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

NOT VOTING—21

Becerra	Herger	Payne
Campbell	Hirono	Rangel
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Moore	Schock
Doggett	Mulvaney	Serrano
Green, Gene	Neal	Watt
Guinta	Paul	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1435

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 54, H.R. 3248, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 53 and 54, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 15, 2012 I was scheduled to fly out of Champaign, Illinois, on American Airlines Flight 4373 which was supposed to arrive in Chicago at 10 a.m. CST. This flight would have allowed me to make a connector flight to Washington in time for votes at 1:30 p.m. However, a maintenance issue on that flight unfortunately precluded my attendance for the first series of votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on Ordering the Previous Question and "aye" on adoption of H. Res. 547, the Rule for H.R. 3408. Further, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 2079, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Main Street in East Rockaway, New York, as the "John J. Cook Post Office"; H.R. 3247, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Town and Country Commons in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Matthew P. Pathenos Post Office Building"; and H.R. 3248, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 South 5th Street in Saint Charles, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building."

PROTECTING INVESTMENT IN OIL SHALE THE NEXT GENERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY, AND RESOURCE SECURITY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 3408.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 547 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. 3408.

□ 1435

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. 3408) to set clear rules for the development of United States oil shale resources, to promote shale technology research and development, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas 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.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3408, which contains the energy provisions in the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act. This is an action plan to create jobs that will vastly expand American energy production, lower gasoline prices, strengthen our national and economic security, and generate new revenue to help pay for infrastructure, and, Mr. Chairman, all without raising taxes or adding to the deficit.

In this year's State of the Union speech, President Obama proclaimed his support for expanding American energy production with an all-of-the-above energy strategy. Sadly, Mr. Chairman, the President's actions while he has been in office have been anything but pro-energy. In fact, his rhetoric—and I don't say this lightly, Mr. Chairman—is 180 degrees from his actions.

Since taking office, this administration has repeatedly blocked U.S. energy production. The offshore drilling moratorium and the Keystone pipeline are just the tip of the iceberg. He has canceled and withdrawn scheduled lease sales, shut off promising areas to new drilling, blocked mining in mineral-rich areas, and issued countless job-destroying regulations.

Mr. Chairman, actions do speak louder than words. The bill we are considering today is an action plan that clearly contrasts President Obama's anti-energy policies with the pro-energy, pro-American jobs policies of Republicans.

While President Obama has closed off new areas for offshore drilling, this bill will open areas known to contain the most oil and natural gas resources in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Arctic Oceans. As a result, economic analysis has shown that well over 1 million jobs—long-term jobs, long-term American jobs—can be created.

While President Obama opposes energy production in ANWR, this bill will open less than 3 percent of the total area to responsible and safe drilling. That issue has been around a while, Mr. Chairman. ANWR represents the single greatest resource of onshore area production in the United States. This is one of the reasons that way back in 1980, when Jimmy Carter was still President and the Democrats controlled the Congress, they specifically set aside the north slope of ANWR for energy production.

□ 1440

Safe and responsible energy production in ANWR will protect the environment while creating tens of thousands of jobs and providing upwards of 1½ million barrels of oil per day. By the way, this is more than the U.S. imports daily from Saudi Arabia.

While the President has delayed leases and withdrawn over a million acres in the Rocky Mountains to oil shale development, this bill will set clear rules and require additional oil shale leases to be issued. According to the government estimates, this region may hold—and, Mr. Chairman, this is a significant number. This region may hold more than 1½ trillion barrels of oil equivalent. That's six times Saudi Arabia's proven reserves and enough to provide the United States with energy for the next 200 years. And I'm just

talking about oil shale. Robust oil shale development could also create hundreds of thousands of jobs, and that should be self-evident.

Finally, while the President refused to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, this bill would require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, to approve it within 30 days. The Keystone XL pipeline will create more than 20,000 American jobs and displace less stable energy imports with millions of barrels of safe and secure North American oil.

Since this President took office, Mr. Chairman, gasoline prices have climbed by 91 percent. Meanwhile, Iran is threatening to close off the Strait of Hormuz, which is responsible for transportation of almost 17 million barrels of oil a day, or 20 percent of all oil traded. Prices will only climb higher if we don't take action now to increase our energy independence and develop our own energy resources.

Today, Mr. Chairman, Republicans are moving forward with a plan to create more jobs and create more American energy.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Unfortunately, according to the Congressional Budget Office, these drilling measures the Republicans are bringing out on the House floor today, together, would only raise $4.3 billion over 10 years, less than one-tenth of the revenue shortfall needed to fund our highways.

In reality, this bill amounts to little more than a giveaway of our public lands to Big Oil under the guise of funding our Nation's transportation projects, and most estimates are that no new revenue will be produced that is usable for this transportation bill.

Across the United States, oil production is at its highest level in nearly a decade. Natural gas production has reached levels we have never seen before in the United States. Oil production on public lands offshore is higher than it was during each of the last 3 years of the Bush administration.

According to industry analysts, by this summer, there will be nearly 30 percent more floating rigs operating in the Gulf of Mexico than there were prior to the BP spill. Yet the Republican bill would threaten the tourism and fishing economies of coastal States by allowing drilling off of our beaches in Florida, in California, up and down our east and west coasts, and, as well, in an area extensively used by the military where even Secretary Rumsfeld said ''drilling structures and associated development would be incompatible with military activities'' in this area.

This Congress has not enacted a single safety improvement since the BP spill. The bill would allow for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska, ripping out the heart of the crown jewel of our National Wildlife Refuge System. The Arctic Refuge is America's Serengeti. It is one of the natural wonders of the world, like the Grand Canyon, Niagara Falls, or the Great Barrier Reef, and it should be protected.

If we allow drilling in the Arctic Refuge, it will set a precedent that will allow the oil and gas industry to place a bull's-eye on each of the 540 wildlife refuges across this country. And this legislation would rush to give away 125,000 acres of public land in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming to Big Oil for oil shale development. However, there is no commercially viable oil shale technology, and oil shale development could have significant impacts on water quality and quantity in the West if there were a commercially viable technology available, which Shell Oil and the Department of the Interior says does not yet exist.

In fact, the Government Accountability Office has said that the impacts of oil shale development on water could be significant but are unknown. What's more, this provision has been included by the majority, despite the fact that the Congressional Budget Office says that it would not raise any revenue over the next 10 years to fund our highways. So understand that.

This is a provision which CBO says raises no revenue in the next 10 years, but it's just stuck in here. The oil and gas industry would like to see it, so they just tossed it in. Nothing to do with funding transportation.

And the majority's drilling bills wouldn't even ensure that American natural gas stays here in America to help our consumers. Natural gas prices are six times higher in Asia than they are right here. They are more than three times higher in Europe than they are right here.

Low natural gas prices have been driving the economic recovery of the United States. We have far more natural gas in our country—and it's very low-priced—then we have oil. What the Republican bill will allow to happen is for this natural gas to be exported around the world, and exporting our natural gas would eliminate our competitive edge by driving prices up by as much as 54 percent, according to the Department of Energy.

Not ensuring that the natural gas stays here in the United States ensures that the majority, the Republicans, are imposing a de facto natural gas tax on American agriculture, manufacturing, chemicals, steel, plastics by allowing our gas to be exported.

Here's what T. Boone Pickens says about the idea of exporting American natural gas. Here's what he says:

> If we do it, we're truly going to go down as America's dumbest generation. It's bad public policy to export natural gas.

Our natural gas is six times cheaper than Asian; it is three times cheaper than European. What are we doing exporting it? We should keep it here for our own farmers, for our own industries, for our own consumers. That's how we begin to put ourselves on a path of energy independence.

I agree with T. Boone Pickens. We should keep our natural gas here. We should not be following the Republican energy plan of drill here, sell there, and pay more. If we sell this natural gas around the world, the Department of Energy says the price is going up 57 percent here because we'll have less of it. That's how supply and demand works.

The same dynamic exists in the Keystone portion of the bill, where Republicans have failed to include any assurances that even a drop of the oil or the fuels will stay in this country.

When I asked the president of TransCanada, the pipeline company from Canada, whether he would be willing to commit to keeping the oil that passes through this pipeline in the United States, he said no. And why? Because the oil companies and the refineries want to export the fuels to the highest bidders around the world, leaving the American people with all of the environmental risk and little or none of the energy or economic benefit.

So drill here, sell there, pay more, that's not the Republican mantra. Drill here, drill now, pay less. Now they've morphed into what the oil and gas industry want, and all of the economic indicators point to the conclusion that our consumers will be harmed by that.

On the question of the totality of the economic benefits for our country, they are simultaneously proposing to kill the tax breaks for the wind industry, which is now creating 85,000 jobs in our country, in the face of the wind industry, saying that they will have to lay off 40,000 people over the next year unless the production tax break for the wind industry stays on the books.

□ 1450

So all of this is basically upside down as an energy policy. My strongest admonition to the Members who are listening to this debate is to vote ''no'' on this Republican proposal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the Natural Resources Committee and the former chairman of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3408.

I'm really here to talk about ANWR. You know, I just wrote a little poem. It's not too good:

> Old Mother Hubbard went to the cupboard to fetch a barrel of oil.
> Lo and behold, none was there.
> Lack of action by this Congress, beware.
> ANWR still lays bare.
> Time to drill for the people of America.

We have argued this battle over and over again. The gentleman from Massachusetts says no use for atomic power, no use for ANWR, we're in good shape. But look at the prices of gas, Mr. and

Mrs. America. It will go to $5. You say this won't solve the problem. I've heard this before.

If you want to have money for transportation, think for a moment. I passed this bill out, got it to the Senate side, this is the 12th time. One time it got to the President, and President Clinton vetoed it. We would have saved $4 trillion if we had had ANWR open at that time. Think of the highway bill we would have had then. That's something I think the American people should recognize.

We do have the fossil fuels in America. We do have the oil, we do have the gas. But we haven't had the will to develop them because we brought them from overseas. We got them in here, and now we're dependent upon the Mideast, and, yes, Venezuela, our good neighbor Venezuela, Chavez.

It's time for America to wake up. We need this supply of fossil fuels, and it's going to stay here. Not wind, not solar, because fossil fuels are still the cheapest way to move an object. It is the commerce of this Nation. It moves our trains, our planes, our automobiles, our trucks, and our ships, and it will continue to do that. That's what keeps us moving in this country. It keeps our economy strong. As long as we will have that fossil fuel within the United States, it is criminal to continue to rely upon the foreign countries.

We talk about Big Oil. Pick on Big Oil. Big Oil this, Big Oil that, Big Oil this. The truth of the matter is Big Oil does help the United States of America. Little oil helps the United of America. It keeps our trucks and our planes flying. It keeps our economy strong.

So I'm urging you to vote on this aspect of ANWR. Open ANWR. Let's vote on it. Let's provide for this Nation. Let's do what's right for the people in this Nation. It only covers an area as big as Dulles airport. Out of 19 million acres, less than 3,000 acres will be developed. Less than 3,000 acres will be developed to divide us from probably 39 billion barrels of oil, 74 miles away from the pipeline, a pipeline that can deliver 2 million barrels of oil a day to the United States of America, as we have done in the past.

We've had one shipment of oil go overseas, heavy oil. All of the rest has gone to the United States of America. It's gone to the refineries. It's time for us as a Congress to act responsibly.

With all due respect to my friend from Massachusetts, he's against nuclear power. He's against oil. In fact, I question the wind power because one time he was against that. I'm saying, wait a minute. What are we doing to run this country for power? How do we get our economy going again? That is the key to our economy: energy, good cheap energy.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

When the Democrats controlled the Congress in 2009, we passed a bill out here on the House floor that created an advanced energy technology bank that included $75 billion that the nuclear industry could have qualified for, $60 billion for the coal industry for clean coal technology. Although we also built in incentives for wind and for solar and for energy efficiency, we did it all. We gave everyone a running head start. We didn't say ''nothing'' to nuclear. No.

What have the Republicans done over the last year? They passed out here on the floor a bill that zeroed out the money for loan guarantees for wind and solar, but they left in the loan guarantees for the nuclear industry. That's not an all-of-the-above strategy, and you all voted for it unanimously.

No. Here's where we are. This oil-above-all strategy that you have, not all-of-the-above, this is basically at the heart of what this whole debate is all about.

Last year, the oil industry in the United States made $137 billion. This year, they're going to blast right past that $137 billion. Every person watching this debate is looking at the pump right now at $3.50, $4, $4.50 that they're paying, and it's going straight up.

They're going to be reporting profits of upwards of $200 billion. The Republicans continue to keep in the $4 billion-a-year for tax breaks for the oil industry. Over 10 years, that's $40 billion that would pay for the transportation bill.

Subsidizing the oil industry in 2012 to drill for oil is like subsidizing fish to swim or birds to fly; you don't have to do it. The consumer is already doing it at the pump. They're being tipped upside down.

So, there's an easy funding mechanism here. It's just taking away the oil company tax breaks.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

That is the only way that we can substitute the money that stays within that sector.

These guys are going to cut back on the pension plans of Federal retirees in order to pay for a transportation bill when we should be keeping the funding stream within this energy sector because that's why we have cars on the road, in order to use this petroleum.

The oil industry right now is having it both ways. They're getting tax breaks from the taxpayers at the same time that they're taking the other pocket of every American as consumers, and they're taking money out of that pocket as well. That's really at the heart of what this debate is all about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee, Dr. HASTINGS.

I rise in support of H.R. 3408. This legislation does three vital things: it will open up land in the West to oil shale development; open up one of our most promising areas for energy development in the United States, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and increase offshore production as well.

These provisions will create hundreds of thousands of American jobs and ensure the continued production of new domestic increases in our energy security and decrease our reliance on foreign oil—a goal the administration has professed to support time and time again.

Oil shale is one of the most promising new sources of American-made energy. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that the Western United States holds more than 1.5 trillion, with a ''t,'' barrels of oil—six times Saudi Arabia's proven resources and enough to provide the United States with energy for the next 200 years. Opponents to this legislation will argue that this legislation attempts to promote technology that isn't proven.

However, while the American oil shale industry is forced overseas due to regulatory uncertainty and burdensome Federal regulations here, other nations are profiting right now from this technology, countries like Jordan, China, and Estonia.

Just this morning we heard from Secretary Ken Salazar who expressed the administration's support of emerging technologies. You would think that that would include oil shale. Unfortunately, the Obama administration's support amounts to offering leases with such extremely restrictive terms that it attracts hardly any industry support at all.

As a result, countries overseas, which get over 90 percent of their total energy supply from oil shale, like Estonia, have robust oil shale industries.

I asked Secretary Salazar how this administration can say it promotes new energy while stifling research and development of this tremendous energy potential, oil shale, and he had no good answer.

□ 1500

Now, this legislation also opens up energy in Alaska, specifically in the less than 3 percent of ANWR that the bill deals with. This area was set aside by President Carter in 1980 precisely for oil and gas development. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge holds the single greatest potential for a new domestic energy source within the United States. Offshore, this legislation would increase drilling in Federal waters while ensuring the protection for our offshore military operations as well as fair and equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States. This energy legislation will create consistent policies to move the domestic energy industry forward and will create good-paying American jobs for thousands of Americans.

People say all the time to me, Why don't we have a better energy policy in this country? This legislation does exactly that.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3408.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on either side.

The CHAIR. Both sides have 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. My good friend and colleague just asked a very good question: Why don't we have a good American energy policy?

You won't get it with this bill. This may be the worst American energy policy I've ever seen.

Oil shale, are you kidding me? There is no way that you're going to see oil shale developed within the United States at any time probably in our lifetimes. It didn't work in the 1980s. It's not likely to work in the next two decades. So what's this all about? And by the way, if you happen to be from Colorado, Utah, Arizona, California or New Mexico, you'd want to go, Whoa, wait a minute. Oil shale? That takes a lot of water. We don't have enough water, and you're going to use it for that? I don't think so.

Come on. Let's get real here. We do need a real energy policy.

You're going to open up ANWR? There are some very special places in this world, and ANWR happens to be one of them. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge happens to be one of those places. You're not going to open it up. And by the way, as for those of us from California, my good friends on the Republican side are always talking about states' rights. They're always talking about states' rights. Your little piece of legislation here strips away the right of California to take care of its own coastline. It's not just authorizing the offshore drilling. You take away California's coastal zone management powers, stripping away from Californians—all 38 million of us—our ability to take care of our own coast. Something is terribly wrong with this piece of energy legislation.

You're going to fund the transportation with this while stripping money away from the Land and Water Conservation Fund? How does that work? How does that work? And by the way, the money won't be there anyway.

This is not an energy policy—this is a stupid policy—and there ought to be 435 reasons. Each and every person in this House is affected in a negative way by this piece of legislation. There are 435 of us who ought to say, Put this aside just as we have discovered the underlying bill on transportation has found little support and has to go back and be reworked because of its insufficiencies.

This is no way to fund a transportation bill. This is no way to treat California. This is no way to have an energy policy for America. Yes, we do need an energy policy, and we do need to have many different elements to it; but we don't sacrifice those special places like the California coast, like the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, like Bristol Bay, like the coast of Florida, like the east coast of the United States. We do not sacrifice that for an energy policy that doesn't solve the problem that this is purported to solve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership on this very important bill.

I rise in strong support of this legislation.

This administration, Mr. Chairman, has a Secretary of Energy who told The Wall Street Journal that we should be paying the same price for gasoline as they're paying over in Europe. At the time he said that, they were paying $8 to $9 a gallon. Well, I know that most environmental radicals come from very wealthy or very upper-income families, and perhaps they can afford gasoline at $8 or $9 a gallon, but most people can't. In fact, Mr. Chairman, many experts are predicting we're going to be at $5 a gallon as soon as this summer. I can tell you that's going to hurt a lot of poor and lower-income and working people if we go to even $5 a gallon, and it's going to hurt a lot of small towns and rural areas because people in those places generally have to drive longer distances to go to work.

I represent, Mr. Chairman, a large part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. That national park is slightly under 600,000 acres. We get between 9 million and 10 million visitors a year. ANWR—and I happen to be one of the very few Members who has been to ANWR twice—is the most barren place I've ever been to. Chairman YOUNG estimated that there are 100 miles without a tree or a bush on it. ANWR is 19.8 million acres, which is 35 times the size of the Great Smoky Mountains. Time magazine said they get about 200 to 300 visitors a year, and you have to be a survivalist to go in there.

Now we want to expand our energy production there with just a few thousand acres—a minuscule portion of ANWR—to help our own people. If we don't do that, who we're helping are foreign energy producers; but we're hurting a lot of poor and lower-income and working people in this country.

When we passed ANWR in the mid-90s and when it was vetoed by President Clinton, it was said at that time that it would produce 1 million barrels a day coming down into this country, but President Clinton vetoed it. They said at that time that it wouldn't help right away. Well, it would sure be helping now if it hadn't been vetoed. In addition to that, if we would start developing more of our natural resources now, some of these foreign energy producers would have to start bringing their prices down. I think—in fact, I'm convinced—that this legislation would start helping right away or it would, at least, in a very short time.

We need to start putting our own people first, once again, instead of just helping out foreign energy producers.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

Here is the reality. The Republicans need money to build roads, so they want to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which Senator INHOFE from Oklahoma has already made clear doesn't have the votes to pass in the Senate. The same thing is true for California and Florida and off the coast of Massachusetts and New Jersey. They want to drill there as well, and it's very clear that the votes aren't there in the Senate to accomplish that goal either. As the gentleman from California just said, the likelihood of finding any revenues from oil shale is at least two decades away, so there are no revenues there.

There is another bill, by the way, that's going to come out here on the floor. And in order to find the revenues, do you know where they're going to drill? They're going to drill into the pensions of FBI agents; they're going to drill into the pensions of the researchers for cancer out of the National Institutes of Health; and they're going to drill into the pensions of the Border Patrol agents, who are protecting us right now down on the Mexico border. That's where they're going to find almost all of the money for this bill—in the pensions of those people.

Is that really the way we want to build the roads of our country?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. TIPTON. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is clearly an interesting position from our Democratic colleagues. They say we need roads; they say we need jobs; they say we need an energy policy. But not here, not now, not anywhere.

When we look at the challenges that we face from overseas in terms of creating American certainty for energy, it's something for which we must all stand together. We're looking at developing oil shale as a potential resource for this country, right here in America, in order to be able to create American jobs on American soil while using American energy resources.

Let's explore this.

