don't know what else they're going to throw in. But you know what? We've already got a trade deficit with Korea. We take hundreds of thousands of their cars. They take a few, a few thousand from us. And the agreement that the last administration and this administration has reached with Korea won't bring us trade balance with Korea. There is no requirement that it's a tit for tat, a reciprocal agreement, or it's one car there for one car here. So we are going to lose more jobs if that agreement moves through here.

This is a pattern that Americans need to understand. And if you look at that overall trade deficit that's been going on and getting worse and worse every year, what is the top category of that deficit? The top category is imported oil. I agree with some of my colleagues who have pinpointed the problem, but we can't continue to hold ourselves hostage inside our own Nation on the spear of petroleum. We have to support additional exploration; and we are doing that on our own continent with the Alberta oil sands project, for example, in Canada, the largest construction project on our entire continent. But we also have to diversify. We have to be smart. Prior generations were smart. We need to be smarter.

Today, The Washington Post just published an article on the latest trade numbers. They tell us a lot about our economy. There was some good news. We sold more exports and services. And why wouldn't that happen? The value of the dollar has dropped as we've hemorrhaged jobs here in this country. But a funny thing happened—the trade deficit grew again. More imported oil. High-priced oil keeps pushing us further and further in the red. That $500 billion trade deficit from last year that I referenced, according to the Manufacturing Policy Project, represents a loss of 7 million American jobs. In other words, this hole that's been accumulated over the years, 7 million manufacturing and other jobs lost across our country. That means jobs outsourced someplace else, and then they're imported here. We keep shooting ourselves in the foot over and over and over again.

We can no longer afford to add hundreds of billions of dollars annually to our trade deficit. We need a different trade model that results in trade balances at a minimum and hopefully trade surpluses because you simply can't balance our Federal budget or family budgets when our trade accounts are so costly and so out of whack and so many jobs have been moved offshore.

□ 1950

We hear that the majority wants to bring up more NAFTA-like trade agreements, and one of the countries they're talking about is Colombia. They're talking about Korea; they're talking about Colombia. What Colombia is really about is oil, more imported petroleum, when you really get into the weeds and you look at what that agreement is about.

And the question for America really is, If this is the history of imported consumption of petroleum, is that really the future that we want for this generation and the next and the following?

The red lines here represent the growing share of petroleum consumption in our country that's represented

by imports. It's increased steadily over the last quarter century. That is not a path for American liberty nor American economic success.

We need a trade policy that is results oriented, that results in balance and energy independence here at home. We need to grow our exports, yes, and create jobs here in our country by moving our Nation toward energy independence here at home.

And we need for somebody in the executive branch to stand up and fight for reciprocal trade agreements. I said that to President Obama. What's wrong with a trade surplus? What's wrong with a trade balance? Why do we keep going in the red? Why would anyone accept that as a solution for America?

The unemployment rate rose this past month, I contend, because of rising gas prices. It was not good news for an economy that has been struggling to recover. And if we look back again at the last quarter century, and this chart looks a little complicated, but what it shows—the red line is oil prices—is that every time oil prices peak, what follows? Higher unemployment. It's a very predictable pattern. It happened in the 1970s twice. Here we go, high oil prices with the Arab oil embargo back in the '70s. What happened? Rising unemployment.

If you go back to the late 1980s, early 1990s, same thing. Higher oil prices, higher unemployment. And certainly, now, with the greatest recession since the Great Depression, an enormous rise in 2008 when the stock market crashed. What preceded it was an increase in oil prices to over $4 a gallon. And what happened? The crash. Yes, it's a housing crisis. Yes, it's an unemployment crisis. But what triggered it? Gas prices over $4 a gallon.

The American people, once they understand what's happened, will fix it. America really is a hostage in her own land as a result of imported petroleum.

Just as America is starting to regrow her economy now, Big Oil wants to steer our country back toward recession.

Now, look at this chart. In the first quarter of 2011, just one of the companies, ExxonMobil took in $10.7 billion—that's a B—in profits in one quarter. That's a 69 percent increase over last year.