□ 1510

From the Republican side, we've clearly stood for an all-of-the-above policy. Why is there such reluctance from our Democrat colleagues to embrace developing the technology to be able to create certainty for America's energy future, to be able to help struggling young families, senior citizens on fixed incomes make sure that their

utility bills, their gas bills don't continue to rise? That's what we're proposing.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman another 1 minute.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentleman.

When we're talking about protecting Colorado, many of our Democrat colleagues joined the amendment that I put forward, stating that the Secretary wouldn't consider but shall address local concerns. If you understand Colorado water, you can't just take it. It's a priority-based system. You have to actually own that water to be able to develop it.

We have a reasonable plan that we're trying to put forward to develop American energy certainty; but our Democratic colleagues, their solution of having ''no, not here, not now, not anywhere'' is not a solution that will work for America. Let's get our people to work. Let's create certainty for America and stand up for the American consumer for a change.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, just 2 weeks ago, President Obama stood right here in this Chamber; and he said that he was going to propose opening up 75 percent of the oil and gas resources off the coast of the United States. That's a great plan. He doesn't want to drill off the California beaches. He doesn't want to drill off Florida beaches or off the New Jersey or Massachusetts beaches. But the rest of it, he's pretty much saying he's open to. But they're not happy with it over here. The President has a real plan and a plan that can be implemented.

What they are doing is they bring out proposals here that try to build real highways with fake oil revenues that are never going to materialize. So rather than working here in the real world, where the real transportation needs of our country are dealt with with real revenues that are coming in, they talk about oil shale which Shell says is at least another 10 years away. Shell Oil, that is, not some shell collector along the beaches.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

We are talking Shell Oil who says it's 10 years away. JIM INHOFE in the Senate says the votes aren't there to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. So that's zero dollars as well. And the likelihood of them drilling off the coast of California or Florida or Massachusetts for oil is zero. So rather than going through this facade of trying to pretend that real highways can be built with fake oil revenues, we should be taking up the offer of President Obama where he says he'll open up 75 percent of all the drilling possibilities off the coastlines of our country. That is what this debate should be all about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. I thank the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee for the courtesy of speaking in support of H.R. 3408.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3408, the PIONEERS Act, and by doing so, I'm standing up for American innovation, American jobs, and renewed American prosperity. Shale oil is a game-changer. You don't have to look any further than the Eagle Ford shale in my home State of Texas to see the economic benefits of this stable American energy resource.

This past Sunday when I went to the Eagle Ford shale, there were 171 oil rigs and 93 natural gas rigs drilling thousands of wells. More rigs are coming, and major pipeline projects are under way to support production that will grow to 420,000 barrels per day. Let me say that again: 420,000 barrels of oil per day. One of my friends on the other side of the aisle said, Oil shale, no way. I've seen with my own eyes at Eagle Ford shale; and I say, Oil shale, yes way.

Eagle Ford shale job creation is now in full swing with scores of new businesses opening up to support the boom. More than 10,000 jobs have already been created, and 58,000 more are on the way. The economic recession is a thing of the past in this part of our country and in my State.

The world, as we've known it, is literally changing in front of our eyes. Our long-established dependence upon imported energy could be a thing of the past if we unleash America's energy resources. H.R. 3408 will get us one step closer.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 1 minute at this time.

The Republicans, over the past year, have betrayed their agenda. They have pretty much voted out on the House floor to gut the budget for wind, gut the budget for solar, gut the budget for plug-in hybrid vehicles and, at the same time, kept in the money for the nuclear industry, kept in the tax breaks for the oil industry. So that is pretty much what the debate is all about. It's about the past versus the future.

In our country right now, the American people want to know that we're embracing a future-oriented, technology-oriented, advanced-technology-oriented agenda for our country. That's what all the Republicans keep voting against out here, all of the new technologies that allow us to move on from this fossil-fuel era.

And it would be one thing if they just didn't vote for it, but then they have the temerity to stand up and to say they believe in all of the above. No, they do not. They believe in oil above all because otherwise they would not vote to kill wind and solar out here on the House floor over the last year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, Senator INHOFE's quote has been thrown around here recently. Let me give another quote by Senator INHOFE:

> As I have said, we can make great strides toward increasing North American energy independence by developing our own domestic resources. We can do this and support millions of American jobs, produce affordable energy for consumers, and reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

He said that in March 2010. I think that's important.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one other point. There's been an implication here that it has been the policies of this administration that have increased oil and gas supplies; but if you look at the President's own budget that came out this week, there are two aspects of revenue coming in from oil and gas production. You have the lease sales, and you have the royalties. If you look at the President's own budget that came out just 2 days ago, you will see that this year and in the out-years, money coming in from lease sales decreases. That means that the policy of this administration is not more energy production on public lands. It's less.

He has taken advantage of the situation that's going on on State and private lands and is taking credit for it with what's happened in North Dakota. This plan here puts together a solid footing for American energy production on public lands.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I think it would be helpful for both sides to understand what the time situation is for the conclusion of the debate.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Does the gentleman intend to conclude debate with his next speaker?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. My intent, Mr. Chairman, is to hold that 1½ minutes at the end of the overall debate in case the gentleman says something that needs to be responded to.

Mr. MARKEY. In that case, I will yield myself the balance of my time so that I can utter the sentences that will need responding to by the chairman of the committee.

□ 1520

Mr. Chairman, let's go back a little bit to this issue of natural gas and what this Republican bill calls for—more drilling for natural gas in our country. Okay, we can look at that.

We support natural gas. We think that natural gas is the best story that's happened in our country in the last 10 years. We love natural gas. Democrats love it. It's half the pollutants of coal. It's domestically produced. We have to make sure that when we're extracting it we don't shoot chemicals down into

the surface so that we pollute the water that our children drink, but we think that we can work through those issues if people of good faith are willing to work together.

Otherwise, it's a fantastic story. Why is that? Because natural gas is not a world market. The world market is for oil. If it's $116 a barrel in China, it's $116 a barrel in the U.S. It's a global market. And that's what allows OPEC to hold us hostage, because they control all of that oil coming out of the Strait of Hormuz. They control all that oil so that they can basically hold the rest of the globe's economy hostage. But natural gas, not true.

Here we've seen a 30 percent increase in our natural gas reserves over the last 5 years. What does that mean? Well, in China it's $16. Japan, $16 per million cubic feet of natural gas. What is it in the United States? It's $2.42. So it's six, seven times cheaper in the United States. That means it is cheaper for every manufacturer, cheaper for every retailer, cheaper for every farmer, cheaper for every consumer.

What are the Democrats saying? We love natural gas; let's keep it here. Let's not be setting up terminals all across our country to export the natural gas across the planet with the Department of Energy saying, if we did that, the price of natural gas in the United States would rise 57 percent. How can that be good for consumers? Isn't that our advantage? Saudi Arabia is the Saudi Arabia of oil. We are the Saudi Arabia of natural gas. Why don't we use that to our advantage? Why don't we use that to inoculate ourselves against what Saudi Arabia of oil does to us by jacking the price of oil up and down? Why don't we become independent of them? Why don't we move to all natural gas vehicles? Why don't we use natural gas in the generation of electricity? Why don't we use natural gas in the production of all of our products? And why don't we use natural gas in the homes of our country, in the factories of our country, in the industries of our country at a price that's six times lower than China and Japan, three times lower than Europe?

That's what we are calling for here, an energy strategy that is all-American. And if we can get to that with this debate today, I think that the American people will be the winners.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve my remaining 1½ minutes until the end of the overall debate.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3408, which is known as the Protecting Investment in Oil Shale the Next Generation of Environmental, Energy, and Resource Security Act.

This is primarily about the Keystone pipeline. The Keystone pipeline has been a topic of discussion in America for the last 3 or 4 years. When it came to the attention of Congress that this pipeline, which promises to create tens of thousands of jobs and increase our access to safe and secure supplies of oil, was experiencing an unreasonable level of delay, Congress decided that we needed to step in.

We have, in Keystone pipeline, a company willing to invest $7 billion in private funds at no expense to the taxpayer. That would ultimately bring nearly a million barrels of oil per day from Canada to the U.S.—additional oil per day.

Even the President's Jobs Council agrees. Their report specifically suggested the pipeline is a win-win-win for job creation, modernizing the Nation's infrastructure, and helping ultimately to lower gasoline prices in America. I would also like to point out that five major labor unions support the building of the Keystone pipeline.

A few years ago, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was in San Francisco giving a speech at the Commonwealth Club. In response to a question about Keystone pipeline, whether or not they would issue the permit to build it, Secretary of State Clinton said: We are inclined to do so.

This project has now been studied for over 40 months by seven or eight agencies of the Federal Government. And normally, to build an oil pipeline in America, it takes on the average of 24 months. When the Department of State issued their final environmental impact statement back in August 2011, they concluded that there were not any significant environmental issues. And they also said that when they look at the option of either, one, building a pipeline, or, two, not building a pipeline, that the preferable option was to build the pipeline. And of course the rationale for that is that if you don't build the pipeline and you bring oil in from other countries, you either have to do it by truck or by rail, which certainly emits a lot into the atmosphere.

But despite all of these positive reasons to build this pipeline, President Obama made a blatantly political decision when he said: I don't want to decide until after the Presidential election. And that's when Congress got involved and said we'd like a decision by February of 2012. And the President said: Well, I don't have enough time to study it, so I'm not going to allow it—even though it has been studied for 40 months. This is a 1,700-mile pipeline. The only issue left relates to about 60 miles in the State of Nebraska, and the Governor of Nebraska supports building this pipeline.

So this is a win-win-win situation for the American people, and I would urge my fellow Members to support this legislation to require FERC to make a decision on this pipeline.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

Last week, the Republicans filed this bill, this transportation bill that the Secretary of Transportation called the worst transportation bill he had ever seen. The Republican leadership realized that not even Republican Members would vote for this monstrosity of bad policy, so they've chopped the bill up into three parts and hope to get a separate majority on each part. This way, House Republicans hope they can pass the bill and give their Members deniability at the same time. Now, that's not a transparent process or a fair one. It's a way to hide what's really going on from the American people.

Some Republicans don't want to vote for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; others don't want to vote for the money for the highways because some of the right-wing groups in this country are against it. So we've got this shell game going on.

The bill before us, H.R. 3408, contains the text of a very bad bill that came out of the Energy and Commerce Committee. We considered that bill earlier this month. The bill provides a legislative earmark that would direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, to issue a permit for the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline within 30 days of receipt of an application.

□ 1530

Now, existing law requires the President to make a determination whether this pipeline is in the national interest. Serious questions have been raised about whether this pipeline is in our national interest. It is being built with steel imported from South Korea and pipes from India. The oil it transports, I believe, will be exported to China. Meanwhile, the risks of spills from that pipeline that could contaminate drinking water will be borne by American families.

These are factors the President should take into account. But this law ties his hands. It mandates that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approve the pipeline without addressing any of these issues. In fact, it requires approval before we even know the route that the pipeline will take.

Now this follows some Keystone Kops activities on the Republican side of the aisle. They've worked themselves up about this pipeline. So in order to get unemployment insurance or middle class tax breaks, they put in the extension for 2 months of those areas, a requirement that the President decide the issue within 2 months. And the President said, I don't have all the information, I can't make that decision. So he said, I'm not going to approve it within 2 months. I'll consider it later, but I'm not going to approve it.

Suddenly, the Republicans realized they were outsmarted, hoisted by their own petard. They forced the President to make a decision, and he made a decision against them. They don't want to take that chance again.

This bill would put in an exemption from all the laws for one pet project, from the ordinary permitting requirements that apply to every other oil pipeline crossing our borders.

During the committee process, we asked a simple question: Who benefits from this unprecedented congressional intervention into the regulatory process? Many media reports said that a private oil company, Koch Industries, is one of the ''big winners.'' But the committee refused, even though the Democrats asked them, to even inquire from the company, Koch Industries, whether it had a direct and substantial interest in the pipeline. They wouldn't even ask that question. Could you imagine? They talk about they're against earmarks, then when there is an earmark that they want, they won't even tell us who benefits from it?

Under this bill, the oil industry gets a conduit for exporting tar sands products from Canada to China. India gets the opportunity to provide pipes to build it. South Korea gets a market for its steel. But what do we get? Midwestern farmers and ranchers will have their land seized through eminent domain and may lose their vital water supplies to a pipeline spill into the Ogallala Aquifer. Oil prices in parts of the United States will increase as fuel supplies come into their area, and we are left with a dirtier fuel supply and higher emissions of carbon pollution, worsening the climate change that is already starting to afflict our Nation.

I urge all Members to oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, the language that we're discussing at this current time is allowing the Keystone pipeline a path forward. It's based on a bill I introduced back in September, which is H.R. 3548. Keep in mind that the President of the United States killed the Keystone pipeline. We think that was kowtowing to the environmental extremists, some of which may be in the House of Representatives, or represented here today. But the reality is that it was a wrong decision. It is in the best interests of our Nation to have the Keystone pipeline bringing oil from Alberta oil sands into the United States, where it can be refined and used in the United States, offsetting imported oil from Venezuela and Saudi Arabia.

Keystone pipeline would take these supplies from Canada and use them in the United States, creating tens of thousands of jobs over a 2-year to 2½ year construction phase with permanent jobs thereafter to maintain the pipeline and its hubs along the 1,700-mile pipeline.

Now, as far as the environmental objections to the project are concerned, I wish more people would have read the administration's own final environmental impact study. It found that not building the Keystone XL would lead to more oil being transported by riskier means, such as tankers, trains, and trucks. For this reason, the administration's folks concluded that the building of the pipeline is environmentally preferable to not building the pipeline and that its route was safe. Then the Nebraska Governor requested that, just for a little bit of Nebraska, that they do a 30- or 40-mile loop. The path was set, except for this little loop.

Now, it would take a long time to dispel all the myths that have been perpetuated by the opponents in the environmental community. But it's worth noting that these are intrastate issues well on their way to being resolved and, in fact, were carved out in the previous bill mentioned by the gentleman from California, but the President ignored the Nebraska exemption giving Nebraska time to work through its change of route for about 40 or 50 miles of the 1,700. He never mentioned that and killed the pipeline.

So we give a pathway forward to TransCanada to re-file its permit with all of the environmental documents that it has gathered over the last 3 years, presented to the administration last year, and give time to Nebraska to resolve their issue.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. TERRY. So, politics of the extreme put us in this position. But let's ask, who benefits from this oil coming into the United States from our partner, Canada, and being refined and used in the United States of America? If we have this, everyone benefits in our Nation. If we don't have this pipeline to displace the oil, who wins? Venezuela, which continues to send us 900,000 barrels per day, and Saudi Arabia. Our reliance just grows for these nations' oil supplies. That's who wins, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased at this time to yield 4 minutes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee,

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank the ranking member for this time, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I find it remarkable that we are here today debating a bill that is essentially a regulatory earmark for just one company, and that company is called TransCanada. And we're here debating whether to build a pipeline through the heart of our country without even allowing the appropriate State and Federal agencies to completely conduct their due diligence and their oversight responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, this legislative gift wrapped in fine gift-wrapping to TransCanada on behalf of my Republican colleagues will completely circumvent the State Department and the other State and Federal agencies, those agencies that have the know-how and the expertise, to thoroughly examine this process, and Mr. Chairman, they will require that FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, issue a permit for the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline within 30 days of the receipt of the application.

□ 1540

If FERC does not act on the permit application within the meager 30 days, the permit shall be considered approved automatically.

Mr. Chairman, how insane can insanity get? How ridiculous can ridiculous be when we are telling an agency that if they don't pass this permit within 30 days, if they don't do all their investigations within 30 days, then this permit will automatically be approved?

Mr. Chairman, the Keystone XL project is too big, too consequential, too important to the American people for this Congress to completely ignore all the established protocols that have existed prior and exist now and set a precedent of bypassing State and Federal oversight procedures. The very people whose lives will be most affected by this pipeline deserve to have the responsible agencies complete their review process to ensure the American people that this project has been thoroughly examined and vetted.

Mr. Chairman, even my colleagues who may support the merits of the Keystone XL pipeline are appalled—and they should be appalled—at the majority party's attempt to hijack the process and circumvent the appropriate State and Federal agencies in order to hastily, irresponsibly green-light this project.

This sentiment can be summed up best by a letter sent to me on February 9 by a citizen of this Nation, a Nebraskan rancher by the name of Randy Thomas, who said:

> The short circuiting of the process leaves those of us who live and work along the proposed pathway of this project with many lingering doubts about its safety, and the impacts it could have on our livelihoods.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve better than this shoddy attempt to provide TransCanada with a regulatory earmark that allows them to bypass the established rules and procedures we have in place. I cannot support this, and I ask my colleagues to join me in not supporting this particular bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds if he would yield to me for further comment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California only has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. We heard debate from the other side about refining oil. I think we ought to refine our debate because, on the other side of the aisle, a comment was made that extremists are pushing opposition to this pipeline. From what I heard from Mr. RUSH and what I understand the case to be is that those who ordinarily make this decision should have all the facts, and I don't think that is an extreme position at all.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we're here today because it's time to decide. President Obama and his administration have made a decision not to decide, even though his own Secretary of State, in their final economic environmental impact statement, made the decision that if you looked at two options—one, build the pipeline, or two, not build the pipeline—the preferable route was to build the pipeline; 1 million more barrels of oil a day coming to America, ultimately. We're facing ever-increasing gasoline prices.

There's only 60 miles at issue at all in this pipeline out of 1,700. Five major labor unions support this pipeline. There's not one dime of Federal dollars in this pipeline, unlike the millions and billions that this administration have given to wind power and solar power and battery companies—many of which are in bankruptcy, just like Solyndra, which received $538 million from the taxpayers of America. This is a private company willing to put in $7 billion to bring 100,000 more barrels of oil a day, willing to provide 20,000 additional jobs to construct this pipeline.

So I think the decision here is very easy for the American people, and that's what Mr. TERRY's legislation does. Since the President won't make a decision, Mr. TERRY directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to make the decision. We have all of the data necessary. It's the right decision to make.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1½ minutes.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the Rules for H.R. 7, "The American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act of 2012." I believe the transportation bill should have been an open rule. This bill is not a comprehensive bill. When Congress spends taxpayer dollars, we are accountable for how it is spent. As written, this measure limits federal government oversight and therefore limits accountability.

I believe, a well-functioning transportation system is critical to the Nation's prosperity. Whether it is by road, aviation, or rail we rely on our transportation system to move people and goods safely. A properly functioning transportation infrastructure will facilitate commerce, attract and retain businesses, and support jobs.

Public transportation benefits the economy in several ways. It helps the right people to get to the right jobs, without wasting otherwise productive hours. It allows employers to tap into various pools of recipients who have no other means of getting to work and it helps customers get to the doors of businesses.

For every dollar we invest in running public transportation systems boosts business sales by another three dollars. A $10 million investment in building public transportation systems creates more than 300 jobs, and the same amount spent on running them creates nearly 600 more.

Part of the challenge of our transportation system is to ensure that everyone is able to benefit. The GAO would study ways to increase access to the underserved and unrepresented communities, as well as, minority communities. This will help to identify areas that we can work to improve. The GAO would further study how to increase the mobility of the disabled.

Public transportation is important to ensure these communities will not only have access to services, businesses, and the community at large, but will also improve their quality of life.

Public involvement needs to encompass the full range of community interests, yet people underserved by transportation often do not participate. We need to find ways to reach the underserved. They not only have greater difficulty getting to jobs, schools, recreation, and shopping than the population at large, but often they are also unaware of transportation proposals that could dramatically change their lives. Many lack experience with public involvement, even though they have important, unspoken issues that should be heard.

Underserved people include those with special cultural, racial, or ethnic characteristics. Cultural differences sometimes hinder full participation in transportation planning and project development.

People with disabilities find access to transportation more difficult and their ability to participate in public involvement efforts more constrained. People with limited resources often lack both access and time to participate. In addition individuals who have not been adequately educated may not be fully aware either of what transportation services are available or of opportunities to help improve them.

These groups are a rich source of ideas that can improve transportation not only for themselves but also for the entire community. Agencies must assume responsibility for reaching out and including them in the decision-making process—which requires strategic thinking and tailoring public involvement efforts to these communities and their needs. Techniques to reach the underserved are grouped here under two headings:

A thorough study of how this bill will impact cost and jobs. As well as a study on how to improve services to the underserved and under-represented will insure that there is accountability for how we are using government resources.

There is much left to be done in the areas of Transportation in our great Nation. I believe this study is a step in the right direction.

Generally, the same transit agencies operate both rail and a bus system, which improves efficiency by ensuring both Systems complement each other.

For example, transit agencies can design bus routes that collect passengers from outlying neighborhoods and deliver them to rail transit stations.

Congress has always allowed transit systems operating both rail and bus lines to receive bus and bus facility grants, recognizing that bus and rail lines work as part of a complete transit network in large metropolitan areas and that federal policy should support local and regional efforts to maximize the efficiency of transit service. H.R. 7 would reverse this longstanding federal policy.

In Houston, TX alone, the City operates 1,300 buses and 7 miles of rail. Denying access to these funds to major metropolitan areas does not make sense. Public transportation benefits the economy in several ways. It helps the right people to get to the right jobs, without wasting otherwise productive hours. It allows employers to tap into various pools of recipients who have no other means of getting to work and it helps customers get to the doors of businesses.

In the case of Houston, the light rail system is vital to increase mobility of Houston, Texas' population which is forecasted to grow by an additional 9.4 million people by 2035, a 38.9 percent increase over the projected 2010 levels. The same can be said for many urban areas across our Nation.

Light rail projects and other transportation investments represent the potential to create thousands of jobs, enhanced mobility, and future economic development for the region.

Public transportation is an investment in the truest sense of the word: An outlay today pays out considerable profit down the road. Nationwide, government invests $15.4 billion in public transportation a year. Public transportation generates upwards of $60 billion in economic benefits. Public transportation boosts state and local tax revenues by at least 4 percent and as much as 16 percent.

Some 30,000 people work directly for the public transportation industry, which creates thousands more jobs indirectly through fields ranging from engineering to construction.

For every dollar we invest in running public transportation systems boosts business sales by another three dollars. A $10 million investment in building public transportation systems creates more than 300 jobs, and the same amount spent on running them creates nearly 600 more.

To be sure, public transportation systems are not cheap to build or run; however, public transportation pays for itself several times over. And if a stronger economy is the destination we seek, public transit is the fastest way to get there. These funds could be used to fix buses, bus shelters, and bus facilities.

With the recent uptick in fuel prices more people are opting to ride the bus. In addition, the bus system also is vital resource for the disable and seniors who rely on these services for transportation. The TE program funds projects that build bus shelters. This would encourage even more people to opt for public transportation. Shelters safeguard passengers against the sun, wind, and rain. Texas has heat waves and many other parts of the country have inclement weather. Funding the building of bus shelters may not be a priority for some, but to the people who are standing waiting for the bus it makes a world of difference.

In addition, bus stops are extremely important for people with disabilities. The inaccessibility of bus stops often represents the weak link in the system and can effectively prevent the use of fixed-route service. This can severely hamper bus ridership by disability community, and thereby limit their mobility. Increasing the accessibility of fixed-route service

under the TE program will decrease paratransit costs.

Since 1983, when the Surface Transportation Assistance Act was signed into law, 2.86 cents in motor fuels taxes has been deposited into the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund to provide a dedicated stable source of funding for public transportation programs. H.R. 7 eliminates the Mass Transit Account and dedicates that 2.86 cents to highway programs.

The bill moves transit and other public transportation programs into a new ''Alternative Transportation Fund,'' which would be dependent on appropriations from general revenue. Although the bill makes a one-time transfer of $40 billion into the Alternative Transportation Fund to cover funding for those programs through the life of the bill, there is no guarantee for public transportation funding beyond FY 2016. Such a reality would make it difficult, if not impossible, for transit agencies to develop reliable long-term capital plans, and it would leave the future of the program in doubt.

Public transportation agencies around the country are already struggling to maintain current levels of service and keep the system in a state of good repair. Removing federally guaranteed funding could result in a virtual construction and service freeze, the effects of which would be felt by riders, businesses, contractors, manufacturers and suppliers around the country.

Transit agencies may have to take on more debt in order to finance capital projects, and it could result in increased fares for our constituents.

There is no reason to make such a drastic change in how we finance public transportation. Our amendment would restore the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and the 2.86 cents dedicated funding stream for public transportation programs. It would eliminate the Alternative Trust Fund, make the Highway Trust Fund whole, and allow it to once again fund both highways and mass transit.

FAST FACTS

HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT BILL (OR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BILL) (H.R. 7)—IMPACT ON JOBS

Cuts 550,000 American Jobs. Cuts investments in highways by $15.8 billion from current levels. We know that every $1 billion invested in infrastructure creates an estimated 34,800 jobs. Cuts Highway Investments in 45 states & DC. Reduces highway investments for all but 5 states (Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts Nebraska, Wyoming), neglecting the need to fix our bridges and roads.

Buy America Loopholes. Continues loopholes that allow surface transportation jobs to be outsourced overseas, and fails to extend Buy America protections to all Federal surface transportation programs.

Unstable Funding. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office reported that the GOP bill would bankrupt the Highway trust fund by 2016—creating a $78 billion shortfall over 10 years and jeopardizing critical transportation projects and American jobs. Boehner argue the bill doesn't create jobs. Speaker John A. Boehner made the unusual argument that spending money on highway projects under the bill would not create jobs. ''We are not making the claim that spending taxpayer money on transportation projects creates jobs.''

OTHER TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

Undermines Safety. Cuts National Highway Traffic Safety Administration grants, allows companies with poor safety records to be exempted from hazardous material safety requirements, delays the deadline for installing new train systems to automatically prevent train collisions and derailments for passenger rail from December 31, 2015 to December 31, 2020 and eliminates worker safety for hazmat workers.

Kills Public Transit. Eliminates all of the dedicated funding for public transportation, leaving millions of riders already faced with service cuts and fare increases out in the cold. The bill stops the highway user fee revenues for transit, so that transit will compete with other priorities in the budget. These provisions are opposed by 600 groups—including National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, American Public Transportation Association, League of Conservation Voters, U.S. Steelworkers, U.S. PIRG, and Chamber of Commerce. The bill also fails to provide flexibility to transit systems to use Federal funds to maintain service and transit worker jobs at times of economic crisis. Mandates Privatization in Public Transit & Highways. Incentivizes transit agencies to contract out their bus services, makes private entities eligible to receive Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants, and mandates private sector participation in local transit planning and for engineering and design services on Federal-aid highway projects.

Jeopardizes Efforts to Make Streets and Roads Safer for Children, Pedestrians, and Bikes. Eliminates efforts to help underwrite local bike paths, bike lanes and pedestrian safety projects, including the Safe Routes to School program. Weakens Environmental, Public Health, and Safety Protections. Includes sweeping changes that undermine local community involvement and environmental protection in transportation project development, such as delegating environmental and safety reviews—including whether they should be conducted—entirely to state highway agencies, imposing arbitrary deadlines for completing or challenging reviews regardless of project size, and waiving environmental reviews for all projects where the Federal share of the costs is less than $10 million or 15 percent of the total project cost regardless of the scope of the project.

Hurts Amtrak. Reduces funding for Amtrak by $308 million, abrogates labor contracts between Amtrak and its food and beverage workers likely costing 2,000 union jobs, and prevents Amtrak from using Federal funds to hire outside counsel to file a lawsuit or defend itself against a passenger rail operator.

FEDERAL RETIREMENT (H.R. 3813)

Cutting Federal Retirement. In an effort to finance the highway bill, the package includes extraneous provisions that take $44 billion out of the pockets of the middle-class—who have already suffered through a pay freeze for 2 years, which contributed approximately $60 billion to deficit reduction. Raising Worker Contributions. Increases the retirement contribution from current federal workers by 1.5 percent. New federal workers would be forced to contribute 3.2 percent more for an annuity that is 40 percent less than existing benefits—with the retirement based on the high five years of salary, instead of the high three years. Changing Benefits Already Earned. Eliminates the annuity supplement payment for federal employees who retire before age 62, throwing into chaos the longstanding retirement plans of middle-class workers who relied on the promise of this benefit and dedicated decades of service to our country. Even the conservative American Enterprise Institute has said, ''Benefits already accrued should not be altered. Those benefits have been promised and earned, and the obligation to pay them should be honored.''

Role of Federal Workers. Federal workers support our troops in the battlefield and provide care upon their return, protect our borders, safeguard our food supply, make sure seniors get their Social Security checks, and help hunt down Osama Bin Laden.

Opposition. Opposed by American Federation of Government Employees, National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, National Treasury Employees Union, National Federation of Federal Employees, National Association of Government Employees, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, National Association of Assistant U.S. Attorneys, and Federal Managers Association.

Further, I believe that more should be done for small businesses owned by women and minorities. It is a shame that the numbers of women and minority owned business competing for these contracts has been decreasing every year. We must reinforce our commitment to women and minority owned business.

The Department of Transportation's DBE program aims to increase participation of small businesses owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

Enhanced oversight is critical to ensuring that the objectives of the DBE program are achieved and federal funds are spent appropriately. But the current program lacks a mechanism to enforce that committed spending for DBEs reflects actual spending.

The October 2011 report by GAO highlights both DOT's need for increased oversight and the lack of clarity in determining whether both committed and actual spending are meeting the goals of the DBE program.

Two things need to be addressed to help the DBE program: increased oversight, and the ability to enforce the DBE program requirements.

The program lacks the necessary ''teeth,'' its requirements are often flaunted to the determent of small business owners.

I believe the Secretary of the Department of Transportation should be required to issue regulations providing for strengthening oversight, enforcement, and compliance with DBE spending requirements.

I have offered a bill, H.R. 3710—Deficit Reduction, Job Creation, and Energy Security Act, that I firmly believe will increase jobs, decrease our deficit, and will be great for our economy.

H.R. 3710 will direct the Secretary of Interior to increase the total lease acreage set forth in the proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas leasing program for 2012–2017 by an additional 10 percent. This 10 percent increase shall be known as the Deficit Reduction Acreage. As such, the Secretary shall lease 20 percent of the Deficit Reduction Acreage each year from 2012–2017. All proceeds from the Deficit Reduction Acreage shall be deposited into the Deficit Reduction Energy Security Fund.

For 15 years after issuance of the first lease or receipt of the first payment coming from the Deficit Reduction Energy Security Fund, all proceeds shall be deposited into an interest bearing account for a period of 2 years. Upon expiration of the 2 year period, these proceeds shall be distributed as follows:

The interest gained during 2 year period shall be placed in the Coastal and Ocean Sustainability and Health Fund (COSH); and

The principle from the Deficit Reduction Energy Security Fund shall be deposited into the US Treasury and applied directly toward Deficit Reduction.

The COSH fund will establish grants for states (Coastal and Disaster Grant Program and a National Grant Program) for addressing coastal and ocean disasters, restoration, protection, and maintenance of coastal areas and oceans, including research and programs in coordination with state and local agencies.

Additionally, the Deficit Reduction and Energy Security Act establishes an Office of Onshore and Offshore Energy Employment and Training, and an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion. CBO has estimated that this amendment is outside of the 10 year budgetary window, so there is no score.

I think we must carefully consider the bill that I propose. And again I reiterate the importance of having an open rule for the Surface Transportation Reauthorization to ensure that all Members of this Body have an opportunity to address their concerns with this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, today I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Protecting Investment in Oil Shale the Next Generation of Environmental, Energy and Resource Security Act, which is purported to help finance the transportation bill.

I agree with my colleagues' concerns about the Keystone XL pipeline provision that forces the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve the project. The permitting process for Keystone XL has become a political spin war and I urge my colleagues to oppose my colleague from Nebraska's proposal. We should allow the original permitting process to be completed fairly and without interference.

However, I come to the Floor today to talk about another huge problem with the oil shale provisions: CBO estimates they would have no significant net impact on the federal budget from 2012–2022.

Oil shale has yet to be produced in commercial quantities despite 100 years of research and development. The oil shale provisions found in H.R. 3408 are being promoted by the Majority as a funding mechanism for the surface transportation reauthorization package despite the fact that the Congressional Budget Office last week concluded that opening up 2 million acres in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming for oil shale speculation would generate negligible revenue over the next decade.

Speculators have swept through Colorado throughout our state's history to try and make a quick buck off oil shale. The last time around, in the early 1980s, Federal legislation much like H.R. 3408 ushered in a boom-bust cycle that devastated communities on the Western Slope when it became clear production was not profitable. 85 million dollars in annual payroll disappeared in Garfield and Mesa counties over two years.

Oil shale is still not commercially viable—in fact, Shell Corporation estimates it could be 2020 before a company could be ready to develop a Federal oil shale lease.

We need real solutions for funding our nation's crumbling transportation infrastructure. Using H.R. 3408 as a funding source for the surface transportation reauthorization is not a good faith effort to create the jobs Americans so desperately need.

Mr. Chair, I hope every member of Congress realizes what an economic mistake H.R. 3408 is. I urge every member to oppose the PIONEERS Act and to support the amendment to strike all oil shale provisions.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of titles XIV and XVII of Rules Committee print 112–14 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3408

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

TITLE XIV—KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

SEC. 14001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''North American Energy Access Act''.

SEC. 14002. RESTRICTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person may construct, operate, or maintain the oil pipeline and related facilities described in subsection (b) except in accordance with a permit issued under this title.

(b) PIPELINE.—The pipeline and related facilities referred to in subsection (a) are those described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Pipeline Project issued by the Department of State on August 26, 2011, including any modified version of that pipeline and related facilities.

SEC. 14003. PERMIT.

(a) ISSUANCE.—

(1) BY FERC.—The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall, not later than 30 days after receipt of an application therefor, issue a permit without additional conditions for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the oil pipeline and related facilities described in section 14002(b), to be implemented in accordance with the terms of the Final Environmental Impact Statement described in section 14002(b). The Commission shall not be required to prepare a Record of Decision under section 1505.2 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations with respect to issuance of the permit provided for in this section.

(2) ISSUANCE IN ABSENCE OF FERC ACTION.—If the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has not acted on an application for a permit described in paragraph (1) within 30 days after receiving such application, the permit shall be deemed to have been issued under this title upon the expiration of such 30-day period.

(b) MODIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The applicant for or holder of a permit described in subsection (a) may make a substantial modification to the pipeline route or any other term of the Final Environmental Impact Statement described in section 14002(b) only with the approval of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Commission shall expedite consideration of any such modification proposal.

(2) NEBRASKA MODIFICATION.—Within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the State of Nebraska for an effective and timely review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 of any modification to the proposed pipeline route in Nebraska as proposed by the applicant for the permit described in subsection (a). Not later than 30 days after receiving approval of such proposed modification from the Governor of Nebraska, the Commission shall complete consideration of and approve such modification.

(3) ISSUANCE IN ABSENCE OF FERC ACTION.—If the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has not acted on an application for approval of a modification described in paragraph (2) within 30 days after receiving such application, such modification shall be deemed to have been issued under this title upon expiration of the 30-day period.

(4) CONSTRUCTION DURING CONSIDERATION OF NEBRASKA MODIFICATION.—While any modification of the proposed pipeline route in Nebraska is under consideration pursuant to paragraph (2), the holder of the permit issued under subsection (a) may commence or continue with construction of any portion of the pipeline and related facilities described in section 14002(b) that is not within the State of Nebraska.

(c) NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—Except for actions taken under subsection (b)(1), the actions taken pursuant to this title shall be taken without further action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SEC. 14004. RELATION TO OTHER LAW.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and any other Executive Order or provision of law, no presidential permits shall be required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline and related facilities described in section 14002(b) of this Act.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this title shall affect the application to the pipeline and related facilities described in section 14002(b) of—

(1) chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code; or

(2) the authority of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to regulate oil pipeline rates and services.

(c) FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The final environmental impact statement issued by the Secretary of State on August 26, 2011, shall be considered to satisfy all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

TITLE XVII—NATURAL RESOURCES

Subtitle A—Oil Shale Leasing

SEC. 17001. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Protecting Investment in Oil Shale the Next Generation of Environmental, Energy, and Resource Security Act'' or the ''PIONEERS Act''.

SEC. 17002. EFFECTIVENESS OF OIL SHALE REGULATIONS, AMENDMENTS TO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS, AND RECORD OF DECISION.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other law or regulation to the contrary, the final regulations regarding oil shale management published by the Bureau of Land Management on November 18, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 69,414) are deemed to satisfy all legal and procedural requirements under any law, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321

et seq.), and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58), and the Secretary of the Interior shall implement those regulations, including the oil shale leasing program authorized by the regulations, without any other administrative action necessary.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS AND RECORD OF DECISION.—Notwithstanding any other law or regulation to the contrary, the November 17, 2008 U.S. Bureau of Land Management Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision for Oil Shale and Tar Sands Resources to Address Land Use Allocations in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are deemed to satisfy all legal and procedural requirements under any law, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58), and the Secretary of the Interior shall implement the oil shale leasing program authorized by the regulations referred to in subsection (a) in those areas covered by the resource management plans amended by such amendments, and covered by such record of decision, without any other administrative action necessary.

SEC. 17003. OIL SHALE LEASING.

(a) ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LEASE SALES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall hold a lease sale within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act offering an additional 10 parcels for lease for research, development, and demonstration of oil shale resources, under the terms offered in the solicitation of bids for such leases published on January 15, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 10).

(b) COMMERCIAL LEASE SALES.—No later than January 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Interior shall hold no less than 5 separate commercial lease sales in areas considered to have the most potential for oil shale development, as determined by the Secretary, in areas nominated through public comment. Each lease sale shall be for an area of not less than 25,000 acres, and in multiple lease blocs.

SEC. 17004. POLICIES REGARDING BUYING, BUILDING, AND WORKING FOR AMERICA.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.—It is the intent of the Congress that—

(1) this subtitle will support a healthy and growing United States domestic energy sector that, in turn, helps to reinvigorate American manufacturing, transportation, and service sectors by employing the vast talents of United States workers to assist in the development of energy from domestic sources;

(2) to ensure a robust oil shale industry and ensure that the benefits of development support local communities, under this subtitle, the Secretary of the Interior shall make every effort to promote the development of oil shale in a manner that will support the long-term commercial development of oil shale, and shall take into consideration the socioeconomic impacts, infrastructure requirements, and fiscal stability for local communities located within areas containing oil shale resources; and

(3) the Congress will monitor the deployment of personnel and material onshore to encourage the development of American technology and manufacturing to enable United States workers to benefit from this subtitle through good jobs and careers, as well as the establishment of important industrial facilities to support expanded access to American resources.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall when possible, and practicable, encourage the use of United States workers and equipment manufactured in the United States in all construction related to mineral resource development under this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing

SEC. 17101. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Energy Security and Transportation Jobs Act''.

PART 1—EXPANDING OFFSHORE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 17201. 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:

''(5)(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.

''(6)(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. 17202. 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, from the levels of oil and gas produced as of the date of enactment of this paragraph, 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.''.

PART 2—CONDUCTING PROMPT OFFSHORE LEASE SALES

SEC. 17301. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 216 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 216 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

SEC. 17302. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 220 ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFFSHORE VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the inclusion of Lease Sale 220 in the Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017, the Secretary shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 220 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO MAKE REPLACEMENT LEASE BLOCKS AVAILABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each lease block in a proposed lease sale under this section for which the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, under the Memorandum of Agreement referred to in subsection (c)(2), issues a statement proposing deferral from a lease offering due to defense-related activities that are irreconcilable with mineral exploration and development, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall make available in the same lease sale two other lease blocks in the Virginia lease sale planning area that are acceptable for oil and gas exploration and production in order to mitigate conflict.

(2) VIRGINIA LEASE SALE PLANNING AREA DEFINED.—In this subsection the term ''Virginia lease sale planning area'' means the area of the outer Continental Shelf (as that term is defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.)) that is bounded by—

(A) a northern boundary consisting of a straight line extending from the northernmost point of Virginia's seaward boundary to the point on the seaward boundary of the United States exclusive economic zone located at 37 degrees 17 minutes 1 second North latitude, 71 degrees 5 minutes 16 seconds West longitude; and

(B) a southern boundary consisting of a straight line extending from the southernmost point of Virginia's seaward boundary to the point on the seaward boundary of the United States exclusive economic zone located at 36 degrees 31 minutes 58 seconds North latitude, 71 degrees 30 minutes 1 second West longitude.

(c) BALANCING MILITARY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION GOALS.—

(1) JOINT GOALS.—In recognition that the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program and the domestic energy resources produced therefrom are integral to national security, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall work jointly in implementing this section in order to ensure achievement of the following common goals:

(A) Preserving the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain an optimum state of readiness through their continued use of the Outer Continental Shelf.

(B) Allowing effective exploration, development, and production of our Nation's oil, gas, and renewable energy resources.