Occidental, that's the group that wants to drill more in Colombia, and they need a free trade agreement to do that and bring it in here. Their profits are up $1.6 billion, 46 percent increase.

Conoco Philips, $2.1 billion. Their profits are up 43 percent in one quarter, and most of these profits are being pocketed tax-free.

While working Americans earning less than $20,000 paid 15 percent of their income in taxes, Chevron, which made $6.2 billion in one quarter—their profits went up 36 percent—they only paid 4.6 percent in taxes on their total of $32 billion in profits last year.

Now, I heard my colleague earlier talking about, oh, gosh, we should really feel sorry for them because, my gosh, they're making all this money, but they need more tax preferences because they won't invest. What are they doing with all this money? These are the largest profits in American history.

Oil companies aren't paying what they owe in taxes. I'll tell you one thing they are doing with their money. They're handing out handsome campaign contributions.

The Koch brothers of Texas, who made a whole lot of money in that industry, generously donated more than $2 million last year and recently bankrolled Governor Walker in Wisconsin and the anti-worker movement that they're pushing in that State.

Overall, the big oil and gas industry donated $27 million last year to political campaigns and, get ready, spent $146 million on lobbyists. That's over, gosh—for each Member of Congress it's like they've assigned one or two people to each one of us. No wonder Congress voted against closing $53 billion in tax loopholes to Big Oil. That's a 300 percent return on their investment, more than they can make searching for new sources of energy.

In 2010, the biggest oil company, ExxonMobil, paid only 2.3 percent of its profits to the United States. That's scandalous when businesses in my district are paying at a 35 percent corporate profit rate. And you know what? They don't ask me for all those special privileges. The businesses working hard in my region, gosh, I can think of bakeries and of factories and of machine tool companies. They don't ask for special privileges. They want to help America. They want to do their fair share.

But this group, they're wired in here.

The year before, ExxonMobil received an $838 million tax refund. Meanwhile, those in the majority would take away unemployment benefits for working Americans. And I can tell you what: you can go across this country in the food lines in community after community, and you know who's lined up? So many of our veterans who have come home to no work.

I say take some of this, create a civil works program, let our returning veterans lead it and improve communities across this country. Let them take unemployed Americans and move around this Nation, fixing up roads, fixing up bridges, painting up what needs to be done, reforesting, doing what Franklin Roosevelt knew how to do a century ago.

Of course, you know, looking at these numbers is British Petroleum. British Petroleum, over the last 5 years, instead of paying taxes, actually took over $48 billion in tax breaks. And in the first quarter of this year they've already made $7.2 billion more, a 16 percent increase over what they earned last year. That's despite the terrible oil spill down in Louisiana and along the gulf.

So it's clear who the winners are. Since January, crude output has actually risen slightly. And although demand has remained steady, prices have climbed by 23 percent. Meanwhile, oil stock prices have risen. Just at Chevron, the stocks have risen 14 percent.

Tax loopholes, corporate welfare, government subsidies, does this really sound like a free market to Americans who are listening tonight?

I urge my colleagues to reject more giveaways for oil companies who are raking in money by holding the American people hostage. It's time to hold them accountable. They ought to pay their fair share. Other businesses do. Americans do.

Let's cut the billions of dollars in corporate welfare and focus on getting hardworking Americans back to work. We need to create jobs in this country and close those trade deficits. We need to stop outsourcing our jobs through these so-called free trade agreements that really aren't free, and we need to move to balanced trade accounts.

We need to reform the NAFTA trade model and not pass the same kind of deal for Korea or Colombia. We need reciprocal trade, not trade deficits. Our country, for too long, has been held hostage to these agreements.

And we need energy independence to help restore our own liberty. Wouldn't it be great if we could put all Americans to work that need a job and helping to create these new sources of energy? And I know full well it is within the capability of American people to do this.

But we shouldn't put all our eggs in the basket of Big Oil. We ought to give them some competition on price. We ought to look at hydrogen-generation facilities across this country. We have the capability to do that.

We need to move into biofuels. Through the Department of Agriculture, working with our renewable energy community, we are fully capable of unlocking the power of the carbohydrate molecule in this century just as we did the hydrocarbon molecule in the last.