(2) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—No person may engage in any exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas off the coast of Virginia that would conflict with any military operation, as determined in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior on Mutual Concerns on the Outer Continental Shelf signed July 20, 1983, and any revision or replacement for that agreement that is agreed to by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior after that date but before the date of issuance of the lease under which such exploration, development, or production is conducted.

SEC. 17303. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 222 IN THE CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 222 under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) by as soon as practicable, but not later than September 1, 2012.

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

SEC. 17304. LEASE SALE OFFSHORE CALIFORNIA WITH NO NEW OFFSHORE IMPACT.

(a) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LEASE SALE.—The Secretary shall offer for sale leases of tracts in the Southern California Planning Area in the Santa Maria and Santa Barbara/Ventura Basins in accordance with section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) as soon as practicable, but not later than July 1, 2014.

(b) USE OF EXISTING STRUCTURES OR ONSHORE-BASED DRILLING.—Leases offered for sale under this section shall include such terms and conditions as are necessary to require that development and production may occur only from existing offshore infrastructure or from onshore-based drilling.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO LEASING PROGRAM.—Areas shall be offered for lease under this section notwithstanding the omission of the Southern California Planning Area from any outer Continental Shelf leasing program under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344).

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—Section 307(c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1456(c)) shall not apply to lease sales under this section and activities conducted under leases issued in such sales, including exploration, development, and production.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before conducting the first lease sale under this section, the Secretary shall prepare an environmental impact statement for the lease sales required under this section, under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(2) ACTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332), in such statement—

(i) the Secretary is not required to identify nonleasing alternative courses of action or to analyze the environmental effects of such alternative courses of action; and

(ii) the Secretary shall only—

(I) identify a preferred action for leasing and not more than one alternative leasing proposal; and

(II) analyze the environmental effects and potential mitigation measures for such preferred action and such alternative leasing proposal.

(B) DEADLINE.—The identification of the preferred action and related analysis for the first lease sale under this subtitle shall be completed within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS.—In preparing such statement, the Secretary shall only consider public comments that specifically address the Secretary's preferred action and that are filed within 20 days after publication of an environmental analysis.

(4) COMPLIANCE.—Compliance with this subsection is deemed to satisfy all requirements for the analysis and consideration of the environmental effects of proposed leasing under this section.

SEC. 17305. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 214 IN THE NORTH ALEUTIAN BASIN OFFSHORE ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct the lease sale formerly known as Lease Sale 214, for the tracts located in the North Aleutian Basin Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO LEASING PROGRAM.—Areas shall be offered for lease under this section notwithstanding inclusion of areas referred to in subsection (a) in the Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017.

SEC. 17306. ADDITIONAL LEASES.

Section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) ADDITIONAL LEASE SALES.—In addition to lease sales in accordance with a leasing program in effect under this section, the Secretary may hold lease sales for areas identified by the Secretary to have the greatest potential for new oil and gas development as a result of local support, new seismic findings, or nomination by interested persons.''.

SEC. 17307. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

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

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

(3) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

PART 3—LEASING IN NEW OFFSHORE AREAS

SEC. 17401. LEASING IN THE EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO.

Section 104 of division C of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432; 120 Stat. 3003) is repealed.

SEC. 17402. REFORMING OIL AND GAS LEASING IN THE EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) REFORMING ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARIES.—Effective July 1, 2012, for purposes of administering the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) the boundary between the Central Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area and the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area shall be 86 degrees, 41 minutes west longitude.

(b) EXTENDING THE MORATORIUM.—Effective during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending June 30, 2025, the Secretary of the Interior shall not offer for leasing, preleasing, or any related activity any area in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area except as required under subsection (c).

(c) LIMITED NEW LEASING IN THE EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017, the Secretary shall conduct planning and leasing for one lease sale in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area in each of 2013, 2014, and 2015. Each lease sale shall only consist of 50 contiguous Outer Continental Shelf lease blocks in those areas the Secretary considers to have the greatest potential for oil and gas after issuing a request for, receiving, and considering public comment. In reviewing potential areas for such leasing, the Secretary shall focus on those areas for which there are known quantities of hydrocarbons that can be conventionally produced using existing or reasonably foreseeable technology, and for which oil and gas exploration, development, production, and marketing could be carried out in an expeditious manner.

(2) LEASE CONDITIONS.—In addition to such requirements as otherwise apply, each lease sale under this subsection shall be subject to the following:

(A) The Secretary may include limits on permanent surface occupancy on any lease block if surface occupancy is incompatible with military operations.

(B) The Secretary may include limits on drilling schedules and surface occupancy to accommodate defense activities on a short-term or seasonal basis. Such limits shall be treated as administrative suspensions of a lease term.

(C) The Secretary may limit permanent surface infrastructure on any Outer Continental Shelf lease block that is closer than 12 nautical miles to the coast of any State, unless that infrastructure is approved by the State.

(d) REQUIREMENT TO MAKE REPLACEMENT LEASE BLOCKS AVAILABLE.—For each lease block in a proposed lease sale under this section for which the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, under the Memorandum of Agreement referred to in subsection (e)(2) issues a statement proposing deferral from a lease offering due to defense-related activities that are irreconcilable with mineral exploration and development, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall make available in the same lease sale two other lease blocks in the same Outer Continental Shelf planning area that are acceptable for oil and gas exploration and production in order to mitigate conflict.

(e) BALANCING MILITARY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION GOALS.—

(1) JOINT GOALS.—In recognition that the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program and the domestic energy resources produced therefrom are integral to national security, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense shall work jointly in implementing this section in order to ensure achievement of the goals of—

(A) preserving the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain an optimum state of readiness through their continued use of the Outer Continental Shelf; and

(B) allowing effective exploration, development, and production of our Nation's oil, gas, and renewable energy resources.

(C) recognizing the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program is an integral part of the Nation's energy security program to develop domestic oil and gas resources.

(2) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—No person may engage in any exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area that would conflict with any military operation, as determined in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior on Mutual Concerns on the Outer Continental Shelf signed

July 20, 1983, and any revision or replacement for that agreement that is agreed to by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior after that date but before the date of issuance of the lease under which such exploration, development, or production is conducted.

SEC. 17403. AREAS ADDED TO CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO PLANNING AREA.

The Secretary shall conduct an offshore oil and gas lease sale under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) for the areas added to the Central Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area as a result of the enactment of section 17402(a) as soon as practicable, but not later than the first lease sale under such section after the date of the enactment of this Act in which any area in such planning area is made available for leasing.

SEC. 17404. APPLICATION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT WITH RESPECT TO TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (a), by inserting after ''control'' the following: ''or lying within the United States' exclusive economic zone and the Continental Shelf adjacent to any territory of the United States''; and

(2) in paragraph (p), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(3) in paragraph (q), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(r) The term 'State' includes each territory of the United States.''.

PART 4—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUE SHARING

SEC. 17501. DISPOSITION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES TO COASTAL STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) is amended—

(1) in the existing text—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''All rentals,'' and inserting the following:

''(c) DISPOSITION OF REVENUE UNDER OLD LEASES.—All rentals,''; and

(B) in subsection (c) (as designated by the amendment made by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph), by striking ''for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter'' and inserting ''in the period beginning June 5, 1950, and ending on the date of enactment of the Energy Security and Transportation Jobs Act'';

(2) by adding after subsection (c) (as so designated) the following:

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COASTAL STATE.—The term 'coastal State' includes a territory of the United States.

''(2) NEW LEASING REVENUES.—The term 'new leasing revenues'—

''(A) means amounts received by the United States as bonuses, rents, and royalties under leases for oil and gas, wind, tidal, or other energy exploration, development, and production on areas of the outer Continental Shelf that are authorized to be made available for leasing as a result of enactment of the Energy Security and Transportation Jobs Act; and

''(B) does not include amounts received by the United States under any lease of an area located in the boundaries of the Central Gulf of Mexico and Western Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas on the date of the enactment of the Energy Security and Transportation Jobs Act, including a lease issued before, on, or after such date of enactment.''; and

(3) by inserting before subsection (c) (as so designated) the following:

''(a) PAYMENT OF NEW LEASING REVENUES TO COASTAL STATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), of the amount of new leasing revenues received by the United States each fiscal year, 37.5 percent shall be allocated and paid in accordance with subsection (b) to coastal States that are affected States with respect to the leases under which those revenues are received by the United States.

''(2) PHASE-IN.—Paragraph (1) shall be applied—

''(A) with respect to new leasing revenues under leases awarded under the first leasing program under section 18(a) that takes effect after the date of enactment of the Energy Security and Transportation Jobs Act, by substituting '12.5 percent' for '37.5 percent'; and

''(B) with respect to new leasing revenues under leases awarded under the second leasing program under section 18(a) that takes effect after the date of enactment of the Energy Security and Transportation Jobs Act, by substituting '25 percent' for '37.5 percent'.

''(b) ALLOCATION OF PAYMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of new leasing revenues received by the United States with respect to a leased tract that are required to be paid to coastal States in accordance with this subsection each fiscal year shall be allocated among and paid to coastal States that are within 200 miles of the leased tract, in amounts that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each such State that is closest to the geographic center of the lease tract, as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a coastal State under paragraph (1) each fiscal year with respect to a leased tract shall be—

''(A) in the case of a coastal State that is the nearest State to the geographic center of the leased tract, not less than 25 percent of the total amounts allocated with respect to the leased tract;

''(B) in the case of any other coastal State, not less than 10 percent, and not more than 15 percent, of the total amounts allocated with respect to the leased tract; and

''(C) in the case of a coastal State that is the only coastal State within 200 miles of a least tract, 100 percent of the total amounts allocated with respect to the leased tract.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts allocated to a coastal State under this subsection—

''(A) shall be available to the coastal State without further appropriation;

''(B) shall remain available until expended; and

''(C) shall be in addition to any other amounts available to the coastal State under this Act.

''(4) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a coastal State may use funds allocated and paid to it under this subsection for any purpose as determined by the laws of that State.

''(B) RESTRICTION ON USE FOR MATCHING.—Funds allocated and paid to a coastal State under this subsection may not be used as matching funds for any other Federal program.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—This section and the amendment made by this section shall not affect the application of section 105 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)), as in effect before the enactment of this Act, with respect to revenues received by the United States under oil and gas leases issued for tracts located in the Western and Central Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas, including such leases issued on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PART 5—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 17601. POLICIES REGARDING BUYING, BUILDING, AND WORKING FOR AMERICA.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.—It is the intent of the Congress that—

(1) this subtitle will support a healthy and growing United States domestic energy sector that, in turn, helps to reinvigorate American manufacturing, transportation, and service sectors by employing the vast talents of United States workers to assist in the development of energy from domestic sources; and

(2) the Congress will monitor the deployment of personnel and material onshore and offshore to encourage the development of American technology and manufacturing to enable United States workers to benefit from this subtitle through good jobs and careers, as well as the establishment of important industrial facilities to support expanded access to American resources.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall when possible, and practicable, encourage the use of United States workers and equipment manufactured in the United States in all construction related to mineral and renewable energy resource development on the Outer Continental Shelf under this subtitle.

SEC. 17602. REGULATIONS.

Section 30(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1356(a)) is amended by striking ''shall issue regulations which'' and inserting ''shall issue regulations that shall be supplemental to, complementary with, and under no circumstances a substitution for the provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States extended to the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf by section 4(a)(1), except insofar as such laws would otherwise apply to individuals who have extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, or business, which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim, and that''.

Subtitle C—Alaska Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing

SEC. 17701. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Alaskan Energy for American Jobs Act''.

SEC. 17702. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COASTAL PLAIN.—The term ''Coastal Plain'' means that area described in appendix I to part 37 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) PEER REVIEWED.—The term ''peer reviewed'' means reviewed—

(A) by individuals chosen by the National Academy of Sciences with no contractual relationship with, or those who have no application for a grant or other funding pending with, the Federal agency with leasing jurisdiction; or

(B) if individuals described in subparagraph (A) are not available, by the top individuals in the specified biological fields, as determined by the National Academy of Sciences.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'', except as otherwise provided, means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary's designee.

SEC. 17703. LEASING PROGRAM FOR LANDS WITHIN THE COASTAL PLAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary—

(1) to establish and implement, in accordance with this subtitle and acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in consultation with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain; and

(2) to administer the provisions of this subtitle through regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other provisions that ensure the oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the Coastal Plain will result in no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment, including, in furtherance of this goal, by requiring the application of the best commercially available technology for oil and gas exploration, development, and production to all exploration, development, and production operations under this subtitle in a manner that ensures the receipt of fair market value by the public for the mineral resources to be leased.

(b) REPEAL OF EXISTING RESTRICTION.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 1003 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3143) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 1003.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS UNDER CERTAIN OTHER LAWS.—

(1) COMPATIBILITY.—For purposes of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the oil and gas leasing program and activities authorized by this section in the Coastal Plain are deemed to be compatible with the purposes for which the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was established, and no further findings or decisions are required to implement this determination.

(2) ADEQUACY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The ''Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement'' (April 1987) on the Coastal Plain prepared pursuant to section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3142) and section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) is deemed to satisfy the requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 that apply with respect to prelease activities under this subtitle, including actions authorized to be taken by the Secretary to develop and promulgate the regulations for the establishment of a leasing program authorized by this subtitle before the conduct of the first lease sale.

(3) COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA FOR OTHER ACTIONS.—Before conducting the first lease sale under this subtitle, the Secretary shall prepare an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to the actions authorized by this subtitle that are not referred to in paragraph (2). Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary is not required to identify nonleasing alternative courses of action or to analyze the environmental effects of such courses of action. The Secretary shall only identify a preferred action for such leasing and a single leasing alternative, and analyze the environmental effects and potential mitigation measures for those two alternatives. The identification of the preferred action and related analysis for the first lease sale under this subtitle shall be completed within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary shall only consider public comments that specifically address the Secretary's preferred action and that are filed within 20 days after publication of an environmental analysis. Notwithstanding any other law, compliance with this paragraph is deemed to satisfy all requirements for the analysis and consideration of the environmental effects of proposed leasing under this subtitle.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be considered to expand or limit State and local regulatory authority.

(e) SPECIAL AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after consultation with the State of Alaska, the city of Kaktovik, and the North Slope Borough, may designate up to a total of 45,000 acres of the Coastal Plain as a Special Area if the Secretary determines that the Special Area is of such unique character and interest so as to require special management and regulatory protection. The Secretary shall designate as such a Special Area the Sadlerochit Spring area, comprising approximately 4,000 acres.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Each such Special Area shall be managed so as to protect and preserve the area's unique and diverse character including its fish, wildlife, and subsistence resource values.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM LEASING OR SURFACE OCCUPANCY.—The Secretary may exclude any Special Area from leasing. If the Secretary leases a Special Area, or any part thereof, for purposes of oil and gas exploration, development, production, and related activities, there shall be no surface occupancy of the lands comprising the Special Area.

(4) DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.—Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may lease all or a portion of a Special Area under terms that permit the use of horizontal drilling technology from sites on leases tracts located outside the Special Area.

(f) LIMITATION ON CLOSED AREAS.—The Secretary's sole authority to close lands within the Coastal Plain to oil and gas leasing and to exploration, development, and production is that set forth in this subtitle.

(g) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle, including regulations relating to protection of the fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and environment of the Coastal Plain, by no later than 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REVISION OF REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall, through a rule making conducted in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, periodically review and, if appropriate, revise the regulations issued under subsection (a) to reflect a preponderance of the best available scientific evidence that has been peer reviewed and obtained by following appropriate, documented scientific procedures, the results of which can be repeated using those same procedures.

SEC. 17704. LEASE SALES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Lands may be leased under this subtitle to any person qualified to obtain a lease for deposits of oil and gas under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

(b) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, by regulation and no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, establish procedures for—

(1) receipt and consideration of sealed nominations for any area of the Coastal Plain for inclusion in, or exclusion (as provided in subsection (c)) from, a lease sale;

(2) the holding of lease sales after such nomination process; and

(3) public notice of and comment on designation of areas to be included in, or excluded from, a lease sale.

(c) LEASE SALE BIDS.—Lease sales under this subtitle may be conducted through an Internet leasing program, if the Secretary determines that such a system will result in savings to the taxpayer, an increase in the number of bidders participating, and higher returns than oral bidding or a sealed bidding system.

(d) SALE ACREAGES AND SCHEDULE.—

(1) The Secretary shall offer for lease under this subtitle those tracts the Secretary considers to have the greatest potential for the discovery of hydrocarbons, taking into consideration nominations received pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) The Secretary shall offer for lease under this subtitle no less than 50,000 acres for lease within 22 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The Secretary shall offer for lease under this subtitle no less than an additional 50,000 acres at 6-, 12-, and 18-month intervals following offering under paragraph (2).

(4) The Secretary shall conduct four additional sales under the same terms and schedule no later than two years after the date of the last sale under paragraph (3), if sufficient interest in leasing exists to warrant, in the Secretary's judgment, the conduct of such sales.

(5) The Secretary shall evaluate the bids in each sale and issue leases resulting from such sales, within 90 days after the date of the completion of such sale.

SEC. 17705. GRANT OF LEASES BY THE SECRETARY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may grant to the highest responsible qualified bidder in a lease sale conducted under section 17704 any lands to be leased on the Coastal Plain upon payment by the such bidder of such bonus as may be accepted by the Secretary.

(b) SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS.—No lease issued under this subtitle may be sold, exchanged, assigned, sublet, or otherwise transferred except with the approval of the Secretary. Prior to any such approval the Secretary shall consult with, and give due consideration to the views of, the Attorney General.

SEC. 17706. LEASE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An oil or gas lease issued under this subtitle shall—

(1) provide for the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold under the lease, as determined by the Secretary under the regulations applicable to other Federal oil and gas leases;

(2) provide that the Secretary may close, on a seasonal basis, portions of the Coastal Plain to exploratory drilling activities as necessary to protect caribou calving areas and other species of fish and wildlife based on a preponderance of the best available scientific evidence that has been peer reviewed and obtained by following appropriate, documented scientific procedures, the results of which can be repeated using those same procedures;

(3) require that the lessee of lands within the Coastal Plain shall be fully responsible and liable for the reclamation of lands within the Coastal Plain and any other Federal lands that are adversely affected in connection with exploration, development, production, or transportation activities conducted under the lease and within the Coastal Plain by the lessee or by any of the subcontractors or agents of the lessee;

(4) provide that the lessee may not delegate or convey, by contract or otherwise, the reclamation responsibility and liability to another person without the express written approval of the Secretary;

(5) provide that the standard of reclamation for lands required to be reclaimed under this subtitle shall be, as nearly as practicable, a condition capable of supporting the uses which the lands were capable of supporting prior to any exploration, development, or production activities, or upon application by the lessee, to a higher or better use as certified by the Secretary;

(6) contain terms and conditions relating to protection of fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment as required pursuant to section 17703(a)(2);

(7) provide that the lessee, its agents, and its contractors use best efforts to provide a fair share, as determined by the level of obligation previously agreed to in the 1974 agreement implementing section 29 of the Federal Agreement and Grant of Right of Way for the Operation of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, of employment and contracting for Alaska Natives and Alaska Native corporations from throughout the State;

(8) prohibit the export of oil produced under the lease; and

(9) contain such other provisions as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure compliance with this subtitle and the regulations issued under this subtitle.

(b) NEGOTIATED LABOR AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary, as a term and condition of each lease under this subtitle, shall require that the lessee and its agents and contractors negotiate to obtain an agreement for the employment of laborers and mechanics on production, maintenance, and construction under the lease.

SEC. 17707. POLICIES REGARDING BUYING, BUILDING, AND WORKING FOR AMERICA.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.—It is the intent of the Congress that—

(1) this subtitle will support a healthy and growing United States domestic energy sector that, in turn, helps to reinvigorate American

manufacturing, transportation, and service sectors by employing the vast talents of United States workers to assist in the development of energy from domestic sources; and

(2) the Congress will monitor the deployment of personnel and material onshore and offshore to encourage the development of American technology and manufacturing to enable United States workers to benefit from this subtitle through good jobs and careers, as well as the establishment of important industrial facilities to support expanded access to American resources.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall when possible, and practicable, encourage the use of United States workers and equipment manufactured in the United States in all construction related to mineral development on the Coastal Plain.

SEC. 17708. COASTAL PLAIN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

(a) NO SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECT STANDARD TO GOVERN AUTHORIZED COASTAL PLAIN ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall, consistent with the requirements of section 17703, administer this subtitle through regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other provisions that—

(1) ensure the oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the Coastal Plain will result in no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment;

(2) require the application of the best commercially available technology for oil and gas exploration, development, and production on all new exploration, development, and production operations; and

(3) ensure that the maximum amount of surface acreage covered by production and support facilities, including airstrips and any areas covered by gravel berms or piers for support of pipelines, does not exceed 10,000 acres on the Coastal Plain for each 100,000 acres of area leased.