□ 2000

We need to bring our natural gas resources forward. We really need to crack the clean coal riddle and find a way to use our huge reserve of clean coal. We need to keep investing, yes, in solar and in wind power and in geothermal. We are just bringing up these technologies around the country and creating thousands and thousands of jobs.

I represent one of the three solar platforms on the continent, and for the last four decades those who have worked in the glass industry and the silicone industry have been transforming and creating companies like First Solar, which was the hottest stock on Wall Street a couple years ago, companies that are involved in green energy production.

Is it perfect yet? No. But neither was Edison's light bulb when he invented it in Milan, Ohio, where he did so much of

his work, a community that I represent, and we are about to put his statue over in Statuary Hall.

So America has to think about a full set of energy sources and not be so dependent on just one that, for whatever reason, lack of competition probably, but also abuse of power has just come to play too important a role in our economy and in our people. It hurts our people too many times over and over and over again.

Fifty percent of what we could actually save in energy comes through more judicious consumption. We have tried to provide incentives for Americans to insulate their homes, to put in new kinds of windows. There are new building materials coming on the market, new types of insulation, building your home in a manner that uses less energy in the way that it is sited on the spot, using the full energy of the sun where you can. We are much smarter about the way we are building than we were 30 or even 20 years ago, and those improvements need to continue.

Imagine an America where every roof was a solar producer where there is enough sunshine to make a difference. Imagine an America where we captured the power of the wind and properly stored it and moved it to grid. Imagine an America where what you put in your tank, if you even put something in your tank to fuel it, that it is grown and renewable in this country. Imagine an America where you could have plug-in hybrids that move around this country and our gas stations become a different type of fueling station. That is all possible.

We are working through the U.S. Department of Defense, and I will just sort of end with this, because I believe that the Department of Defense knows better than any aspect of our society what we are paying as an oil hostage. Our soldiers are deployed all over the world and very close to oil reserves. I think they are worth more than that. I think their genius can be used inside the boundaries of this country to make us energy independent again. Our energy dependence is our chief strategic vulnerability.

Go to the Marine Corps Web site. I salute the Marines. They are taking the lead inside the Department of Defense in trying to create new solutions, not just on their own bases, but as their troops move around the world.

I salute the Navy. Some of the incredible inventions that they are coming up with to move power from one point to another with not a loss of one kilowatt, are unbelievable, some of the superconducting work that is being done inside Navy today.

I congratulate the Air Force for trying new biofuels and helping to push America forward in terms of its ability to power itself internally.

And I salute the U.S. Army. Your work on solar tents, your work in trying to capture the power of the Earth, to power the systems that you are involved with today is something that is absolutely technologically amazing.

You inspire us all. And there is a way for America not to be so dependent on those who would extract from us but in fact use our genius to restore our liberty and independence again.

Imagine how many jobs we could create in this country if we could bring our military back home and could spend the trillions of dollars that have been spent in oil-producing foreign lands here, at home. Literally, we could rebuild the transmission grid of this country from one end to the other. We could bring up the genius of patent holders who, as we are here this evening, have ideas that can be brought to market and put that money to work for the American people. They deserve it.

God bless America. God bless the future of this country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for May 10 on account of official business in district.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 12, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1521. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 08-02, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1522. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter in response to Pub. L. 110-84 Sec. 708; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1523. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1524. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8175] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1525. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to the Republic of Columbia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1526. 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; Correction [Docket Number: EERE-2008-BT-TP-0020] (RIN: 1904-AB89) received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1527. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Occupational Radiation Protection [Docket No.: HS-RM-09-853] (RIN: 1992-AA-45) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1528. A letter from the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Approval of Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plans for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards for the Edmonson County, KY; Greenup County Portion of the Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY; Lexington-Fayette, KY; and Owensboro, KY [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-1186-201114; FRL-9295-9] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1529. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Interstate Transport of Pollution Revisions for the 1997 8-hour Ozone and 1997 PM 2.5 NAAQS: ''Interference with Visibility'' Requirement [EPA-R08-OAR-2007-1036; FRL-9297-1] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1530. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Nevada; PM-10; Determinations Regarding Attainment for the Truckee Meadows Nonattainment Area and Applicability of Certain Clean Air Act Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0995; FRL-9296-9] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1531. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to the South Coast Portion of the California State Implementation Plan, CPV Sentinel Energy Project AB 1318 Tracking System [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-1078; FRL-9293-6] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1532. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Policies to Promote Rural Radio Service and to Streamline Allotment and Assignment Procedures [MB Docket No.: 09-52]

received March 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1533. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1534. A letter from the Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) Report for FY 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1535. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 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.