(b) SITE-SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION.—The Secretary shall also require, with respect to any proposed drilling and related activities, that—

(1) a site-specific analysis be made of the probable effects, if any, that the drilling or related activities will have on fish and wildlife, their habitat, subsistence resources, and the environment;

(2) a plan be implemented to avoid, minimize, and mitigate (in that order and to the extent practicable) any significant adverse effect identified under paragraph (1); and

(3) the development of the plan shall occur after consultation with the agency or agencies having jurisdiction over matters mitigated by the plan.

(c) REGULATIONS TO PROTECT COASTAL PLAIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES, SUBSISTENCE USERS, AND THE ENVIRONMENT.—Before implementing the leasing program authorized by this subtitle, the Secretary shall prepare and promulgate regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, stipulations, and other measures designed to ensure that the activities undertaken on the Coastal Plain under this subtitle are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes and environmental requirements of this subtitle.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL AND STATE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The proposed regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, and stipulations for the leasing program under this subtitle shall require compliance with all applicable provisions of Federal and State environmental law, and shall also require the following:

(1) Standards at least as effective as the safety and environmental mitigation measures set forth in items 1 through 29 at pages 167 through 169 of the ''Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement'' (April 1987) on the Coastal Plain.

(2) Seasonal limitations on exploration, development, and related activities, where necessary, to avoid significant adverse effects during periods of concentrated fish and wildlife breeding, denning, nesting, spawning, and migration based on a preponderance of the best available scientific evidence that has been peer reviewed and obtained by following appropriate, documented scientific procedures, the results of which can be repeated using those same procedures.

(3) That exploration activities, except for surface geological studies, be limited to the period between approximately November 1 and May 1 each year and that exploration activities shall be supported, if necessary, by ice roads, winter trails with adequate snow cover, ice pads, ice airstrips, and air transport methods, except that such exploration activities may occur at other times if the Secretary finds that such exploration will have no significant adverse effect on the fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment of the Coastal Plain.

(4) Design safety and construction standards for all pipelines and any access and service roads, that—

(A) minimize, to the maximum extent possible, adverse effects upon the passage of migratory species such as caribou; and

(B) minimize adverse effects upon the flow of surface water by requiring the use of culverts, bridges, and other structural devices.

(5) Prohibitions on general public access and use on all pipeline access and service roads.

(6) Stringent reclamation and rehabilitation requirements, consistent with the standards set forth in this subtitle, requiring the removal from the Coastal Plain of all oil and gas development and production facilities, structures, and equipment upon completion of oil and gas production operations, except that the Secretary may exempt from the requirements of this paragraph those facilities, structures, or equipment that the Secretary determines would assist in the management of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and that are donated to the United States for that purpose.

(7) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on access by all modes of transportation.

(8) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on sand and gravel extraction.

(9) Consolidation of facility siting.

(10) Appropriate prohibitions or restrictions on use of explosives.

(11) Avoidance, to the extent practicable, of springs, streams, and river systems; the protection of natural surface drainage patterns, wetlands, and riparian habitats; and the regulation of methods or techniques for developing or transporting adequate supplies of water for exploratory drilling.

(12) Avoidance or minimization of air traffic-related disturbance to fish and wildlife.

(13) Treatment and disposal of hazardous and toxic wastes, solid wastes, reserve pit fluids, drilling muds and cuttings, and domestic wastewater, including an annual waste management report, a hazardous materials tracking system, and a prohibition on chlorinated solvents, in accordance with applicable Federal and State environmental law.

(14) Fuel storage and oil spill contingency planning.

(15) Research, monitoring, and reporting requirements.

(16) Field crew environmental briefings.

(17) Avoidance of significant adverse effects upon subsistence hunting, fishing, and trapping by subsistence users.

(18) Compliance with applicable air and water quality standards.

(19) Appropriate seasonal and safety zone designations around well sites, within which subsistence hunting and trapping shall be limited.

(20) Reasonable stipulations for protection of cultural and archeological resources.

(21) All other protective environmental stipulations, restrictions, terms, and conditions deemed necessary by the Secretary.

(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—In preparing and promulgating regulations, lease terms, conditions, restrictions, prohibitions, and stipulations under this section, the Secretary shall consider the following:

(1) The stipulations and conditions that govern the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska leasing program, as set forth in the 1999 Northeast National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska Final Integrated Activity Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

(2) The environmental protection standards that governed the initial Coastal Plain seismic exploration program under parts 37.31 to 37.33 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) The land use stipulations for exploratory drilling on the KIC–ASRC private lands that are set forth in appendix 2 of the August 9, 1983, agreement between Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the United States.

(f) FACILITY CONSOLIDATION PLANNING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, after providing for public notice and comment, prepare and update periodically a plan to govern, guide, and direct the siting and construction of facilities for the exploration, development, production, and transportation of Coastal Plain oil and gas resources.

(2) OBJECTIVES.—The plan shall have the following objectives:

(A) Avoiding unnecessary duplication of facilities and activities.

(B) Encouraging consolidation of common facilities and activities.

(C) Locating or confining facilities and activities to areas that will minimize impact on fish and wildlife, their habitat, and the environment.

(D) Utilizing existing facilities wherever practicable.

(E) Enhancing compatibility between wildlife values and development activities.

(g) ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) manage public lands in the Coastal Plain subject to section 811 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3121); and

(2) ensure that local residents shall have reasonable access to public lands in the Coastal Plain for traditional uses.

SEC. 17709. EXPEDITED JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) FILING OF COMPLAINT.—

(1) DEADLINE.—Subject to paragraph (2), any complaint seeking judicial review—

(A) of any provision of this subtitle shall be filed by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) of any action of the Secretary under this subtitle shall be filed—

(i) except as provided in clause (ii), within the 90-day period beginning on the date of the action being challenged; or

(ii) in the case of a complaint based solely on grounds arising after such period, within 90 days after the complainant knew or reasonably should have known of the grounds for the complaint.

(2) VENUE.—Any complaint seeking judicial review of any provision of this subtitle or any action of the Secretary under this subtitle may be filed only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

(3) LIMITATION ON SCOPE OF CERTAIN REVIEW.—Judicial review of a Secretarial decision to conduct a lease sale under this subtitle, including the environmental analysis thereof, shall be limited to whether the Secretary has complied with this subtitle and shall be based upon the administrative record of that decision. The Secretary's identification of a preferred course of action to enable leasing to proceed and the Secretary's analysis of environmental effects under this subtitle shall be presumed to be correct unless shown otherwise by clear and convincing evidence to the contrary.

(b) LIMITATION ON OTHER REVIEW.—Actions of the Secretary with respect to which review could have been obtained under this section shall not

be subject to judicial review in any civil or criminal proceeding for enforcement.

(c) LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COURT COSTS.—No person seeking judicial review of any action under this subtitle shall receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys' fees and other court costs, including under any provision of law enacted by the Equal Access to Justice Act (5 U.S.C. 504 note).

SEC. 17710. TREATMENT OF REVENUES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 50 percent of the amount of bonus, rental, and royalty revenues from Federal oil and gas leasing and operations authorized under this subtitle shall be deposited in the Treasury.

SEC. 17711. RIGHTS-OF-WAY ACROSS THE COASTAL PLAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue rights-of-way and easements across the Coastal Plain for the transportation of oil and gas produced under leases under this subtitle—

(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185), without regard to title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.); and

(2) under title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (30 U.S.C. 3161 et seq.), for access authorized by sections 1110 and 1111 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3170 and 3171).

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall include in any right-of-way or easement issued under subsection (a) such terms and conditions as may be necessary to ensure that transportation of oil and gas does not result in a significant adverse effect on the fish and wildlife, subsistence resources, their habitat, and the environment of the Coastal Plain, including requirements that facilities be sited or designed so as to avoid unnecessary duplication of roads and pipelines.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall include in regulations under section 17703(g) provisions granting rights-of-way and easements described in subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 17712. CONVEYANCE.

In order to maximize Federal revenues by removing clouds on title to lands and clarifying land ownership patterns within the Coastal Plain, the Secretary, notwithstanding section 1302(h)(2) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3192(h)(2)), shall convey—

(1) to the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation the surface estate of the lands described in paragraph 1 of Public Land Order 6959, to the extent necessary to fulfill the Corporation's entitlement under sections 12 and 14 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611 and 1613) in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement between the Department of the Interior, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation dated January 22, 1993; and

(2) to the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation the remaining subsurface estate to which it is entitled pursuant to the August 9, 1983, agreement between the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the United States of America.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 112–398. Each such 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 MS. ESHOO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 14003(a), add at the end the following:

(3) ENSURING PUBLIC SAFETY.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), a permit shall not be issued or deemed to have been issued under this subsection until the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission examines and determines the relevance to the Keystone XL pipeline of the report issued by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, pursuant to the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90), describing the results of its review of hazardous liquid pipeline regulations and whether such regulations are sufficient to ensure the safety of pipelines used for the transportation of diluted bitumen.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Last year, in the bipartisan pipeline safety bill that was signed into law, I worked with Chairman UPTON to include language which requires the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, which is called PHMSA, to complete a comprehensive review of hazardous liquid pipeline regulations. This review will determine whether the current regulations are sufficient to ensure the safety of pipelines used for the transportation of diluted bitumen or tar sands oil. Everyone agrees that this review makes sense. The House and the Senate both passed the pipeline safety bill without a single Member of Congress voting against it. What doesn't make sense is directing the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue a permit for the Keystone XL pipeline before we know whether our safety standards are adequate.

Last year, Cynthia Quarterman, the Administrator of PHMSA, testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee, stating the agency had not done a study to analyze the risks associated with transporting diluted bitumen. We've heard concerns that pipelines carrying tar sands oil may pose greater safety risks and may be more corrosive than pipelines carrying conventional crude. According to a recent whistleblower who worked as a safety inspector for the first Keystone pipeline, he said:

> This oil has the consistency of peanut butter and is similar to sending heavy grit sandpaper down the steel pipe.

□ 1550

So we're not talking about a theoretical risk. In July 2010, a pipeline carrying tar sands oil ruptured near Marshall, Michigan. Over 800,000 gallons of oil spilled into the Talmadge Creek and then flowed into the Kalamazoo River. A year and a half after the spill, the cleanup continues and is expected to cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Oil tar sands, unlike conventional crude oil, sinks to the bottom of a river, making it especially difficult to clean up.

TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline doesn't really inspire confidence either. This is a brand-new, supposedly state-of-the-art pipeline. It was predicted to spill no more than once every 7 years; but in just a year and a half of operation, it's reported 14 separate oil spills. In North Dakota, over 21,000 gallons of tar sands oil have been spilled, and these spills are a warning to all of us that we need to get this right.

This is not a subject to be taken lightly. We've seen in my neck of the woods, in the northern part of the county where I live, in San Bruno, California, an explosion, natural-gas pipeline explosion that killed eight people. It injured dozens, and it destroyed 38 homes.

The Federal Government has been regulating pipelines since 1968, and we're still seeing explosions like the one in San Bruno, California. I think it's dangerous, Mr. Chairman, to move forward with a tar sands pipeline before we have the proper safety knowledge and procedures in place.

So my amendment is really quite simple. It requires the FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, to review the results of the PHMSA study before issuing a permit for the Keystone XL pipeline. I think this review is important for the safety of Americans who will be living near this pipeline for decades to come and who rely on the rivers and the streams and the aquifers it will cross.

This approach makes sense. It's also far less costly to build pipelines correctly than to try to fix or replace a line that's already built.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I do so reluctantly because we all have such great respect for Ms. ESHOO of California. She is a hardworking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and provides great leadership.

But we oppose this amendment for a couple of simple reasons. Number one, this study by the Department of Transportation is going to be made anyway. We're not stopping that at all.

Number two, Keystone will transport a grade of crude oil that has been in our Nation's pipelines for decades. There's nothing really new about this substance. Venezuelan oil has about the same density. Certain Saudi Arabian oils have basically the same density.

Studies by the Canadian Government and private sector engineers in this country have demonstrated that heavy oils and diluted bitumen are not more dangerous or corrosive than regular grades of oil. We have not found any evidence to the contrary of those studies.

The reason that we're opposing this amendment is because this amendment would say you cannot begin this pipeline until this study is completed, and our position is we want this study to go forward. We've waited over 40 months to get the approval to build this pipeline. The American people need this pipeline. America needs this additional oil.

If the study comes back and comes up with significant, or any, safety issues, I can assure you that Congress is ready to act to address those. But there's no indication that there will be a problem.

So for that reason, we feel quite confident that this pipeline should be built. We want the study to go forward, but we want the permit to be issued to build it now, as the Department of State recognized in their final environmental statement back in August of 2011.

I would urge the defeat of the Eshoo amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. MARKEY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 903, after line 22, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) ENERGY SECURITY.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall require every permit issued under this Act to include provisions that ensure that any crude oil and bitumen transported by the Keystone XL pipeline, and all refined petroleum fuel products whose origin was via importation of crude oil or bitumen by the Keystone XL pipeline, will be entered into domestic commerce for use as a fuel, or for the manufacture of another product, in the United States. The President may provide for waivers of such requirement in the following situations:

(A) Where the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interest because it—

(i) will not lead to an increase in domestic consumption of crude oil or refined petroleum products obtained from countries hostile to United States interests or with political and economic instability that compromises energy supply security;

(ii) will not lead to higher costs to refiners who purchase the crude oil than such refiners would have to pay for crude oil in the absence of such a waiver; and

(iii) will not lead to higher gasoline costs to consumers than consumers would have to pay in the absence of such a waiver.

(B) Where an exchange of crude oil or refined product provides for no net loss of crude oil or refined product consumed domestically.

(C) Where a waiver is necessary under the Constitution, a law, or an international agreement.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purported benefits of the Keystone pipeline have achieved mythic status. We have been told that this pipeline will lower gas prices, even though TransCanada says gas prices will go up. We've been told tens of thousands will be hired to build it, even though only about 5,000 or 6,000 temporary construction jobs will be created.

And in a particularly egregious descent into Fairyland, we have been told that the oil coming through this pipeline would enable us to reduce our dependence on oil imported from unfriendly Middle Eastern or Latin American nations.

Last month, Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper even said, when you look at the Iranians threatening to block the Strait of Hormuz, I think this just illustrates how critical it is that supply for the United States be North American.

But under this bill, the Republican bill, there is no guarantee that even a drop of the tar sands oil and fuels will stay here in this country. They keep saying how great it would be if we had a million barrels of oil coming into the United States from Canada. There's no guarantee in this bill, and that's because many of the refineries where the Keystone crude will be sent plan to reexport the refined fuels.

This is the map of what the oil industry plans on doing with this oil. It comes right through the United States, and then it heads off to Asia, South America, over to Europe. And Valero, one of these refineries, says in its investor presentation that it plans to refine the Canadian crude at the same facility it is building in Port Arthur, Texas, an export zone, because doing so leverages its export logistics.

Our amendment will say this oil coming through this pipeline from Canada stays here in the United States and doesn't head off to China. That's what the amendment is all about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

This is one of those myths that we must try to dispel. I guess if you say it enough times, some people will start believing it. But the reality is, why would you build a pipeline 1,700 miles, branching off to several refineries along the way, to our main refineries in Texas and Louisiana, simply to put it on a boat, send it through South America over to China, when they're already discussing, because the President denied this permit and set off a little bit of an international fury, sending a message to the rest of the world that we're going to kowtow to the environmental extremists as our energy policy in the United States, they are now talking about, or have been for some time, of just building a pipeline straight from the Alberta tar sands up here, all the way to Vancouver coast.

Now, let me just read some of the article, since Prime Minister Stephen Harper went to China last week to court them to buy the oil that the United States just rejected when the President denied the Keystone XL permit.

□ 1600

This is from an article from Ottawa.ctv, referring to the Prime Minister:

He also made a subtle dig at environmentalists who helped block TransCanada's planned Keystone XL pipeline, which would have carried Canada's oil to refineries in the United States.

''We uphold our responsibility to put the interests of Canadians ahead of foreign money and influence that seek to obstruct development in Canada in favor of energy imported from other, less stable parts of the world,'' he told the dinner.

By the way, he was referring to Saudi Arabia, Middle East, and Venezuela where we're getting our oil now and will continue to do so unless this Keystone pipeline is built offsetting up to a million barrels per day.

In Bloomberg on February 10, Harper said he is committed to ''profoundly'' diversifying the country's energy exports that will facilitate construction of new infrastructure needed to ship the country's oil to China.

He's not talking about Keystone pipeline. He's talking about the new one along the west to Vancouver.

The article continues:

Canada, which holds the third largest oil reserves, is seeking to reduce its reliance on the United States after President Barack Obama rejected TransCanada Corp.'s $7 billion Keystone XL pipeline to ship Canadian oil to the Gulf Coast.

''We want to sell our energy to people who want to buy our energy.''

That's why he went to China because obviously it's not the United States.

Oil and Gas Journal states:

Harper's visit was described as an open warning to Washington after President Barack Obama rejected the Keystone pipeline.

''It's not a subtle warning. It's an open warning. Harper has said Keystone was a

wake-up call,'' said Wenran Jiang, an energy expert at the University of Alberta.

Now, next, Washington Post:

Chinese state-controlled Sinopec has a stake in a proposed Canadian pipeline to the Pacific Ocean that would substantially boost Chinese investment in Alberta oil sands.

From today, February 15, Kinder Morgan pipeline—this is from the Houston Business Journal—the chief of Port Metro Vancouver, the city's port authority, said the port would be willing to undertake the dredging and infrastructure work necessary to allow the bigger ships into the port that could carry crude shipped to the coast from Alberta oil sands.

The reality is if you want this oil to go to China, kill the XL pipeline, the Keystone pipeline, and let this one be built in Canada, which Canada is already preparing to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Keystone is not the energy future that advocates claim it is. But if in fact the Keystone pipeline is built, then this amendment says that that oil in fact should be used in the United States to reduce our dependence on oil. It appears right now that if this pipeline is built, it will be for the purpose of transporting tar sands oil from Canada down to Houston for refining and then export to Latin America and China. That's very much what is on the mind of many people.

You can't have both—have that pipeline be essentially a conduit for export and claim that it's going to reduce American dependence on overseas oil. This amendment speaks directly to that it and it allows those who claim that Keystone will allow us energy independence to guarantee in law that that will happen.

Mr. MARKEY. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining on either side?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, oil companies are running a multi-million dollar lobbying campaign to approve the Keystone pipeline, a pipeline the owner itself says the price of oil in middle America to go up, not down.

Here's what the oil company, TransCanada, said in its own application:

Additional producer revenues are possible if the Keystone pipeline also relieves the oversupply situation in the Midwest.

It goes on to say:

The market prices of Canadian heavy crudes should rise in the Midwest.

This gives new meaning to the phrase ''voodoo economics.''

Only in a party bought and paid for by the Koch Brothers would politicians have the audacity to claim that raising oil prices in America will lower gas prices help consumers or improve national security.

Our amendment prevents oil companies from gouging American consumers by requiring that any oil pumped through the Keystone pipeline stay in America which is, ostensibly, the avowed purpose of the pipeline.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Again, could we get a review of the time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute. The gentleman from Nebraska has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. Could you inform me as to who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Nebraska has the right to close.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining minute.

The gentleman from Nebraska says, What's the problem? All the oil's going to stay in the United States. It's not going to China.

That's what will happen if we don't build the pipeline. So they should vote for the Markey amendment because the Markey amendment could only be guilty of redundancy saying all the oil stays here in America.

So if that's your purpose, that's what the Markey amendment says. We'll hold you to your word when we have the vote.

But here's the real plan. TransCanada puts the dirtiest oil on the planet into the brand new pipeline Republicans are giving it; two, TransCanada sends that oil to the gulf coast where it can make billions more than where it currently sells it in the Midwest; three, refineries in the gulf coast re-export it to other countries at world oil prices and don't pay any taxes to the U.S. for doing so; four, Americans get higher gas prices and no increased energy security; five, TransCanada, Hugo Chavez, and the sheiks of Saudi Arabia laugh all the way to the bank.

Please vote ''yes'' for the Markey-Connolly-Cohen-Welch amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This amendment just defies logic in the sense that the refined product of gasoline is going to be used in the United States. Now, the fallacy of this amendment here is it says all of the refined products. Well, there's stuff that's left over after the process that we can't even use in the United States that's commonly exported today for decades.

We actually don't use all of the diesel, and we trade with Europe to bring in more gasoline.

So what this amendment is trying to do is, A, start a trade war because it violates all trade rules and regulations. But the reality is it's a misnomer. If you really want this oil to go to China and us to have to continue to import from Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, then vote ''yes'' on this amendment because evidently you're more concerned about jobs in China than you are in the United States.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. RUSH. 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 903, after line 22, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) RESTRICTION ON USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), a permit shall not be issued or deemed to have been issued under this subsection absent a condition that prohibits the permit recipient from initiating or threatening to initiate proceedings to invoke the power of eminent domain for the purpose of taking ownership, rights-of-way, easements, or other access or use of private property in the United States, for purposes of constructing or operating the Keystone XL pipeline, against the will of the property's owner.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1610

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, why is it that the proponents of this bill are smiling and smirking while walking around this Capitol?

It's because this bill requires the hasty approval of an unprecedented permit for the Keystone XL pipeline. They're smiling and smirking because their friends, the Big Oil companies, are big winners with this bill while the little people, the private property owners along the path of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, will be the big losers.

Mr. Chairman, people might be surprised to learn that TransCanada has been bullying the American people—American landowners—and has been pressuring them to allow the company to build a pipeline through their land. In fact, during the subcommittee hearing, we heard testimony from witnesses who live along the path near the proposed route of this pipeline that TransCanada is doing just that—bullying them. They don't even have a permit to build the pipeline, yet we are told that

they are threatening American citizens with eminent domain, basically telling people, If you don't give us access to your land, if you don't give us your land, then we're going to take it.

Mr. Chairman, this is wrong. This is wrong. This is wrong. Why are we rewarding a private foreign company that is trying to intimidate and coerce American citizens with this regulatory earmark?

In order to protect private property owners along the path of this pipeline, I am offering an amendment that will restrict the use of eminent domain. My amendment requires that a permit for this pipeline would only be issued if it prohibits the use of eminent domain to take someone's private property against his will.

Mr. Chairman, my office was in contact with a Nebraska rancher by the name of Randy Thompson, who wrote me a letter dated February 9, and I want to read an excerpt of it for my colleagues.

He wrote:

Dear Congressman Rush, I would like to express to you, sir, my concerns about the bill introduced by Representative Terry to fast-forward the permitting process for the Keystone XL pipeline. It seems inherently wrong to me that a foreign corporation can actually force American citizens to forfeit their individual property rights through the use of eminent domain. With the denial of a permit, TransCanada has, for the time being, suspended their land acquisition process in the State of Nebraska. I can assure you, however, that they will be back on our doorsteps with a vengeance once a new route has been determined and a permit has been granted. It appears to me that some Members of Congress are all too eager to subsidize the Big Oil companies, not only with our tax dollars, but now with land that belongs to American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, we have a duty to protect our citizens from being bullied into giving up their land against their will for the gain of private foreign companies. Let us wipe the smiles and the smirks off the faces of the proponents of this bill. Pass this amendment. Protect the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. TERRY. None of us are smiling over the fact that the President killed the pipeline that would have created 20,000 jobs and that would have provided us a newer level of energy security. This amendment, in essence, is a way of killing this pipeline. Let's be clear about this.

The pipeline is 1,700 miles, and through each State this proposed pipeline would pass, the pipeline company would negotiate with the landowners on the proposed routes. So, if you have one person who objects, then he can ostensibly kill the pipeline. In every State, there is a mechanism in its own State laws that resolves any disputes for a right-of-way. We've heard some language here about taking people's property. This is for use of a property and a right-of-way, a small strip of land, okay? So their rights are protected. The States' rights are protected.

What this amendment would do is to strip the States of their rights here, and it would send them off to an unknown area that has no rights to resolve any disputes. They only need one landowner to kill a 1,700-mile project. The gentleman that the gentleman from Chicago mentioned is one of those people. He belongs to BOLD Nebraska, an organization of environmentalists that wants to kill the pipeline.

At this point, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding.

I am actually here to speak on Mr. MARKEY's amendment, the previous amendment. I do want to oppose the amendment of my good friend from Chicago, Mr. RUSH, but I think Mr. TERRY eloquently made the case as to why it is not in order at this point in time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to the previous amendment that Mr. MARKEY offered, which would restrict the use of both crude oil and refined products that come in from the Keystone pipeline to have to be sold in the United States. It goes without saying that if it's crude oil it would make absolutely no sense to transship it through the Keystone pipeline to the gulf coast and then put it in a tanker to go overseas. If you're going to export crude oil, it makes much more sense to export it directly from Canada.

On the refined product end of it, you have to know one thing, which is that this crude oil that we would be importing from Canada is a heavy crude oil. We have some of the best refineries in the country that have been upgraded by billions and billions of dollars so that we can handle not just the light sweet crudes, like West Texas Intermediate or Saudi Light, but so we can handle these heavy crudes, like the Canadian crude oil, that would come down.

When you have a barrel of crude oil, you can't just say, I want to make it all gasoline. You can make a lot of gasoline, but you're going to end up having to make diesel oil and asphalt and a lot of other products. Our refineries are the best in the world at cracking these heavy crudes. As they come down through the Midwest to the Louisiana and Texas refineries, most of the refined products would be sold in the United States, but the United States is primarily a gasoline market. The European market, on the other hand, is primarily a diesel market. So, as our refineries have become better and more competitive, it makes sense not to put a restriction on the refined products but to let the market allocate it. It would actually create jobs in the United States. We could ship some of these refined—primarily diesel, but some of the distillates could go to the European market. You'd get a better margin, create jobs, and protect jobs here in the United States. The primary market will always be the United States. Currently, about 75 percent of the crude oil that's refined on the gulf coast is used in refined products that are sold in the United States, but somewhere around 20 to 25 percent has been going to Europe, primarily the distillates and the diesel.

The Markey amendment would turn that market on its head. It would be counterproductive to our economy, counterproductive to our consumers, and counterproductive to the general oil markets in the world.

I know Mr. MARKEY is trying to do what he thinks is the right thing, but in actuality, we defeated his amendment in the committee, I think, 34–14 or something like this. We got eight Democrats—about 40 percent of the Democrats—to vote with us against the Markey amendment in committee. We ought to defeat it by that same margin here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

At this point, I also want to thank Mr. WHITFIELD for his excellent leadership on this issue.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1 minute remaining.

□ 1620

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that as Members of this Congress, we were elected to this body to protect the American people, to protect our citizens, to protect their property.

And, Mr. Chairman, the action that's occurring by the Republican majority is going to pass. But it's also going to turn that responsibility, that obligation, the reason for our existence here in this Congress upside down. It's going to make it just meaningless for the protection of the American people.

Why don't you protect the landowners, the private landowners?

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield so I can answer the question?

The answer to that question would be that each State has set up a due process law——

Mr. RUSH. Why don't we protect the landowners, the property holders in our Nation? We are elected here to protect them and not let a big oil company, TransCanada, a foreign company, come in and just take——

Mr. TERRY. They don't take. * * *

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Nebraska will suspend.

The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members should not interject remarks after the Member under recognition has declined to yield.

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

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

Mr. RUSH. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DOYLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 906, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 14005. USE OF AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL.

Notwithstanding section 14003(a)(1) and (2), a permit shall not be issued or deemed to have been issued under this title unless the permit applicant certifies and provides adequate documentation to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that at least 75 percent of iron and steel to be used in the construction of the domestic portion of the pipeline and related facilities described in section 14002(b) is produced in North America.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, despite all the controversy surrounding this pipeline, I think this is a good opportunity for us to examine some of the claims that the applicant for the Keystone XL pipeline has made.

Now let me say at the onset, I support building this pipeline in a way that protects the environment and helps create American jobs. I don't support the rushed 30-day manner that this bill would have us do, but I do support the pipeline.

When I started reading about the 800,000 tons of steel to be used in the Keystone XL pipeline, like everyone else, I was pretty excited about the prospects for our U.S. manufacturers, and especially coming from Pittsburgh, our steel manufacturers. So I have to tell you, I was a little confused when I talked to my friends in the U.S. steel industry and they told me they weren't making any of the steel for this project. Now, I knew this had to be a mistake because TransCanada had told us that there would be 7,000 direct manufacturing jobs created by this project, so surely someone somewhere in the United States has to know what these jobs are.

I've also heard folks talking about the wonderful jobs being created at steel mills in southwestern Pennsylvania. The trouble is I can't find a steel mill in southwestern Pennsylvania that's making steel for the Keystone XL pipeline. In fact, I'm having trouble finding a single U.S. steelmaker that has any orders for any of this pipe.

Now, I've reached out to the permit applicant, TransCanada, and several other sources for some clarifying information regarding their claim that 75 percent of the steel used in the Keystone XL pipeline will be sourced from North America. Unfortunately, the best I seem to get is that there's a single pipe manufacturer in Little Rock, Arkansas, that is providing much of the steel pipe for the pipeline. The trouble is that manufacturer doesn't actually use U.S. or North American steel to make the pipe. In fact, the Little Rock plant very clearly told me that they make their pipe out of foreign steel imports. They also told me they have imported and are housing on their site 140 miles of ready-made pipe that they got from India to be used in the Keystone pipeline.

So all my amendment does is ask for some truth in advertising. TransCanada has told us that they make every effort to source as much steel from U.S. mills as they can. I'm simply asking the applicant to certify their claims.

Along with other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have sent a letter to TransCanada asking for this information, but I have yet to receive a response. I think Members deserve this information. If there is, in fact, a U.S. steelmaker out there that is making all or some of the steel for the Keystone XL pipeline, I think we have a right to know about it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield myself 3 minutes.

First of all, I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a very hardworking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and provides great leadership, that we reluctantly oppose his amendment.

His amendment is very simple, and it is very direct. It simply says the permit will not be issued until the permit applicant certifies and provides adequate documentation that at least 75 percent of the iron and steel used in the construction of the pipeline is produced in North America, which is a goal that many of us have.

I would like to point out a couple of facts here:

Number one, this is a private company that's putting up $7 billion of its own money;

Number two, in order to keep costs down, it has already acquired all of the steel and iron that it is going to use in this pipeline.

Now, some people will say, well, why in the world would it spend over $2 billion buying this material when they didn't have a permit? Well, they filed this permit 40 months ago, and all of the information coming out from the Secretary of State, the Department of State in their final environmental impact statement would indicate that the pipeline was going to be approved. So they bought this material many months ago to try to keep costs down.

And I will tell you, from the information that we have, 74 percent of the pipe was milled here in North America. In fact, it's milled in four different locations. Not all of them are in North America. The steel comes from seven different sources. Some of it from America and some of it not from America. But the reality is that, if we adopted this amendment, the permit would not be issued because the applicant cannot certify that 75 percent comes from America because it bought this material a long time ago. And, I might add, there's not one dime of taxpayer money in this project.

So our feeling is that, the practical aspect is that, if you would basically stop the building of this pipeline, we would lose all those jobs, we would lose all the additional oil that we would be getting, and we believe that there would be more negatives from it than there would be positives.

And one other comment that I would make is that the American Iron and Steel Institute, which represents many of the companies that Mr. DOYLE is concerned about, is supporting our legislation. We have the letter that they support this legislation, and they support building the pipeline.

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

□ 1630

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

Five of the major labor unions in America support this legislation because they recognize the additional jobs that will be available to them in the construction of the pipeline. So for that reason, reluctantly, I oppose Mr. DOYLE's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you, Mr. DOYLE, for your leadership. This is a great amendment. It's a commonsense amendment. Now we don't know if the XL pipeline will be built. Many have strong opinions on whether or not it should be built at all. But one thing that we should all agree on is, if it is built, it should be built with materials made right here in America.

You see, when we talk about producing energy in America, that doesn't just mean oil, gas, wind, nuclear, and

other sources that power our homes and businesses. It means materials used to extract, refine, and transport that energy. And why does it have to happen that it needs to be American-made materials? Because it means jobs, good-paying jobs that can help to strengthen our middle class. It means stronger communities and a stronger economy at a time when we need that now more than ever. And it means a future with more security and more certainty for the next generation.

This pipeline is going to run through America; it should be made of American iron, steel, and manufactured goods. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense amendment and supporting the American middle class and in supporting American jobs.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DOYLE. I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support the Keystone pipeline, but I found out this last Monday, and I've asked, and I know the chair of our Energy Committee has heard me ask about a project labor agreement that's for the whole pipeline but it doesn't cover Texas. The largest State along the route does not have a project labor agreement with TransCanada. TransCanada maybe didn't deceive me, but they sure didn't answer the questions when I asked them in our committee. I've talked to them about that. I know our labor support nationwide, they have a project labor agreement from the Canadian border to the Oklahoma border, but not for the biggest part of it, in the State of Texas, and I'm going to work with them because it's important to see that the job be done safely.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

My good friend from Kentucky, and he is my good friend, more or less has just said that the amendment can't go through because it's impossible for TransCanada to certify what they said was true. They've misled us. I think we just ought to be honest with the American people. It's obvious from the discussion today and from past discussion that this steel is not being manufactured in North America. It may be finished in North America at some of these plants, but no steel was made in North America. Congress has been misled. This is not a way for a company to do business. They're a private company. They can use anybody they want. What they can't do is lie to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I might reiterate once again, this is a private company spending $7 billion of their own money. Before any of this ever became an issue, they acquired this material. They spent over $2 billion acquiring this material. Everybody is talking about jobs. One of the reasons they're offering this amendment is because of jobs. Well, there's nothing we can do about the material that's already been acquired. It's already purchased. So all we would do if we pass this amendment is we would make sure that the permit for this pipeline would not be issued. This material, all this $2 billion worth of steel, would be moved to Canada. They would build the pipeline to the west coast and move all of the oil to China, and they would get the construction jobs. So we would end up with no jobs.

I know the gentleman's intentions are the very best, and we all are concerned about the issue, but there are no taxpayer dollars involved in this. It is a private company. They have already acquired this material. This never became an issue until, I suppose, about a month ago, and the material was even acquired at that point.

So I would respectfully request that Members oppose this amendment. Let's build this pipeline and let's help America be less dependent on foreign oil, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DOYLE. 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 Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. POLIS. 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:

Beginning at page 926, line 3, strike subtitle A of title XVII.

Page 976, line 20, strike ''50'' '' and insert ''51''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment gets to the heart of what sustains our western communities from Colorado to California to New Mexico to Montana—our water and our land.

My amendment is the answer to concerns from my constituents in Colorado, outcries from farmers, from ranchers, local communities, from sportsmen, from recreationists, and from many others who know this bill threatens their livelihoods, and my amendment corrects that component.

This bill contains a troubling oil shale provision. Now, it was originally included to help pay for the bill's overall cost, but it was found to provide no revenue. So how can something help pay for a bill when it provides no revenue? With the CBO score confirming it receives no revenue, there is, therefore, no reason to include it. We might as well simply take up any random natural resources bill. And, in fact, the whole discussion of oil shale certainly deserves its own discussion. And since it is not going to help pay for our highways, I would urge my colleagues, even if they are supportive of this end product, to remove this from this bill.

Let me be clear, my amendment has nothing to do with one form of energy over another. You'll probably hear people from both sides of this argument talk about the potential for oil shale in the future. It's not about dirty or clean forms of energy; it's simply about common sense. If the technology doesn't exist and it won't bring in revenue, why is it being considered as a revenue provision for an unrelated infrastructure bill?

We've all heard of former Presidential candidate Herman Cain's 9–9–9 plan, but the oil shale section of this bill is a zero-zero-zero plan—no revenue, no jobs, and no energy. It mandates we lock up land at fire-sale prices to those who are connected enough to make bids for a technology that doesn't even exist and would threaten jobs, would threaten water in western Colorado, and threaten our western way of life.

My amendment simply strikes that section, leaving revenue for the overall bill unaffected, and keeps our western lands and waters as they currently are, outside of what's supposed to be an infrastructure and transportation bill.

Now, you might hear some hold up Estonia as an example of oil shale development, but by all accounts, Estonia oil shale has been an economic disaster. Even Jim Bartis with the RAND Corporation said: ''To our knowledge, oil shale in Estonia is not even used to produce transportation fuels.''

You'll also hear that we're the Saudi Arabia of various energy resources. Now, I continue to question the wisdom in looking to Estonia and Saudi Arabia for leadership in energy independence for our country. Even industry insiders know that a provision like the one contained in this bill is simply the wrong thing to do.

Jeremy Boak, a professor who heads the industry-sponsored Center for Oil Shale Technology at the Colorado School of Mines, said that he's doubtful

that any firm would even bid on commercial leases, leaving them to speculators. He also said: ''It isn't obvious to me yet that we need to be putting a bunch of commercial leases out there because no one has a commercial process yet.''

That's something that industry admits. There's no feasible, cost-effective commercial process for extracting oil from shale. We're talking about a potential technology, one that will have profound implications on water, profound implications on land use, and, yes, profound implications on national energy policy, but it's a technology that doesn't exist.

This component of the bill, if we don't remove it, will simply remove speculators rather than those who can actually play a meaningful role in providing for our energy independent future. I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. It would strike a key provision of the bill that would provide American jobs and tap into a potential natural resource, American oil shale.

This amendment also increases the Federal take from drilling in ANWR from 50 to 51 percent, leaving the State of Alaska with that much less.

Now, proponents of this amendment will argue that we should get rid of the oil shale provisions because the technology is not proven. Estonia does get a sizable amount of energy from oil shale currently. I would like to ask why is the proponent of this amendment so concerned that this is going to be a big thing in the future and affect the western way of life if he thinks it's never going to take off and amount to anything. You know, he can't have it both ways.

So why don't we let the companies experiment at their own expense, on their own dime, and see if they can find a commercial, viable process that works to extract this hugely potential source of energy.

□ 1640

The USGS has estimated that there are 1.5 trillion—with a ''T''—barrels of oil equivalent in these oil shale formations. I think it's worth at least experimenting to see if it can be commercially extracted because that would be a huge relief from having to get foreign oil, and it would create money for the treasuries of States and the Federal Government and create American jobs as well as the security aspect.

So I just don't see why there's such opposition to this when they say it's not going to work. That just doesn't make sense. They can't have it both ways. I say, let the companies experiment at their own expense and at no cost to the taxpayer.

So, I strongly urge opposition to this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Perhaps my friend and colleague from Colorado isn't aware that there already is extensive experimentation about the potential of oil shale to meet our energy needs. In fact, there are millions of dollars spent every year in research that industry itself has invested in this technology.

Furthermore, there are 3 million acres of oil shale lands in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming that are under State, private, or tribal leadership and have been for decades. In fact, several large companies alone already control 200,000 acres of oil shale lands. There are a couple of sites in Colorado where they're looking to try to develop cost-effective methods. In fact, by the end of 2012, there will be nine active Federal research and development leases. No one has figured out a cost-effective way to develop these areas.

Again, this is not about the research. In fact, after the second round of bids in early 2009, when the Obama administration affirmed the Bush administration's decision regarding a second round of R&D leasing, there was a significant reduction in industry bids. Industry itself was even less interested in trying to figure out this because it's been a nut that they've been unable to crack for nearly 100 years.

This amendment is not about the environment. It's about common sense.

Mr. Chairman, I inquire how much time remains?

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

Mr. POLIS. Well, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly support this commonsense amendment to preserve our land, our jobs, and our water in the West.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that this is one more example of the Obama administration stifling the production of domestic energy in this country. They put out restrictive regulations that made it so untenable for commercial companies to even go into the research and development leases after President Obama took office that there was little interest in pursuing under the new format.

So we need to go back to the previous way of offering these leases so there is at least interest on the part of industry, at their own expense, to see if this technology is commercially viable.

So, once again, I would just ask the question, why is there opposition to something that they say is not going to work? We don't know if it's going to work or not. And with the possibility of 1.5 trillion barrels' equivalent of oil, let's at least let that happen to see if that can be feasibly explored, developed, and produced.

We have nothing to lose. This is a great win for the American consumer, especially should a commercial application and scalable venture be produced. It would create energy, jobs, and money for the Treasury.

I urge strong opposition to this amendment. I have to disagree with my friend and colleague from Colorado on this particular issue, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 935, line 7, strike ''two other lease blocks'' and insert ''1 other lease block''.

Page 937, after line 13, insert the following:

(3) NATIONAL DEFENSE AREAS.—The United States reserves the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, national defense areas on the Outer Continental Shelf pursuant to section 12(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1341(d)).