1536. A letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1537. A letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1538. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2010 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1539. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2010 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Anti-discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1540. A letter from the Director, EEO and Diversity Programs, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting a copy of the Administration's Fiscal Year 2010 Notification and Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act Annual Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1541. A letter from the Assosciate Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Office'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.

1542. A letter from the Director, Adminsitrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Office's report entitled, ''2010 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1543. A letter from the Clerk of the Court, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (Groesch, et al., v. City of Springfield, IL., No. 07-2932 (March 28, 2011)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1544. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Boards's final rule — Solid Waste Rail Transfer Facilities [Docket No.: EP 684] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1545. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Safe harbor method of accounting for determining the recovery periods for depreciation of certain tangible assets used by wireless telecommunications carriers (Rev. Proc. 2011-22) received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1546. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Relief and Procedures Under Notice 2010-30 for Spouses of U.S. Servicemembers who are Working in or Claiming Residence or Domicile in a U.S. Territory Under the Military Spouses Residency Relief Act [Notice 2011-16] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1547. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities Issued at a Premium [Notice 2011-21] received April 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1548. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Supplemental Notice to Notice 2010-60 Providing Further Guidance and Requesting Comments on Certain Priority Issues Under Chapter 4 of Subtitle A of the Code [Notice 2011-34] received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1549. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Clarification of Controlled Group Qualification Rules [TD 9522] (RIN: 1545-BG94) received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1550. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on two Agency's Drug-Free Workplace Plans, pursuant to Public Law 100-71, section 503(a)(1)(A) (101 Stat. 468); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Oversight and Government Reform.

1551. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Finalizing Medicare Regulations under Section 902 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) for Calender year 2010''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 264. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–75). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1825. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve commuting and transportation options; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 1826. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate criminal penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a standard home office deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1828. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the State of Louisiana for a pilot program to develop measures to eradicate or control feral swine and to assess and restore wetlands damaged by feral swine; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1829. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of nutria; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1830. A bill to authorize the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk products that are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 1831. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr.

KISSELL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 1832. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the State licensure exception for certain health-care professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' 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 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WU, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 1833. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve mental and behavioral health services on college campuses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DOLD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1834. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary dividends received deduction for 2011 or 2012; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 1835. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to fly the flag of a State over the Capitol each year on the anniversary of the date of the State's admission to the Union; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1836. A bill to establish appropriate procedures and sanctions to ensure that unpaid parking fines and penalties owed to New York City by foreign countries are paid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 1837. A bill to address certain water-related concerns on the San Joaquin River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 1838. A bill to repeal a provision of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act prohibiting any Federal bailout of swap dealers or participants; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1839. A bill to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by making the antitrust laws apply to negotiations between groups of independent pharmacies and health plans and health insurance issuers (including health plans under parts C and D of the Medicare Program) in the same manner as such laws apply to protected activities under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 1840. A bill to improve consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1841. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect computerized data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 1842. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and 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 Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1843. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 489 Army Drive in Barrigada, Guam, as the ''John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1844. A bill to amend the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 to clarify that a notice of arrival is not required for certain documented vessels unless arriving from a foreign port or place; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KIND, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1845. A bill to provide for a study on issues relating to access to intravenous immune globulin (IVIG) for Medicare beneficiaries in all care settings and a demonstration project to examine the benefits of providing coverage and payment for items and services necessary to administer IVIG in the home; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1846. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 1847. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, and title 10, United States Code, to extend the number of years that multiyear contracts may be entered into for the purchase of advanced biofuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WEST, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 1848. A bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. 1849. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to make the funding available for carrying out section 140 of title 23 mandatory instead of discretionary; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 1850. A bill to expand retroactive eligibility of the Army Combat Action Badge to include members of the Army who participated in combat during which they personally engaged, or were personally engaged by, the enemy at any time on or after December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1851. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements to compensate local educational agencies and units of local governments for tax revenues lost when the Federal Government takes land into trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe or an individual Indian; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BURGESS, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1853. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for deferred action and parole only in for urgent humanitarian reasons or to gain a significant public benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1854. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program of outreach for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALZ of Minnesota (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1855. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of rehabilitative services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1856. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to strengthen the promotion of religious freedom in United States foreign policy and to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, 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. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Major Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and