Page 941, beginning at line 1, strike ''1 year after the date of enactment of this Act'' and insert ''December 31, 2015''.

Page 945, line 8, strike ''two other lease blocks'' and insert ''1 other lease block''.

Page 946, after line 22, insert the following:

(3) NATIONAL DEFENSE AREAS.—The United States reserves the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, national defense areas on the outer Continental Shelf pursuant to section 12(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1341(d)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is essentially a technical manager's amendment making changes agreed to with the Armed Services Committee in order to ensure that we are fully respecting the needs of our Nation's military.

It adds further protections to those already included through the bill to ensure any production and our Nation's national defense cooperatively coexist in our Nation's offshore areas.

This amendment also includes a slight adjustment to the timing of the leasing of one offshore area off the coast of Alaska. In fact, it moves it back to 2015.

So these have been talked over with the minority. I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman claim time in opposition?

Mr. MARKEY. I claim the time of the minority.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Chairman.

I will say that this amendment marginally improves the bill, but it does not change our fundamental opposition to it. But progress on any front is welcomed, even if we cannot make progress on every front.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would totally agree with you. Progress in any way is beneficial. So I appreciate the gentleman's accepting the amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. We do not oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mrs. CAPPS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 938, line 3, strike section 17304.

Beginning on page 948, line 3, strike part 4.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward amendment, and it is overwhelmingly supported by my constituents, so I hope we can all agree to it.

The amendment strikes a harmful and unnecessary provision in the underlying bill that mandates new drilling—mandates new drilling—in the sensitive waters off Santa Barbara and Ventura counties in California.

The majority says this new drilling is necessary to help fund the transportation bill. But according to CBO, any new drilling off southern California would, at best, generate tens of millions of dollars in revenue, while the gap in transportation funding is measured in the tens of billions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, leaving aside the specious funding arguments that the authors of the bill have made, the people most affected, my constituents, don't want new drilling. My colleagues have heard me invoke Santa Barbara's devastating 1969 oil spill before. And that's because it galvanized central coast residents and virtually the whole State of California against more offshore drilling. We were outraged by the damage to the environment, the wildlife, and to our economy. And we understood the havoc that similar blowouts would wreak upon our economy, especially tourism and fishing industries.

It's why California permanently banned new oil and gas leasing in State waters in 1994. It's why Californians fought to pass groundbreaking environmental laws like the National Environmental Policy Act and the Coastal Zone Management Act. It's why some 24 city and county governments, including both Santa Barbara and Ventura counties, have passed measures requiring voter approval before any new onshore facilities to support offshore drilling could be built. And it's why in 2008 then Republican Governor Schwarzenegger told President Bush and Congress to oppose new drilling off the west coast.

More recently, an oil company in Santa Barbara thought it could capitalize on the high gasoline prices by placing a measure on the ballot to allow slant drilling from the shore.

□ 1650

That plan was rejected by 70 percent—that's right, 70 percent—of the voters in the community that was affected by it, Carpinteria, California. That was just in 2010.

We're also aware of the Pentagon's concerns with new drilling in our area so close to Vandenberg Air Force Base. In a 2008 letter to an oil company proposing to slant drill from the shore, the Air Force replied—and I have a copy of the letter to submit with my statement:

A drilling and production facility would present a wide range of significant operational constraints, inconsistent with Vandenberg Air Force Base's national space launch mission.

Mr. Chairman, Californians have spoken loud and clear: we do not want more drilling off our shores. We want to protect our coastline from the devastation that the 1969 oil spill brought to Santa Barbara. Now, because of this legislation, these communities are at risk again. It's not just the new drilling mandate in this bill, but also because the bill would gut critical environmental laws like CZMA and NEPA, the very laws passed in response to the 1969 spill off the Santa Barbara coast.

It's outrageous. This bill specifically denies California—and only California—any role in new offshore drilling decisions under the Coastal Zone Management Act. It also removes California citizens' ability to voice their concerns about new drilling during the environmental review process.

I find it ironic that some of the same people in this body who decry an overarching Federal Government seem to have no qualms about forcing new drilling upon a local population which is directly against its wishes. This heavy-handed, know-it-all approach rubber-stamps destructive drilling, cuts out environmental reviews, and closes down the public input. Might be good policy for oil companies; but it's bad policy for my constituents, and it's bad energy policy for our Nation.

So, Mr. Chairman, American families want us to pass a balanced transportation bill that creates jobs, fixes our roads and bridges, and ensures that they have a safe way to get to work and back home again. They don't want more politics, especially the kind that puts our coasts, our communities, and our very way of life at risk. So I urge my colleagues to join me in striking these harmful, unnecessary provisions from this bill.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2008.

Mr. RAY G. CHARLES,
ExxonMobil Exploration Company,
Houston, TX.

Mr. ROBERT E. NUNN,
Sunset Exploration, Inc.,
Brentwood, CA.

DEAR MESSRS CHARLES AND NUNN: We have evaluated your proposal to leverage your option to lease on-shore, sub-surface mineral rights beneath 7,780-acres of South Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB) to establish oil and gas drilling and production facilities on 25-acres near Space Launch Complex (SLC) 5 for directional drilling into off-shore reserves.

I believe it would be premature to proceed with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) evaluation of your desired location for the reasons stated below. A drilling and production facility at your proposed location would present a wide range of significant operational constraints, inconsistent with VAFB's national space launch mission. Most significantly, your proposed location is within the Impact Limit Lines of all of our active SLCs; it is within the SLC–5 explosives safety clear zone, eliminating SLC–5 as an optional platform for the approximate 40 year life of the Vahevala project; and in the event of a natural disaster or catastrophic mission failure at any of the SLCs, the presence of the facility would severely complicate emergency response. Consistent with these concerns, the Air Force cannot provide you access to your desired 25-acre location on South VAFB.

We do understand that if you exercise the option to lease, you will be entitled to reasonable access to onshore, subsurface minerals. Any drilling and oil or gas production on South VAFB would still hamper execution of space launches and create operational impacts. However, there are areas which may present less operational impact than your proposed 25-acre site west of SLC–5. They are generally in the northern and eastern portions of South VAFB, within the 7,780-acre option to lease.

We recognize the Air Force's discussions with you regarding the Vahevala project

have been protracted. Please accept my personal assurance that this has been due to diligent examination of the proposal at the several levels of command that support the space launch mission at VAFB. As a result of this diligent examination, our military commanders have decided it is simply not consistent with their most fundamental mission responsibilities.

As the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Energy and the Environment, I am keenly aware of the crucial contributions of your industry to our nation, and to the national defense. I salute you for your initiatives to enhance the energy security of America, and look forward to the possibility of collaborating with you on projects that might be synergistic with the Air Force mission.

Sincerely,

KEVIN W. BILLINGS,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Energy, Environment, Safety and Occupational Health.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, according to the U.S. Census, the State of California's largest import is petroleum. Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the State of California's largest import is petroleum. So I guess it's a good thing that private geologists estimate that over 1.6 billion barrels of American-made energy are ready and waiting to be developed from existing infrastructure in southern California.

What does existing infrastructure mean? Well, there are currently about 23 oil and gas platforms located offshore in southern California which account for about 24 million barrels of oil and 47 billion cubic feet of gas annually. The lease sale proposed in this legislation allows drilling from existing platforms or, to put it in another vernacular, those that are already in place. If we are going to have a serious discussion about offshore drilling, it makes perfect sense to drill not only where there is already drilling going on, but from where the platforms already exist, which is why this bill specifically states: ''no new infrastructure.''

We need to drill where there are known resources, and this California lease sale is a commonsense way to limit the drilling footprint while accessing our resources that are known in southern California. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the State of California is already working with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management on a permit to allow a company to drill from an existing platform in Federal waters into State waters for State resources.

Let me say this: the State of California has entered into the same concept that's embodied in this bill. So let me repeat here one more time. It's Governor Brown's administration that is pursuing drilling off these same platforms closer to the coast.

Additionally, this amendment completely eliminates all coastal States and U.S. territories from receiving fair and equitable income for drilling that would occur potentially off their shores. This means States like Florida and Virginia will not receive any portion of any revenues for drilling that will occur off their coasts under this bill if this amendment were to be adopted.

The underlying bill is a drill-smart plan that directly focuses on those offshore areas where there are known resources. That includes the vast resources of southern California. This amendment would lock away significant resources that belong to the American people. It would keep our country shackled to the foreign powers upon whom we rely for oil and gas imports. It would also hinder our Nation's energy security.

This amendment also ignores the soaring gas prices that American families are facing at the pump right now. Many of those families don't have room in their budget to pay hundreds more dollars just to drive to work or drive their kids to school. And by the way, I might add, Mr. Chairman, I think if there is an epitome of an area in the country that does a lot of driving, it's in California.

We need to get America producing energy again. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and vote for the underlying legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. I would just comment to remark that the very project that my colleague from Washington, my friend, described is the project that the local constituents rejected by 70 percent, the project that was mentioned. We are interested, in California, in ending drilling, not just stopping leasing.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation should be investing our time, our energy and creativity into real solutions that put us toward the path for clean-energy solutions for our future. We've seen time and time again that our congressional district doesn't want to be known for chasing after yesterday's energy solutions, but for leadership towards the renewable energy solutions of today and tomorrow.

I urge an ''aye'' vote for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate once again—and this is understanding that people in our great country have different views—I certainly understand what happened in southern California some 40 years ago. Listen, that picture is indelibly in everybody's mind. But nobody can argue there have not been advances in oil exploration in this country, and certainly in the OCS. But as a recognition of that, in this bill we didn't say just go anywhere you want to go in southern California. We said go to the existing platforms where you're drilling and existing infrastructure where there has been drilling.

Now, that seems to me to be a perfectly acceptable way to utilize the resources that we have—by the way, in Federal waters, not in State waters, in Federal waters—so that we can make ourselves less dependent on foreign energy.

The last thing I would say is the State of California is pursuing precisely the same thing that's embodied in this underlying bill, only in State waters.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose my good friend's amendment from southern California.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BILIRAKIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 944, after line 22, insert the following new subparagraph:

(D) The Secretary shall conduct, and take into consideration the results of, an economic impact survey to determine any adverse economic effects that such lease sales within 100 miles of the western coast of Florida may have on the Florida Gulf coast fishing industry and tourism industry.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With the national unemployment rate hovering around 8 percent—in my home State of Florida, its rate is close to 10 percent—there is no question that our Nation is hurting for economic

growth. This year, the focus of efforts here in the House of Representatives has centered on creating a framework for the private sector to innovate and grow, to create the jobs we desperately need. To that end, Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to take all prudent steps to ensure that jobs and the economy are the focus.

□ 1700

My amendment simply requires the Secretary to conduct an economic impact survey to assess any effect lease sales would have on the Florida tourism and fishing industries.

People from all over the world flock to the gulf coast of Florida specifically to visit our spectacular beaches, our parks, our waterways, and other recreational opportunities. More than 80 million tourists, Mr. Chairman, per year stay in our hotels, eat at our restaurants, and create many economic opportunities for Floridians.

The tourism industry is a multibillion-dollar industry for Florida and the national economy, Mr. Chairman. Florida's seafood and recreational fishing industries also contribute thousands of jobs and billions of dollars to the local economy.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge this House to adopt a commonsense measure to ensure that the Federal Government consider all ramifications of lease sales, and to ensure that the promotion of jobs and the economy remain the focus of any actions of our Federal Government.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I rise to claim the time in the minority.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Chair very much.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, just a point. The issue is not claiming time in the minority or majority. The time is in opposition, and with that in mind, I would rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is correct.

Is the gentleman from Massachusetts opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, there's no question that the gentleman from Washington State is correct, and a master of parliamentary rules, having stood up there or sat up there hundreds of hours, so he is an absolute correct dissector of language used here of seeking recognition from the Chair.

So I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, if those are the technical words of art that the gentleman would prefer for me to use.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts, a true opponent is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank you.

This amendment would require a study to investigate potential economic impacts from a variety of risks that oil development in the Outer Continental Shelf poses to local tourism and fishing economies in Florida.

Well, we actually had a real-world study for 87 days during the BP spill. As we saw in 2010, with the BP oil spill, oil can wreak havoc on a coastal community, meaning a disaster for tourism and fishing, seafood industries. These disasters can and do happen, putting hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars at stake.

It is important for the public to know the risks associated with allowing oil companies to drill off of our coast. But we should be protecting our beaches in Florida and California and New Jersey and Massachusetts, not just requiring a study of how huge a disaster a spill would be for these States.

We should be protecting the lives and the livelihoods of the people of the gulf by taking the lessons of the BP spill and turning them into new laws. But nearly 2 years after the BP spill began, this Congress has not enacted a single new law to improve the safety of offshore drilling. That is indefensible when the BP Commission found that we have a fatally flawed rate of accidents and fatalities in our country. Compared to the rest of the world, ours is four times higher than that in Europe, that is, the fatalities on our oil rigs. So that's the issue.

We have yet to increase the fines because only we can do that here in Congress. Right now, a lot of these oil companies think it's just the equivalent of a parking ticket. You know, if you could pay a parking ticket for a whole day on the main street of any one of the cities in the United States, you'd pay that $1 parking ticket because it would be cheaper than paying 20 bucks to put it in a garage. And that's what we have right now. We have the equivalent of $1 parking tickets that are assessed against oil companies that despoil the ocean, that result in, because of their faulty safety rules, the highest fatality rate in the world in terms of people who work on oil rigs.

At this point, I have completed my statement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), our distinguished chairman.

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

The gentleman's amendment will conduct this economic impact study only for the Eastern Gulf of Mexico OCS Planning Area, as defined in the bill. I understand and appreciate the gentleman's interest in protecting the multiple use of the OCS, and I join him in that interest. For decades, tourism, fishing, and oil and gas drilling have been compatible in the Gulf of Mexico, and there's no reason that the new areas opened up under this bill would not operate in the same way.

While I understand the interests of the gentleman to have this study for those areas in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, I wish that he could have expanded the study to jobs that could have been created by new drilling and the support that comes with that activity.

While that's not embodied in the gentleman's amendment, I would only have to think that because you're having the study on that, there may be some residual, and I would look forward to that residual potentially also.

So I thank the gentleman and congratulate him for offering this amendment.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I'd like to close briefly. Of course I urge passage of this reasonable, commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 948, beginning on line 3, strike part 4.

Page 954, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 176____. PROHIBITION ON LEASE SALES IN CERTAIN AREAS.

No oil and gas lease sale may be conducted for any area of the outer Continental Shelf (as that term is defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.)) for which any of the States of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, or Maine is an affected State under section 2(f)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (33 U.S.C. 1331(f)(1)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It prohibits oil and natural gas lease sales off the coast of Northeast States, including New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Maine. Furthermore, my amendment is paid for by striking language in the bill related to Outer Continental Shelf revenue sharing in Section 17501.

I appreciate the Rules Committee making my amendment in order because this amendment will protect the coastline of New York and other Northeast States. I also thank my cosponsors, including Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. PINGREE.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the last 70 miles of eastern Long Island, where the primary industries are travel and tourism, everything to do with the second

home market, agriculture, and the fishing industry. Thus, in my district, the environment is the economy in many respects. It can ill-afford a disaster like Gulf Coast States endured during the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in 2010. Oil-soaked beaches would devastate Long Island's economy, let alone the environment, and there is no reasonable person who can disagree with me on this point.

The Republican drilling proposals to offset the highway bill would raise less than $4.3 billion over 10 years, according to CBO, or less than one-tenth of the revenue actually needed.

Combine this with the other funding mechanisms for the highway bill, and Republicans are paying for their reckless legislation on the backs of middle class families. For example, the Republican spending package will require Federal employees to increase their pension contributions while reducing their benefits.

Worse, as of this moment, they are using Federal employees' pension contributions to offset costs in two completely separate proposals: the highway bill and the payroll tax cut package for unemployment benefits and the doc fix.

This isn't being honest with the American people. I would ask the Republican leadership to check their numbers again.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and oppose the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1710

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Outer Continental Shelf and the resources it contains are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and therefore it belongs to all of the people of the United States as a whole. These Federal offshore resources are unlike Federal lands and onshore resources outside the borders of the States. Each individual State controls several miles offshore of their coasts, and that varies State by State. But beyond that point, the Federal lands are owned by the Federal Government and its resources.

This bill, underlying legislation, is a drill-smart plan that directly focuses on those offshore areas where there are known resources. Federal assessments estimate that the North Atlantic contains nearly two billion barrels of oil and nearly 18 trillion cubic feet of gas. Using modern technology, it's highly likely that the find could be even more than what is estimated.

This amendment, then, would lock away those resources from the American people who, as I mentioned a moment ago, own them.

Not too long ago, the entire OCS was under moratoria. Offshore drilling in this country was prohibited. When the gas skyrocketed past $4 a gallon in 2008, the American people collectively said, No more. The American people cried out and demanded that Congress act, and we did by lifting the moratoria.

In fact, what the American people found out, Mr. Chairman, at that time is that we had tremendous potential resources here that we weren't utilizing. That's why they cried out and said, Okay. Let's end the several moratoria.

Now, this amendment proposes to reverse the will of the American people, to ignore the high cost of gas at the pump, to ignore that prices are again climbing towards $4 a gallon, and to ignore that our Nation's security is strengthened when we get our energy from here in this Nation and not from hostile foreign nations.

The American people want to increase American energy production and jobs, not stifle American energy production. Let's not forget that we are creating American oil and gas that can be refined and used here. Some of the States that want to shut down production off their coasts are the highest consumers of these fuels that they would have shut down.

Additionally, this amendment completely eliminates all coastal States and U.S. territories from receiving a fair and equitable revenue for drilling that would occur off their shores. That means States like Florida and Virginia and others that would like to participate could not receive a portion of the revenues for drilling that would occur off their States under this bill.

Finally, I would like to say this because we have had a long discussion today in debate, and I've heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, We love natural gas. I'm not sure if it was said with that same cadence, but the message was there.

Listen, Mr. Chairman, nearly 18 trillion cubic feet of natural gas lies off the Atlantic Coast. Can you imagine how much easier it is to get that to market than shipping it from someplace else?

So I would urge rejection of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. BISHOP, thank you for allowing me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit any oil and gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf in the northeast, including my home State of Maine. An accident or a spill off our coast would be devastating to our working waterfronts. We don't have to look any further than the Deepwater Horizon disaster to see the damage an accident can do to a coastal economy. Not only that, but it would be decades before any oil that is discovered would ever make it to market, decades that should be spent researching and investing in new sources of clean energy and breaking our dependence on oil.

The Republican proposals of this bill would not only carelessly expand the permitting for current gas and oil leases but also encourage expanded drilling.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense amendment and voting against this ill-conceived bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time since I have the right to close.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close as well, so I will yield myself the balance of my time.

I would say to my friend from Washington that I would find his argument and I would find the statistics that he cited somewhat more persuasive if this Congress had enacted any reforms, any safeguards to protect our coastline from the kind of disaster that affected the Louisiana and the Florida coast in the wake of the BP oil spill.

We have not put in place a single piece of legislation that would make offshore drilling safer. We have not put in place a single piece of legislation designed to prevent the kind of disaster that took place in the gulf. We are continuing to rely on the sort of slipshod environmental reviews that preceded the granting of leases in the gulf, and I think to expose certainly my region, Ms. PINGREE's region, to the kind of disaster that the gulf was exposed to without putting in place those safeguards is simply unwise, not worth $4.3 billion to fund a bill that most of us feel is a very flawed bill to begin with.

So I would urge adoption of my amendment. As I say, I would urge defeat of the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Two points, Mr. Chairman: first of all, the gentleman suggests that this Congress and this House, led by Republicans, have not done anything as far as safety offshore. I would just remind the gentleman that through the appropriations process there has been a tremendous increase in precisely what the Obama administration was asking for safety. The Obama administration has said essentially that it is safe, although I would argue they should be more aggressive; but they say it's safe to drill. So that argument I don't think really has a great deal of bearing.

But more importantly, I would say this: the port of Boston has a liquid natural gas terminal, and they are importing natural gas from Trinidad and

Yemen, hardly a stable community or country in the Middle East. Right now, right off the coast of Nova Scotia, just north of this area that we're talking about, there is natural gas drilling going on.

So certainly, if we want to be less dependent on foreign oil and foreign energy and we like natural gas, like a lot of my friends on the other side of the aisle have talked about, then we should reject this amendment and adopt the underlying bill.

With that, I urge rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of Mr. BISHOP's amendment, of the Bishop/Crowley/Rangel/Pascrell/Pingree Amendment (#43) to strike sections of this bill that would open parts of the Atlantic coast, including the shores of my home state of New Jersey, to offshore drilling.

Setting aside the precedent we are setting here by funding a transportation authorization with revenues from energy development instead of user fees, House Republicans have clearly failed to learn the lesson from the catastrophic economic and environmental consequences of the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. For one, this bill fails to introduce any comprehensive new safety standards, such as the commonsense steps recommended by the President's bipartisan Oil Spill Commission in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon spill.

In light of that, I am especially concerned that this bill could result in new drilling in the Atlantic Ocean, including off of the shore of my home state of New Jersey. The people of New Jersey strongly oppose opening our shores to offshore drilling. A whopping 63% of New Jersey residents oppose oil and gas drilling off the coast of our state according to a 2010 Monmouth University poll, and through this legislation, the Tea Party wants to force the people of New Jersey to hand over our beaches to the oil companies.

New Jerseyans oppose offshore drilling because they understand the potentially devastating effects it could have on our economy in the event of a spill. The tourism and fishing industries support hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in economic activity across the state and region. In fact, tourism is New Jersey's second largest industry, supporting jobs for over 500,000 people and generating over $50 billion in economic activity for the state each and every year. The people who make their livings in this industry depend on the responsible stewardship of our waters and coasts for their livelihoods. Risky new drilling could put these jobs in jeopardy, potentially destroying more jobs than it would create.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which is fully paid for, and reject opening the northeast to new offshore drilling. Instead, we should be supporting and encouraging alternative energy development off our shores, as I have tried to do by introducing H.R. 3238, the Incentivizing Offshore Wind Power Act. New Jersey is primed to be a leader in the offshore wind industry, and this bill will create jobs and increase renewable domestic energy production in the Garden State.

Instead, by continuing to invest in further digging and drilling for oil rather than searching for new sources of energy, as the bill in front of us proposes we do, we will only end up digging ourselves a deeper hole.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. RICHMOND. 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 952, beginning on line 17, strike ''Federal program'' and insert ''Federal program, except in the case of a project for coastal wetlands conservation, coastal restoration, or hurricane protection, or an infrastructure project directly impacted by coastal wetland losses''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment simply does is it allows those Gulf Coast States to invest their oil and gas into their States in terms of coastal restoration.

I would tell you, Mr. Chairman, that Louisiana, since 1950, has contributed over $160 billion to the Federal Treasury; and, in return, Louisiana has received some of the same benefits as other States have received. However, one unique thing that we've received is a tattered coast line.

Louisiana loses almost a football field an hour in terms of our wetland laws. What this amendment would do is allow us to take some of those revenues that we receive and invest that back into restoring our coast.

I will tell you also, Mr. Chairman, that restoring Louisiana's coast is a very monumental task; and the people of Louisiana, the people of all of the gulf coast communities are willing to step up and take not only their own resources but resources they receive from the Federal Government in terms of any revenues or royalties they will receive and put those back into coastal restoration, making sure that we have wetlands.

□ 1720

Because when we talk about the damage that has been done to Louisiana by the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill, that event cost us 11 Louisiana citizens. Katrina, Rita, Gustav, and Ike cost the gulf coast community the lives of almost 1,600 of its citizens. When we talk about our wetlands, that's our first line of defense in preventing the damage of a hurricane. So, while we are willing to sacrifice our coast and those things so that we can have a stable energy sector in this country, we also recognize that we should invest back in it to make sure the citizens are safe.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

The proposal of the gentleman from Louisiana has merit. I commend him for proposing it, and I do urge its adoption.

The goal of revenue sharing in the bill is to allow States the flexibility to use the money they want with their local States. If this is what the gentleman's State wants to use its money for, I have no problem, and I certainly agree with him. In fact, I would emphasize one other point:

Since I've had an opportunity to visit the gentleman's State and to see firsthand what it has done with the initiative, I think that it is a tremendous template for other States, which is precisely why, in the underlying bill, we have the component of revenue sharing. It is for other States to, maybe, emulate what Louisiana has always done.

So I think the gentleman's amendment is certainly compatible with what we're trying to do. It is a good amendment, and I commend the gentleman for that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I would just simply close by thanking the gentleman and by saying that what the amendment does is really allow the gulf coast communities to invest in their own futures while continuing to invest in the energy future of America.

Mr. Chair, Louisiana has contributed over $160 Billion to the Federal Government through offshore oil and gas revenues—primarily from oil and gas exploration off of Louisiana's coast. From the 1950s until 2006, Louisiana didn't receive any royalties. We have received funding from the Federal government like other states, but our royalty over those 56 years was a tattered coastline.

Louisiana loses 25 square miles of coastal wetlands every year or 1 football field every hour. Our state has 40 percent of the nation's wetlands, but experiences 80 percent of all wetland loss. Part of the reason is nature, but besides blocking off the natural flow of the Mississippi River, oil and gas canals are big culprits.

The bill before us creates a revenue sharing scheme for east and west coast states but does not allow the states to use these royalties as matching funds for federal programs.

I can tell you that right now, because gulf coast states are receiving a very small amount of money from oil and gas production off their shores, much of the time, the Gulf states use these funds as their required cost share of Corps of Engineers and Department of Interior projects for coastal restoration, hurricane protection, wildlife restoration, and other disaster mitigation projects.

My amendment would give states the option to use oil and gas revenues as their state cost share of federal projects for "coastal wetlands conservation, coastal restoration, hurricane protection, or infrastructure projects directly impacted by coastal wetland losses."

I think that coastal states like California, Alaska and Virginia which are embarking on offshore energy production will want the flexibility to spend their revenues on projects that strengthen and protect their coastline. Without this amendment, revenues derived from offshore oil, gas and renewable energy could not be used for these critical projects.

This amendment would help the coastal states help themselves without tapping into the Federal Treasury. We don't want to be dependent on Federal Fund. We want to invest in our own future while we protect America's energy future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. LANDRY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 952, line 19, strike section 17501(b) and insert the following:

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) and the amendment made by subsection (a) shall not affect the application of section 105 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)), as in effect before the enactment of this Act, with respect to revenues received by the United States under oil and gas leases issued for tracts located in the Western and Central Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas, including such leases issued on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—Section 105(f)(1) 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)) is amended by striking ''2055'' and inserting ''2022, and shall not exceed $750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2055''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan amendment offered in cooperation with my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. CEDRIC RICHMOND.

As the gentleman said earlier, Louisianians invented offshore oil exploration, and it has been drilling off its coast ever since the mid-1940s. Yet, for the first 60 years of drilling off the coast of Louisiana, our State and other Gulf Coast States had received no money—not a dime—from the revenue derived from these wells.

Starting in 2007, Congress passed an act called the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. This act provided that a small portion of offshore revenues would finally start to trickle in to our Gulf Coast States. Those of us in the Gulf Coast States will continue to receive a small portion of those revenues through 2017 when, at that time, we will start to receive the 37.5 percent of the offshore revenue of each of those wells producing at that time. However, in GOMESA, it included a cap so that, collectively, those four Gulf Coast States could never receive more than a collective amount of $500 million.

As the current bill is now going to provide revenue sharing without a cap for additional States, we are simply asking for fundamental fairness here in that the cap of $500 million be raised to $750 million. That's what this amendment does. This amendment simply raises the collective cap amongst those four States from $500 million to $750 million, reminding everyone that there will be no cap on the additional States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. If this amendment passes, Mardi Gras will come on the Wednesday before Fat Tuesday this year. That's because the Landry amendment delivers up to $6 billion in a financial King Cake to Louisiana and to the other Gulf States at the expense of the other 46 States in the Union.

In 2006, the Republican Congress passed legislation that will divert $150 billion over the next 60 years from offshore drilling on public lands to the four Gulf Coast States—Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas. That bill set up what amounts to a new entitlement program for these four States, which will result in a massive transfer of wealth from the Federal Government. This amendment would send $6 billion to these four States on top of that $150 billion they will already be getting.

These oil and gas resources on public lands belong to all of the American people, not just to those of the adjacent States. They are public resources that belong as much to someone living in Kansas, Massachusetts, or Hawaii as they do to someone living in Louisiana or Texas. These are resources that should help every American, not just a select few. The revenue generated from these public resources goes to the Federal Treasury to help pay for Medicare and Medicaid. It helps to pay for our national defense. We can no longer afford to continue this diversion of taxpayer funds to these four States. We need this revenue to reduce our deficit and to get our fiscal house in order.

I had offered an amendment that would have recovered the $150 billion we are going to be sending to these four States, which the majority did not make in order, and now this amendment would take us in the complete opposite direction.

So I commend the gentleman from Louisiana. I can't blame him for trying to get even more Federal money directed to his home State under this program. Yet, if you come from one of the 46 States that is not—and let me enumerate them again—Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, or Texas, you would have to be crazy to vote for this amendment, because they're going to take money away from your States, away from your Medicare beneficiaries, away from your contributions to the defense budget. It will be higher in all of those other States because this money is going to be sucked out of the Federal Treasury, as though through a straw, right into the States of Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas. If you vote for this amendment, you are voting to send that money—$6 billion—directly from your State to the gentleman from Louisiana's State.

I urge all members of the Louisiana delegation to vote against the Markey amendment, and I would give a similar recommendation to the other Members from the other three States. But if you don't come from one of those four States, why would you send $6 billion to those States, money which should be in the Federal Treasury, when it should be used for all of the citizens of our country?

At this point, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANDRY. How much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANDRY. I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

□ 1730

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out, the underlying bill vastly expands the number of States that would be eligible for revenue sharing to far beyond those four States that the ranking member mentioned.

But when our committee held a markup on this legislation 2 weeks ago, I pledged to work with the gentleman from Louisiana and Gulf Members to help bring parity to the differences between the existing revenue sharing currently enjoyed in the four Gulf States and all the other coastal States, which, up until this legislation today, as I mentioned, were not entitled to a share of the revenues from oil and gas production off their shores. Let me repeat that again. Under this legislation,

more States will have an opportunity to share this.

But this amendment seeks to bring existing revenue sharing in the Gulf more in line with the plan that was included in the underlying bill. And I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this amendment to the floor. I support it.

Mr. LANDRY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, I have an understanding different from my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts. He is absolutely right when he says the resources are everyone's. The resources are everyone's. But the sacrifices that you make to get those resources come from those Gulf States. We lost 1,836 lives in Katrina. We lost 11 lives in the BP oil spill. We've lost 328 square miles of marsh. And in this bill, we give royalties to all the other States immediately.

What we're asking from Louisiana is that, without a cap, is that in 2023 when we start to give us the 37.5 percent. However, we're willing to cap it at $750 million as opposed to the unlimited amount that all the other States under this bill would do.

And then I think in 2006, Congress recognized that the Gulf Coast States were bearing the brunt of our energy production in this country, the lands that we lose. We produce 90 percent of the Nation's offshore oil and gas. So that's a sacrifice that we make for people in Kansas, people in California to be able to turn on their lights in the afternoon or at nighttime.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members to vote for the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, I will just close with this: As the gentleman from Louisiana just indicated, 30 percent of all oil and gas produced in this country comes from Louisiana shores. A quarter of all the seafood is caught in Louisiana. In Louisiana, we have made it a constitutional amendment that any revenue we receive from the Federal Government or offshore royalties goes to coastal protection and the building of the coast that we are so rapidly losing. And again, this is not an amendment whereby we're asking for more of our share. We are simply asking to raise a cap when other States will have no cap. This is only fundamental fairness here, and I certainly would urge all Members to consider that and to please support this amendment when it comes to the floor.

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

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part A of House Report 112–398.

Mr. DEUTCH. 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 954, after line 19, insert the following:

SEC. 17603. ESTIMATE OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF WORST-CASE DISCHARGE OF OIL.

A person shall not be eligible for a lease issued under this subtitle (including the amendments made by this subtitle) unless the person includes in the application for the lease an estimate of the economic impact, including job losses, resulting from a worst-case discharge of oil from facilities operated under the lease.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 547, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, nearly 2 years ago, an explosion on the BP *Deepwater Horizon* drilling vessel unleashed a steady gush of crude oil into the Gulf of Mexico that went unstopped for 3 full months. The 4.9 million barrels of crude oil spewed into the gulf and jeopardized an ecosystem that is home to over 15,000 species and claimed the mantle as the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history.

Yet the BP *Deepwater Horizon* spill was also an economic disaster. And, Mr. Chairman, that is the issue addressed in the amendment I present to this body today. My amendment simply provides that no one shall be eligible for a lease issued unless there is, first, an estimate of the economic impact, including job losses resulting from a worst-case discharge of oil from facilities operated under that lease.

Right now under current law and under this legislation, as drafted, companies applying for new oil drilling leases are not required to project the toll on local economies resulting from a worst-case scenario spill.

In my home State of Florida and in other Gulf Coast States, like Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana, the economic consequences were enormous. Forced closures of fishing areas led to shuttered businesses. Fewer tourists led to job losses. The powerful economic ripple effect was felt by millions of Americans in States whose coastal towns, cities, and businesses depend on the livelihood of tourism, fishing, restaurants, shrimping, and other industries.

The bill before us today would open large areas of the Gulf of Mexico, the east and west coasts of the United States, and areas in Alaska to oil drilling. Opening these areas to drilling exposes the coastal communities and coastal States to significant economic impact and job losses should a large-scale oil spill like BP *Deepwater Horizon* occur.

And while BP created a $20 billion recovery fund to assist communities devastated by this bill, litigation over the total cost of the disaster continues today. As BP seeks financial contributions from *Deepwater Horizon* contractors for payout of claims, estimates of the spill's total economic impact are upwards of $40 billion and more. The Federal Government has a real interest in ensuring that companies applying for new oil drilling leases are aware of and are prepared for the potential economic impact and job losses resulting from a worst-case scenario spill. It only makes sense that these applications require an economic, in addition to the environmental, estimate of such disasters.

My amendment, therefore, would require the person to include in their application this estimate of economic impact arising from a worst-case discharge of oil from the facilities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in safeguarding our economy from tragedies like the *Deepwater Horizon* spill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, since the *Deepwater Horizon* tragedy, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement have put forward significant regulatory measures governing offshore drilling. This is very important, Mr. Chairman, because existing Federal regulations—specifically, 30 CFR 254.26—already require a worst-case discharge scenario in all lease applications, which includes an evaluation of economic resources that may be impacted. So that's in the law already, Mr. Chairman.

So I find it interesting that we have an amendment before us that we are debating on essentially legislation and regulatory issues that are already currently in place.

Let me make another point to hopefully point out the disconnect of what we are talking about because one of the issues that we are talking about here is the creation of American energy, American jobs, American security, less dependence on foreign sources of our energy.

This last January, for example, the State Department expelled the consul general of Venezuela in Miami for plotting a cyberattack on the U.S. Government. And yet here we are, debating an issue that could affect our getting to

be less dependent on foreign energy sources and ignoring what is the obvious. We, obviously, ought to be trying to be less dependent on foreign oil, and yet that debate isn't even going on. We are talking about a debate on an amendment that is simply redundant of current law.

I don't know why we are having this debate, but I think that the redundancy of it here—we always have a worst-case discharge scenario in current law. We simply don't need this.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1740

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington I respect a great deal, but to say this is redundant of current law is just incorrect. The gentleman knows, and in fact told us, that the requirement he referred to is in regulations.

Mr. Chairman, for anyone who has watched what's gone on in this body, in this Congress, it has been this House of Representatives that has brought to the floor bill after bill after bill to give this Congress the ability to repeal regulations and to block regulations. I don't want to have to rely on what's in regulations. If we believe in American jobs, and the suggestion that somehow the American jobs in the energy industry are more important than the American jobs in the tourism industry and the shrimpers and the people in tourism who realize every day the opportunity to provide for their families because of the beautiful, pristine coastline that we have in Florida and because of all that surrounds the environment in the other States in the gulf, to suggest that those are somehow less important than energy jobs is inappropriate.

But more than that, I don't want to have to rely on regulations, Mr. Chairman. If we are committed to ensuring that there is an analysis of what would happen in the worst case, then let's put it in the law. Let's put it in the statute. Let's not rely on the regulations that my friends so often blame on these bureaucrats for writing. Let's not rely on them. Here's an opportunity for us to stand together and not want to rely on regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join with me, as they've already acknowledged that this is an important issue, to not have to rely on regulations any longer. Let's make this a part of the law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, since I have the right to close, I will reserve.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, there are lots of amendments that are controversial. Simply requiring that companies do what the regulations require them to do, which my colleague from Washington acknowledges that they are already required to do, but making it a part of the law instead of requiring regulations that may change from time to time is the appropriate step. I think we should all be in agreement on that, and I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, from time to time there shows, really, progress in the course of debate. The gentleman from Florida correctly pointed out that my side of the aisle has some real heartburn on a lot of regulations. I'll be the first to admit that. Apparently he does, too, by his acknowledgement that we have that acknowledgement, and he doesn't want to be governed by regulations. So I think we're making progress, at least in that way, and I congratulate him.

But here's the point. On this specific issue, this Congress has responded, and to their credit, this administration has responded, not probably to the extent that I would like, seeing that the regulatory oversight on potential spills in the gulf or any place in the OCS will be responded to in a timely manner. That was done through the appropriation process by a Republican-led Congress. I congratulate the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations for doing precisely that.

But I will repeat again, in my view, in this particular case this amendment is redundant to what the law, through regulations, already is; and I would urge rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DEUTCH. 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 Florida will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 112–398 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. ESHOO of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 7 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. LANDRY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) 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 173, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

AYES—173

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Costello
Courtney
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
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
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)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
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)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—249

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
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
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
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
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bonner
Campbell
Flores
Fortenberry
Lewis (CA)
Palazzo
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Sullivan

□ 1812

Messrs. YOUNG of Indiana, GOHMERT, and GRIMM changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BLUMENAUER and OLVER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 55, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 254, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—173

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
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)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—254

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
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
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke (MI)
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
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
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Campbell
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1817

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. DICKS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) 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 149, noes 276, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—149

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Boswell
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fortenberry
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
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
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—276

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
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
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
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
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Doggett
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Slaughter
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1821

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DOYLE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) 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 193, noes 234, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

AYES—193

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
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)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Renacci
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
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
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—234

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
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
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
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
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Campbell
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1825

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 265, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

AYES—160

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
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)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
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
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—265

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
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
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
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
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
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
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
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
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (TX)
Campbell
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Shuster
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1829

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) 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 160, noes 267, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—160

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
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
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
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
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

NOES—267

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
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
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
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
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
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
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
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Campbell
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1833

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) 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 257, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—169

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
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)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

NOES—257

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
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)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
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)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Loebsack
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
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
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 (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Cleaver
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1837

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 159, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—266

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

NOES—159

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gibson
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Cleaver
Gingrey (GA)
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1841

Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. CARNEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 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 188, noes 236, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—188

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
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
Gibson
Gohmert
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Reyes
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
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
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
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
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)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
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
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
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 (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
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
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 (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Cleaver
Himes
Maloney
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Serrano
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1845

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote numbers 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote numbers 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 63. I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote number 62.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CASSIDY) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3408) to set clear rules for the development of United States oil shale resources, to promote shale technology research and development, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following Member of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. ISRAEL, New York.

ST. JUDE'S CHARITABLE AUCTION

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, for 50 years, the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital has been one of the leading facilities for researching and treating catastrophic diseases in children. Every year, nearly 8,000 children are treated at St. Jude. That's why I'm proud of a group of friends back in my hometown who, for 36 years, have been raising money for St. Jude through an annual auction.

When the auction started, the first goal they set and reached was $10,000. Well, that has long since been eclipsed. This year was another record-breaking year. The Minden, Louisiana, St. Jude auction held earlier this month raised $1,065,235 to help the ongoing work of saving children's lives.

So thank you to Melissa Brown and Christie Ruple, the cochairs of the Minden St. Jude auction. And thank you to Pete Treat who, after suffering the terrible loss of his 5-year-old daughter to leukemia, started the Minden St. Jude auction and now has had the privilege of watching that auction raise more than $1 million for the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital.

□ 1850

REMEMBERING WHITNEY HOUSTON

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a loss that so many have spoken about over the last week, and that is the loss of Whitney Houston. I would imagine that everyone would acknowledge the beauty of her music and certainly the beauty that she was as a person and a human being. What a very sad loss for her daughter, Bobbi, and her mother, Cissy, her aunt, Dionne Warwick, and the extended family members who loved her dearly.

We cannot help but be reminded of Whitney's beautiful voice singing "The