Process Heaters''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 60. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 61. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Sewage Sludge Incineration Units''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H. Res. 263. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WU, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 265. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Asian and Pacific Islander HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY:

H. Res. 266. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should, without any further delay, submit the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement to Congress for its consideration and immediate approval under fast track procedures pursuant to the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority of 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. CONYERS introduced a bill (H.R. 1857) for the relief of Bartosz Kumor; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that ''Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .'' (Section 8, Clause 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that ''Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived. . . .'' (Sixteenth Amendment). The Commuter Relief Act modifies the income tax code in a manner that is consistent with these Constitutional authorities.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Congress has the authority to enact this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by the Commerce Clause of the United States which, by granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, allows Congress to prevent federal agencies from interfering in American's ability to buy or sell unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution that, by granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, allows Congress to prevent the federal government from interfering in Americans' ability to grow and process industrial hemp and by the Ninth Amendment and Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution that recognizes that rights and powers are retained and reserved by the people and the states.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1832.

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 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clause 1), which says, ''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. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 1835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution—Article 4 Section 4

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 1836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of section 8 and clause 7 of section 9 of article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 1838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1839.

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. CONAWAY:

H.R. 1840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rest is the power of Congress to regulate Commerce among the several states, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 1841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 1842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1844.

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. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, the bill is authorized by Congress' power to 'provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.'

By Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 1847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, which provides that Congress shall have the power to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; by Article 1, Section 8, which provides that Congress shall have the power 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; and by Article 4, Section 3 which provides that Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 1848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1849.

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. NUGENT:

H.R. 1850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 15 which grants Congress the power to make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 16 which grants Congress the power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1851.

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, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 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. WALZ of Minnesota:

H.R. 1855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1856.

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 ''secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity,'' as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and Amendment I, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 58.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 59.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 60.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 61.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 44: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 58: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FORBES, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 85: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 104: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 127: Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 177: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 198: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 303: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 333: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 396: Mr. JONES, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 401: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 421: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 440: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 452: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 459: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 463: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 466: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 470: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 485: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 488: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 589: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 591: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 609: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 645: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 690: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 733: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 763: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 771: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 822: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 874: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 886: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CARTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 892: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 912: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 937: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 949: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 962: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 964: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 965: Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 972: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 998: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1006: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1026: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1032: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1041: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1054: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1057: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1058: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1070: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1105: Mr. POLIS and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1113: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1121: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1126: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1130: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1145: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1176: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1191: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1193: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1195: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 1240: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1254: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1259: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1269: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1288: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1299: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1311: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1331: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1360: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1375: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1380: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1385: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1397: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1404: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 1407: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1418: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1431: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1441: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 1448: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1451: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1466: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1479: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1489: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1498: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1515: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1523: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1529: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1536. Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1573: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1581: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1585: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 1588: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1592: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1623: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1671: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1674: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1676: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1681: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1684: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 1686: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1689: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1697: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 1705: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1712: Mr. CANSECO, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. HALL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 1716: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1735: Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1744: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1748: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1777: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1781: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1797: Mr. POLIS.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOWDY.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Res. 60: Ms. NORTON and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H. Res. 95: Mr. COBLE and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H. Res. 137: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H. Res. 141: Mr. HOLT and Mr. FORBES.
H. Res. 180: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. Res. 241: Mr. FORBES and Mr. BUCSHON.
H. Res. 244: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 254: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. FORBES.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered to H.R. 754, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, by Representative ROGERS, or a designee does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.